

# STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) (FY2017-20)

## State- Tamil Nadu



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Checklist – Consolidated State Annual Action Plan of all ULBs to be sent for Assessment by MoUD (as per table 6.2) \_\_\_\_\_ 3

**Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHpsc) Meeting** \_\_\_\_\_ 5

**Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary** \_\_\_\_\_ 6

**1.1 BACKGROUND** \_\_\_\_\_ 6

**1.2 THRUST AREAS** \_\_\_\_\_ 6

**1.3 COVERAGE OF CITIES UNDER MISSION** \_\_\_\_\_ 6

**1.4 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND FUNDING ALLOCATION** \_\_\_\_\_ 7

**Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs** \_\_\_\_\_ 1

**2.1 Project Progress** \_\_\_\_\_ 1

**2.2 Service Levels** \_\_\_\_\_ 6

**2.3 Capacity Building** \_\_\_\_\_ 13

**2.4 Reforms** \_\_\_\_\_ 15

**2.5 Use of A&OE** \_\_\_\_\_ 17

**2.6 Funds flow** \_\_\_\_\_ 18

**2.7 Funds disbursements and Conditions** \_\_\_\_\_ 20

**Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)** \_\_\_\_\_ 21

**3.1 Principles of Prioritization** \_\_\_\_\_ 28

**3.2 Importance of O&M** \_\_\_\_\_ 29

**3.3 Reform Implementation** \_\_\_\_\_ 30

**3.4 Annual Capacity Building Plan** \_\_\_\_\_ 32

**3.5 A&OE** \_\_\_\_\_ 33

**3.6 Financing of Projects** \_\_\_\_\_ 34

**Chapter 4: TABLES:** \_\_\_\_\_ 36

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?   | Yes    | As per MoUD Principles of prioritization, the SLIPs for all cities have been prepared. First Priority has been given to universal coverage of water supply and second has been given to sewerage system. |
| 2.    | Has the SAAP prioritized cities for investment as per priority sectors and gap assessment?                               | Yes    | Prioritization has been done based on the principles of MoUD for priority sectors and based on gap assessment  |
| 3.    | Is the indicator wise summary of improvements proposed (both investments and management improvements) by State in place? | Yes    | Indicator wise summary of improvements (both investments and management improvements) are summarized in the State Annual Action Plan.  |
| 4.    | Have all the cities under Mission identified/done baseline assessments of service coverage indicators?                   | Yes    | All the cities have identified service coverage indicators and incorporated in the Service Level Improvement Plan.   |
| 5.    | Is the SAAP derived from an approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks agreed by Ministry for each Sector?        | Yes    | SAAP has been prepared to meet out the Service Level benchmarks agreed by MoUD for each sector.  |
| 6.    | Is the investment proposed commensurate to the level of improvement envisaged in the indicator?                          | Yes    | The investment proposed will improve the service level indicators to desired levels as envisaged in SLIP and SAAP.   |
| 7.    | Are State Share and ULB share in line with proposed Mission approach?  | Yes    | As per AMRUT Guidelines, depending upon the size of the city the State Share and ULBs Share has been considered. At least 20% of fund contribution by the State.   |
| 8.    | Is there a need for additional   | Yes    | Action has been taken to converge the additional funds through State   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| S.No. | Points of Consideration  | Yes/No | Give Details   |
|-------|--|--------|--|
|       | resources and have state considered raising additional resources (State programs, aided projects, additional devolution to cities, 14th Finance Commission, external sources)? |        | Programmes, 14 <sup>th</sup> Finance commission, TNSUDP, JICA and KFW.   |
| 9.    | Does State Annual Action Plan verify that the cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments?                            | Yes    | Cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments for each project considered in the State Annual Action Plan.  |
| 10.   | Has the State Annual Action Plan considered the resource mobilization capacity of each ULB to ensure that ULB share can be mobilized?  | Yes    | The State Annual Action Plan has considered the financial capacity of each ULB and if required, ULB share can be mobilized through other financial institutions.   |
| 11.   | Has the process of establishment of PDMC been initiated and completed?   | Yes    | CMWSSB and TWAD Board are designated as PDMC for Chennai city and other AMRUT Cities in Tamil Nadu   |
| 12.   | Has a roadmap been prepared to realize the resource potential of the ULB?  | Yes    | The CDP/CCBP prepared for the ULBs has identified the road map to realize the resource potential of respective ULBs  |
| 13.   | Is the implementation plan for projects and reforms in place (Timelines and yearly milestones)?  | Yes    | Timelines and yearly milestones are proposed in SLIP and SAAP.   |
| 14.   | Has the prioritization of projects in ULBs been done in accordance with para 7.2 of the guidelines?  | Yes    | The projects for each ULBs has been prioritized based on the principles of AMRUT guidelines viz., gap analysis and financial strength of ULBs, consultation with local MPs, Mayors and Commissioners etc., |

State Mission Director

**Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHPS) Meeting**

Copy of Minutes enclosed.

## Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

Cities are engines of growth for the economy of every nation, including India. Nearly 31% of India's current population lives in urban areas and contributes 63% of India's GDP (Census 2011). With increasing urbanization, urban areas are expected to house 40% of India's population and contribute 75% of India's GDP by 2030. This requires comprehensive development of physical, institutional, social and economic infrastructure. All are important in improving the quality of life and attracting investments to the City, setting in motion a virtuous cycle of growth and development. In this regard, the Government of India launched Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), a flagship programme on 25<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

The aim of the mission is to provide basic services (e.g. Water supply, Sewerage, Storm Water drainage, Non-Motorized transport and green spaces) to households and build amenities in cities, which will improve the quality of life for all, especially the poor and the disadvantaged. Under this programme, Government of India have selected 500 AMRUT Cities in the Country based on the urban population of the State/ UT. In which 32 Cities / Towns, have been selected in Tamil Nadu viz., 12 City Municipal Corporations (includes 5 ULBs merged with Corporations), 14 Municipalities and 1 Town Panchayat. Recently, Rameswaram Municipality has been added under AMRUT by Government of India.

### 1.2 THRUST AREAS

The Mission will focus on the following Thrust Areas. Viz.,

- Water Supply,
- Sewerage facilities and Septage Management,
- Storm Water Drains to reduce flooding,
- Pedestrian, Non-motorized and public transport facilities, parking spaces, and
- Enhancing amenity value of cities by creating and upgrading green spaces, parks and recreation centers, especially for children.

### 1.3 COVERAGE OF CITIES UNDER MISSION

Out of 33 Cities /Towns, four municipalities are merged with Corporation of Chennai and one municipality merged with Coimbatore City Municipal Corporation. The list of cities/towns and the population of the respective cities/towns are mentioned below. The total population of the AMRUT Cities are 1,37,73,346.

#### List of Urban Local Bodies

| S.No                | Name of the Corporations         | Name of the ULBs Merged                    |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 1                   | Chennai Corporation              | Madavaram, Ambattur, Alandur, Tiruvottiyur |
| 2                   | Coimbatore Municipal Corporation | Kurichi                                    |
| <b>Other Cities</b> |                                  |  |
| 3                   | Ambur Municipality               | 16 Pudukottai Municipality                 |
| 4                   | Avadi Municipality               | 17 Rajapalayam Municipality                |

| S.No | Name of the Corporations       | Name of the ULBs Merged                  |
|------|--------------------------------|--|
| 5    | Cuddalore Municipality         | 18 Salem Municipal Corporation           |
| 6    | Dindigul Municipal Corporation | 19 Tambaram Municipality                 |
| 7    | Erode Municipal Corporation    | 20 Thanjavur Municipal Corporation       |
| 8    | Hosur Municipality             | 21 Thiruvannamalai Municipality          |
| 9    | Kancheepuram Municipality      | 22 Thoothukkudi Municipal Corporation    |
| 10   | Karaikudi Municipality         | 23 Tiruchirappalli Municipal Corporation |
| 11   | Kumbakonam Municipality        | 24 Tirunelveli Municipal Corporation     |
| 12   | Madurai Municipal Corporation  | 25 Tiruppur Municipal Corporation        |
| 13   | Nagapattinam Municipality      | 26 Velankanni Town Panchayat             |
| 14   | Nagercoil Municipality         | 27 Vellore Corporation                   |
| 15   | Pallavaram Municipality        | 28 Rameswaram Municipality               |

#### 1.4 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND FUNDING ALLOCATION

A three tier Programme Management Structure exists in the AMRUT Mission, i.e.

**National Level:** An APEX COMMITTEE, under the Chairmanship of Secretary, MoUD, GoI, consisting of representatives of concerned ministries and organizations, which will consider and approve the projects at National Level and supervise the Mission.

**State Level:** - A State Level High Powered Steering Committee (SHPS), constituted as per the AMRUT guidelines, which is headed by the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Tamil Nadu. The State Mission is headed by the Chairperson and Managing Director, Tamil Nadu Urban Finance Infrastructure Development Corporation, who is the State Mission Director. In addition, State Mission Management Unit provides handholding support to State Mission Directorate.

**City Level:** - The projects will be executed in city level by the Urban Local Bodies, parastatal agencies (i.e) Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board, Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board etc.

**FUND ALLOCATION** - The Mission funds consist of the following four parts as per guidelines

- Project fund - 80% of the annual budgetary allocation
- Incentive for Reforms - 10% of the annual budgetary allocation
- State funds for Administrative & Office Expenses (A&OE) - 8% of the annual budgetary allocation
- MoUD funds for Administrative & Office Expenses (A&OE) - 2% of the annual budgetary allocation
- State Share for the Mission shall be not less than 20% for all the ULBs.
- ULB Share shall be 30% for all the ULBs, except Chennai, Madurai and Coimbatore

**PROJECT FUND** -MoUD, GoI, vide D.O.No.K-14012/95/2015-AMRUT-I dated June 6<sup>th</sup> 2016 has allocated an amount of Rs. 1801.37 Crores to Projects and A&OE of Rs.144.11 Cr for Tamil Nadu.

**Table 1.1 Breakup of Total MoUD Allocation in AMRUT**

| (Amount in Crores) – Year 2017-20                |  |   |                                 |                   |                                      |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Total Central Funds allocated to State (2016-17) | Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total given in coloumn 1) | Allocation of Funds for AMRUT (Central Share) | Project proposal Submitted - CA | *State /ULB share | Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5) |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4                               | 5                 | 6                                    |
| 1801.370   | 144.11   | 1801.37                                       | 1802.74                         | 2308.32           | 4255.17                              |

\* State /ULB share is more than Gol Contribution since 3 cities (Chennai, Madurai and Coimbatore) have population more than 10 lakhs and hence the Gol contribution is 1/3rd of the project cost.

**Table 1.2.1 Abstract-Sector Wise Proposed Total Project Fund and Sharing Pattern**

| (Amount in Crores) – Year 2017-20 |                                 |               |                |               |                |             |                |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| S.No                              | Sector                          | No.of Project | Gol            | State         | ULB            | Convergence | Total          |
| 1                                 | Water supply                    | 3             | 275.27         | 146.74        | 311.69         | 0.00        | 733.70         |
| 2                                 | Sewerage and Septage management | 13            | 1482.44        | 657.46        | 1147.40        | 0.00        | 3287.29        |
| 3                                 | Storm Water Drainage            | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00           |
| 4                                 | Non-Motorized transport         | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00           |
| 5                                 | Green Space                     | 28            | 45.03          | 18.01         | 27.02          | 0.00        | 90.07          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                |                                 | <b>44</b>     | <b>1802.74</b> | <b>822.21</b> | <b>1486.11</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>4111.06</b> |

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

| (Amount in Crores) – Year 2017-20 |              |                |             |               |               |             |                |                |                |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| S.No                              | Sector       | Gol            | State       |               |               | ULB         |                | Total          | Total          |
|                                   |              |                | 14th FC     | Others        | Total         | 14th FC     | Others         |                |                |
| 1                                 | Water supply | 275.27         | 0           | 146.74        | 146.74        | 0           | 311.69         | 311.69         | 733.70         |
| 2                                 | Sewerage     | 1482.44        | 0           | 657.46        | 657.46        | 0           | 1147.40        | 1147.40        | 3287.29        |
| 3                                 | Drainage     | 0.00           | 0           | 0.00          | 0.00          | 0           | 0.00           | 0.00           | 0.00           |
| 4                                 | NMT          | 0.00           | 0           | 0.00          | 0.00          | 0           | 0.00           | 0.00           | 0.00           |
| 5                                 | Green space  | 45.03          | 0           | 18.01         | 18.01         | 0           | 27.02          | 27.02          | 90.07          |
|                                   | <b>Total</b> | <b>1802.74</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>822.21</b> | <b>822.21</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>1486.11</b> | <b>1486.11</b> | <b>4111.06</b> |



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

Sanctioned 2015-16 and proposed 2017-20 funds Amount in Cr

| <b>Table 1.3 Abstract-Use of Funds on Projects: On Going and New</b> |               |                                 |  |                |              |              |                |              |  |               |                |               |              |                |   |                |               |                |                |              |                |                |  |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| <b>S. No.</b>  | <b>Sector</b> | <b>Total Project Investment</b> | <b>Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)</b> |                |              |              |                |              | <b>Proposed Spending during current financial year</b> |               |                |               |              |                | <b>Balance Carry Forward for the next 3 yrs upto 2020</b> |                |               |                |                |              |                |                |  |
|  |               |                                 | <b>Center</b>  | <b>State</b>   |              |              | <b>ULB</b>     |              |  | <b>Center</b> | <b>State</b>   |               |              | <b>ULB</b>     |   |                | <b>Center</b> | <b>State</b>   |                |              | <b>ULB</b>     |                |  |
|  |               |                                 |  | <b>14th FC</b> | <b>Other</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>14th FC</b> | <b>Other</b> | <b>Total</b>   |               | <b>14th FC</b> | <b>Other</b>  | <b>Total</b> | <b>14th FC</b> | <b>Other</b>  | <b>Total</b>   |               | <b>14th FC</b> | <b>Other</b>   | <b>Total</b> |                |                |  |
| 1  | Water supply  | 5661.67                         | 0  | 0              | 0            | 0            | 0              | 0            | 457.93   | 0             | 305.93         | 305.93        | 0.00         | 368.47         | 368.47  | 1831.72        | 0             | 1223.73        | 1223.73        | 0            | 1473.88        | 1473.88        |  |
| 2  | Sewer age     | 5295.42                         | 0  | 0              | 0            | 0            | 0              | 0            | 469.91   | 0             | 211.82         | 211.82        | 0.00         | 377.36         | 377.36  | 1879.65        | 0             | 847.27         | 847.27         | 0            | 1509.42        | 1509.42        |  |
| 3  | Drain age     | 0.00                            | 0  | 0              | 0            | 0            | 0              | 0            | 0.00   | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00         | 0.00           | 0.00  | 0.00           | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00           | 0            | 0.00           | 0.00           |  |
| 4  | NMT           | 0.00                            | 0  | 0              | 0            | 0            | 0              | 0            | 0.00   | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00         | 0.00           | 0.00  | 0.00           | 0             | 0.00           | 0.00           | 0            | 0.00           | 0.00           |  |
| 5  | Green space   | 237.69                          | 0  | 0              | 0            | 0            | 0              | 0            | 23.77  | 0             | 9.51           | 9.51          | 0.00         | 14.26          | 14.26   | 95.08          | 0             | 38.03          | 38.03          | 0            | 57.04          | 57.04          |  |
|  | <b>Total</b>  | <b>11194.78</b>                 | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>     | <b>0</b>     | <b>0</b>       | <b>0</b>     | <b>951.61</b>  | <b>0</b>      | <b>527.26</b>  | <b>527.26</b> | <b>0</b>     | <b>760.09</b>  | <b>760.09</b>   | <b>3806.45</b> | <b>0</b>      | <b>2109.03</b> | <b>2109.03</b> | <b>0</b>     | <b>3040.34</b> | <b>3040.34</b> |  |

**Table 1.4 Abstract-Plans for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks**

| Proposed Priority Projects | Total Project Cost | Indicator   | Baseline | Annual Targets                      |     |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
|                            |                    |   |          | (Increment from the Baseline Value) |     |      |      |      |      |
|                            |                    |   |          | FY 2016                             |     | FY   | FY   | FY   | FY   |
|                            |                    |   |          | H1                                  | H2  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Water Supply               | 733.70             | 1.Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%      | 55%                                 | 58% | 65%  | 73%  | 78%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 2.Per capita quantum of water supplied                  | 74       | 74                                  | 77  | 87   | 97   | 122  | 135  |
|                            |                    | 3.Quality of water supplied                             | 79%      | 81%                                 | 85% | 87%  | 93%  | 95%  | 100% |
| Sewerage                   | 3287.29            | 4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)        | 82%      | 84%                                 | 86% | 90%  | 94%  | 98%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 5.Coverage of sewerage network services                 | 23%      | 29%                                 | 33% | 51%  | 66%  | 83%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 6.Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage                  | 23%      | 32%                                 | 36% | 55%  | 66%  | 79%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 7.Efficiency in treatment                               | 49%      | 49%                                 | 51% | 66%  | 75%  | 82%  | 100% |

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

|                                  |                  |               |                |             |             |              | Rs.in Cr       |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| S.n                              | Name of the City | Water supply  | Sewerage       | Drainage    | NMT         | Green space  | Grand Total    |
| 1                                | Ambur            | 0.00          | 275.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 277.73         |
| 2                                | Avadi            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 3                                | Chennai          | 88.70         | 317.29         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 13.65        | 419.64         |
| 4                                | Coimbatore       | 0.00          | 331.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 5.46         | 336.46         |
| 5                                | Cuddalore        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 6                                | Dindigul         | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 7                                | Erode            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 8                                | Hosur            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 9                                | Kancheepuram     | 0.00          | 50.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 52.73          |
| 10                               | Karaikudi        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 11                               | Kumbakonam       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 12                               | Madurai          | 450.00        | 300.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 752.73         |
| 13                               | Nagapattinam     | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 14                               | Nagercoil        | 0.00          | 310.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 312.73         |
| 15                               | Pallavaram       | 0.00          | 22.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 24.73          |
| 16                               | Pudukottai       | 195.00        | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 197.73         |
| 17                               | Rajapalayam      | 0.00          | 194.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 196.73         |
| 18                               | Salem            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 19                               | Tambaram         | 0.00          | 35.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 37.73          |
| 20                               | Thanjavur        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 21                               | Thiruvannamalai  | 0.00          | 260.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 262.73         |
| 22                               | Thoothukkudi     | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 23                               | Tiruchirappalli  | 0.00          | 453.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 455.73         |
| 24                               | Tirunelveli      | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 25                               | Tiruppur         | 0.00          | 415.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 417.73         |
| 26                               | Velankanni       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 27                               | Vellore          | 0.00          | 325.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 327.73         |
| 28                               | Rameswaram       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| <b>Total Project Investments</b> |                  | <b>733.70</b> | <b>3287.29</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>90.07</b> | <b>4111.06</b> |
| <b>A &amp;OE</b>                 |                  |               |                |             |             |              | <b>144.11</b>  |
| <b>Grand Total</b>               |                  |               |                |             |             |              | <b>4255.17</b> |

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

| S.No | Name of the Cities | Total Project Investment | Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year) |         |       |       |         |       | Proposed Spending during current financial year |        |         |        |        |         | Balance Carry Forward for the next Year |        |         |         |         |         |      |         |         |
|------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|---------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|---------|---------|
|      |                    |                          | Center  | State   |       |       | ULB     |       |   | Center | State   |        |        | ULB     |   |        | Center  | State   |         |         | ULB  |         |         |
|      |                    |                          |   | 14th FC | Other | Total | 14th FC | Other | Total   |        | 14th FC | Other  | Total  | 14th FC | Other                                   | Total  |         | 14th FC | Other   | Total   |      |         |         |
| 1    | Ambur              | 387.77                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 38.78  | 0.00    | 15.51  | 15.51  | 0.00    | 23.27                                   | 23.27  | 155.11  | 0.00    | 62.04   | 62.04   | 0.00 | 93.06   | 93.06   |
| 2    | Avadi              | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 3    | Chennai            | 2391.35                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 159.15 | 0.00    | 164.83 | 164.83 | 0.00    | 154.29                                  | 154.29 | 636.60  | 0.00    | 659.31  | 659.31  | 0.00 | 617.17  | 617.17  |
| 4    | Coimbatore         | 1120.84                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 74.61  | 0.00    | 50.86  | 50.86  | 0.00    | 98.70                                   | 98.70  | 298.43  | 0.00    | 203.44  | 203.44  | 0.00 | 394.80  | 394.80  |
| 5    | Cuddalore          | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 6    | Dindigul           | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 7    | Erode              | 249.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 24.95  | 0.00    | 9.98   | 9.98   | 0.00    | 14.97                                   | 14.97  | 99.80   | 0.00    | 39.92   | 39.92   | 0.00 | 59.88   | 59.88   |
| 8    | Hosur              | 151.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 15.15  | 0.00    | 6.06   | 6.06   | 0.00    | 9.09                                    | 9.09   | 60.60   | 0.00    | 24.24   | 24.24   | 0.00 | 36.36   | 36.36   |
| 9    | Kancheepura        | 57.51                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5.75   | 0.00    | 2.30   | 2.30   | 0.00    | 3.45                                    | 3.45   | 23.00   | 0.00    | 9.20    | 9.20    | 0.00 | 13.80   | 13.80   |
| 10   | Karaikudi          | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 11   | Kumbakonam         | 72.82                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 7.28   | 0.00    | 2.91   | 2.91   | 0.00    | 4.37                                    | 4.37   | 29.13   | 0.00    | 11.65   | 11.65   | 0.00 | 17.48   | 17.48   |
| 12   | Madurai            | 1514.81                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 100.36 | 0.00    | 64.86  | 64.86  | 0.00    | 137.75                                  | 137.75 | 401.42  | 0.00    | 259.44  | 259.44  | 0.00 | 550.99  | 550.99  |
| 13   | Nagapattinam       | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 14   | Nagercoil          | 557.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 55.75  | 0.00    | 22.30  | 22.30  | 0.00    | 33.45                                   | 33.45  | 223.00  | 0.00    | 89.20   | 89.20   | 0.00 | 133.80  | 133.80  |
| 15   | Pallavaram         | 303.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 30.35  | 0.00    | 12.14  | 12.14  | 0.00    | 18.21                                   | 18.21  | 121.40  | 0.00    | 48.56   | 48.56   | 0.00 | 72.84   | 72.84   |
| 16   | Pudukottai         | 202.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 20.25  | 0.00    | 8.10   | 8.10   | 0.00    | 12.15                                   | 12.15  | 81.00   | 0.00    | 32.40   | 32.40   | 0.00 | 48.60   | 48.60   |
| 17   | Rajapalayam        | 443.87                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 44.39  | 0.00    | 17.75  | 17.75  | 0.00    | 26.63                                   | 26.63  | 177.55  | 0.00    | 71.02   | 71.02   | 0.00 | 106.53  | 106.53  |
| 18   | Salem              | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 19   | Tambaram           | 362.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 36.25  | 0.00    | 14.50  | 14.50  | 0.00    | 21.75                                   | 21.75  | 145.00  | 0.00    | 58.00   | 58.00   | 0.00 | 87.00   | 87.00   |
| 20   | Thanjavur          | 182.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 18.25  | 0.00    | 7.30   | 7.30   | 0.00    | 10.95                                   | 10.95  | 73.00   | 0.00    | 29.20   | 29.20   | 0.00 | 43.80   | 43.80   |
| 21   | Thiruvannamalai    | 267.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 26.75  | 0.00    | 10.70  | 10.70  | 0.00    | 16.05                                   | 16.05  | 107.00  | 0.00    | 42.80   | 42.80   | 0.00 | 64.20   | 64.20   |
| 22   | Thoothukkudi       | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00    | 0.00    | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 23   | Tiruchirappalli    | 899.72                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 89.97  | 0.00    | 35.99  | 35.99  | 0.00    | 53.98                                   | 53.98  | 359.89  | 0.00    | 143.95  | 143.95  | 0.00 | 215.93  | 215.93  |
| 24   | Tirunelveli        | 304.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 30.45  | 0.00    | 12.18  | 12.18  | 0.00    | 18.27                                   | 18.27  | 121.80  | 0.00    | 48.72   | 48.72   | 0.00 | 73.08   | 73.08   |
| 25   | Tiruppur           | 652.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 65.25  | 0.00    | 26.10  | 26.10  | 0.00    | 39.15                                   | 39.15  | 261.00  | 0.00    | 104.40  | 104.40  | 0.00 | 156.60  | 156.60  |
| 26   | Velankanni         | 38.58                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 3.86   | 0.00    | 1.54   | 1.54   | 0.00    | 2.31                                    | 2.31   | 15.43   | 0.00    | 6.17    | 6.17    | 0.00 | 9.26    | 9.26    |
| 27   | Vellore            | 930.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 93.05  | 0.00    | 37.22  | 37.22  | 0.00    | 55.83                                   | 55.83  | 372.20  | 0.00    | 148.88  | 148.88  | 0.00 | 223.32  | 223.32  |
| 28   | Rameswaram         | 50.39                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5.04   | 0.00    | 2.02   | 2.02   | 0.00    | 3.02                                    | 3.02   | 20.15   | 0.00    | 8.06    | 8.06    | 0.00 | 12.09   | 12.09   |
|      |                    | 11194.78                 | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 950.89 | 0.00    | 527.26 | 527.26 | 0.00    | 760.81                                  | 760.81 | 3803.57 | 0.00    | 2109.03 | 2109.03 | 0.00 | 3043.22 | 3043.22 |

## 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 2017-20, a key requirement is to review the performance of the approved SAAP 2015-16 & SAAP 2016-17. This chapter reviews the performance of the implementation of the past SAAPs on key themes in the AMRUT Guidelines. In Tamil Nadu, the SAAP 2016-17 has been prepared at a cost of Rs. 1582.89 and it has been approved by APEX committee.

### 2.1 PROJECT PROGRESS

As per SAAP 2015-16 there are 10 water supply projects, 1 sewerage projects and 25 Green space projects have been approved by the SLHPSC. The physical and financial progress of projects is tabularized below;

| SAAP 2015-16 |                    |               |                |     |      |            |                            |               |                               |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|------|------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| S.N.         | Name of ULB        | Approved SAAP |                | DPR | SLTC | Work Order | Implementation in Progress |               | Amount Disbursement Till Date |
|              |                    | Project Name  | Amount Rs..Cr  | Y/N | Y/N  | Y/N        | Physical (%)               | Financial (%) |                               |
| 1            | Ambur              | Water Supply  | 50.90          | Yes | Yes  | No         | 0%                         | 20%           | 11.71                         |
| 2            | Chennai            |               | 954.00         |     |      |            |                            |               | 205.31                        |
| 3            | Coimbatore         |               | 395.41         |     |      |            |                            |               | 97.67                         |
| 4            | Erode              |               | 484.45         |     |      |            |                            |               | 111.42                        |
| 5            | Hosur              |               | 87.91          |     |      |            |                            |               | 20.22                         |
| 6            | Madurai            |               | 320.00         |     |      |            |                            |               | 79.04                         |
| 7            | Nagercoil          |               | 223.44         |     |      |            |                            |               | 51.39                         |
| 8            | Rajapalayam        |               | 180.05         |     |      |            |                            |               | 41.41                         |
| 9            | Thanjavur          |               | 48.14          |     |      |            |                            |               | 11.07                         |
| 10           | Tiruppur           |               | 250.00         |     |      |            |                            |               | 57.50                         |
| 11           | Vellore            |               | 234.93         |     |      |            |                            |               | 54.04                         |
|              | <b>TOTAL (A)</b>   |               | <b>3229.23</b> |     |      |            |                            |               | <b>740.78</b>                 |
| <b>B</b>     | <b>SEWERAGE</b>    |               |                |     |      |            |                            |               |                               |
| 1            | Velankanni         |               | 23.32          | Yes | Yes  | No         |                            |               | 5.36                          |
| <b>B</b>     | <b>TOTAL (B)</b>   |               | <b>23.32</b>   |     |      |            |                            |               | <b>5.36</b>                   |
| <b>C</b>     | <b>GREEN SPACE</b> |               |                |     |      |            |                            |               |                               |
| 1            | Ambur              |               | 1.33           | Yes | Yes  | No         |                            |               | 0.30                          |
| 2            | Avadi              |               | 2.06           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.47                          |
| 3            | Chennai            |               | 11.01          |     |      |            |                            |               | 2.53                          |
| 4            | Coimbatore         |               | 4.28           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.98                          |
| 5            | Cuddalore          |               | 2.13           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| SAAP 2015-16 |                            |               |                |     |      |            |                            |               |                               |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|-----|------|------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| S.N.         | Name of ULB                | Approved SAAP |                | DPR | SLTC | Work Order | Implementation in Progress |               | Amount Disbursement Till Date |
|              |                            | Project Name  | Amount Rs..Cr  | Y/N | Y/N  | Y/N        | Physical (%)               | Financial (%) |                               |
| 6            | Dindigul                   |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 7            | Erode                      |               | 2.27           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.52                          |
| 8            | Hosur                      |               | 2.07           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.48                          |
| 9            | Kancheepuram               |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 10           | Karaikudi                  |               | 2.16           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.50                          |
| 11           | Kumbakonam                 |               | 2.17           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.50                          |
| 12           | Madurai                    |               | 2.22           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.51                          |
| 13           | Nagercoil                  |               | 1.98           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.46                          |
| 14           | Pallavaram                 |               | 2.02           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.46                          |
| 15           | Pudukottai                 |               | 2.07           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.47                          |
| 16           | Rajapalayam                |               | 2.26           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.52                          |
| 17           | Salem                      |               | 1.93           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.44                          |
| 18           | Tambaram                   |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 19           | Thanjavur                  |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 20           | Thiruvannamalai            |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 21           | Thoothukkudi               |               | 1.99           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.46                          |
| 22           | Tiruchirappalli            |               | 2.14           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.49                          |
| 23           | Tirunelveli                |               | 2.72           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.63                          |
| 24           | Tiruppur                   |               | 2.16           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.50                          |
| 25           | Vellore                    |               | 2.01           |     |      |            |                            |               | 0.46                          |
| <b>C</b>     | <b>TOTAL (C)</b>           |               | <b>63.67</b>   |     |      |            |                            |               | <b>14.64</b>                  |
|              | <b>GRAND TOTAL (A+B+C)</b> |               | <b>3316.22</b> |     |      |            |                            |               | <b>760.78</b>                 |

As per SAAP 2016-17, there are 5 water supply projects, 7 sewerage projects and 25 Green space projects have been approved by the SLHPSC. The physical and financial progress of projects is tabularized below;

| SAAP 2016-17 |                  |               |                 |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----|------|------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| S.No.        | Name of the ULBs | Approved SAAP |                 | DPR | SLTC | Work Order | Implementation in Progress |             | Amount Disbursement till date |
|              |                  | Project Name  | Amount Rs in Cr | Y/N | Y/N  | Y/N        | Physical %                 | Financial % |                               |
| 1            | Chennai          | Water Supply  | 723.96          | Yes | Yes  | NA         | NA                         | NA          | NA                            |
| 2            | Pallavaram       |               | 274             |     | Yes  |            |                            |             |                               |
| 3            | Tambaram         |               | 320             |     | Yes  |            |                            |             |                               |
| 4            | Kumbakonam       |               | 25.67           |     | No   |            |                            |             |                               |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| SAAP 2016-17 |                  |               |                 |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----|------|------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| S.No.        | Name of the ULBs | Approved SAAP |                 | DPR | SLTC | Work Order | Implementation in Progress |             | Amount Disbursement till date |
|              |                  | Project Name  | Amount Rs in Cr | Y/N | Y/N  | Y/N        | Physical %                 | Financial % |                               |
| 5            | Madurai          |               | 437.3           |     | No   |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Total            |               | <b>1780.93</b>  |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| NA           | Chennai          | Sewer age     | 482.72          | Yes | Yes  | NA         | NA                         | NA          | NA                            |
|              | Coimbatore       |               | 322.83          |     | No   |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Kumbakonam       |               | 39.64           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Tiruchirappalli  |               | 439.21          |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Tirunelveli      |               | 297             |     | YES  |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Vellore          |               | 348             |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Rameswaram       |               | 45.02           |     | No   |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | Total            |               | <b>1974.42</b>  |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 1            | Ambur            | Green space   | 0               | Yes | Yes  | NA         | NA                         | NA          | NA                            |
| 2            | Avadi            |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 3            | Chennai          |               | 13.19           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 4            | Coimbatore       |               | 5.276           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 5            | Cuddalore        |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 6            | Dindigul         |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 7            | Erode            |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 8            | Hosur            |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 8            | Kancheepuram     |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 10           | Karaikudi        |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 11           | Kumbakonam       |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 12           | Madurai          |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 13           | Nagapattinam     |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 14           | Nagercoil        |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 15           | Pallavaram       |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 16           | Pudukottai       |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 17           | Rajapalayam      |               | 0               |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 18           | Salem            |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 19           | Tambaram         |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 20           | Thanjavur        |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 21           | Thiruvannamalai  |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 22           | Thoothukkudi     |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 23           | Tiruchirappalli  |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 24           | Tirunelveli      |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 25           | Tiruppur         |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 26           | Velankanni       |               | 0               |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
| 27           | Vellore          |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |

| SAAP 2016-17 |                           |               |                 |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----|------|------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| S.No.        | Name of the ULBs          | Approved SAAP |                 | DPR | SLTC | Work Order | Implementation in Progress |             | Amount Disbursement till date |
|              |                           | Project Name  | Amount Rs in Cr | Y/N | Y/N  | Y/N        | Physical %                 | Financial % |                               |
| 28           | Rameswaram                |               | 2.638           |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | <b>Total Project Cost</b> |               | <b>79.14</b>    |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |
|              | <b>Grand Total</b>        |               | <b>3834.49</b>  |     |      |            |                            |             |                               |

**1) 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)**

As per above table, there are 74 projects are approved in 2015-16 & 2016-17 under AMRUT mission. In which, 16 water supply projects, 8 sewerage projects and 50 green space projects. The DPRs for all 74 projects has been prepared.

**2) What is the plan of action for the pending DPRs? (300 words)**

NA

**3) How many SLTC meetings had been held in the State? How many DPRs have been approved by the SLTC till date? (250 words)**

Three State Level Technical Committee has been conducted till date and 44 projects of SAAP 2015-16 worth Rs.3321.02Cr and 33 projects of SAAP 2016-17 worth Rs. 1444.42Cr have been approved out of 39 projects.

**4) By when will the pending DPRs be approved by the SLTC and when will implementation start? (250 words)**

The pending DPR are likely to be approved by State Level Technical Committee by end of March 2017. In which all the pending projects will be approved. On receiving approval from SLTC, tendering procedure will be started. We are expecting all these projects will be tendered before end of March 2017. Implementation of water supply projects and green space projects approved on SAAP 2015-16 has already started.

**5) 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)**

Due to the cyclone impact of the state. The Urban Local Bodies were not in a position to proceed with the tenders for the sanctioned projects. The projects are expected to be tendered before end of March 2017. The proposed plan of action is summarized below:

- To conduct weekly and monthly review of project progress
- To prepare micro level plan involving resource allocation,
- To make the ULBs to adhere the timeline.



**6) 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)**

The amount received from Gol has already been distributed to ULBs as per the approved projects for SAAP 2015-16. The total amount utilized till date are Rs. 286.79Cr. Since the process of bidding has just been started actual utilization of fund will improve in next 2-3 months. There is no deviation in funding pattern approved by the Apex Committee. The funding pattern for towns with population less than 10 lacs is State share is 20% and ULB share is 30% and towns with population above 10 lacs is State share is 33% and ULB share is 47%.

**7) List out the projects where release of funds to ULBs by the State was delayed?**

There is no delay in the release of funds to ULBs by the State.

**8) In how many ULBs implementation was done by agencies other than ULBs? Was a resolution taken from all ULBs? (tabular and 200 words)**

Based on the projects approved by SAAP 2015-16, all ULBs except Chennai, the water supply projects will be executed by Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board.

**9) 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)**

Following projects are assessed value lesser than the approved by the apex committee.2015-16 & 2016-17

| Rs.in Cr            |                  |                                   |                            |                  |                                   |                            |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| S.n                 | Name of the City | Projects Approved in SAAP 2015-16 | Projects Approved in SHPSC | Name of the City | Projects Approved in SAAP 2016-17 | Projects Approved in SHPSC |
| <b>Water Supply</b> |                  |                                   |                            |                  |                                   |                            |
| 1                   | Chennai          | 741.14                            | 954.00                     | Chennai          | 723.96                            | 802.02                     |
| 2                   | Coimbatore       | 452.00                            | 395.41                     | Pallavaram       | 274.00                            |                            |
| 3                   | Rajapalayam      | 245.00                            | 180.05                     | Tambaram         | 320.00                            |                            |
| 4                   | Vellore          | 250.00                            | 234.93                     | Kumbakonam       | 25.67                             | -                          |
| 5                   | Erode            | 242.00                            | 484.45                     | Madurai          | 437.30                            | -                          |
| 6                   | Hosur            | 144.00                            | 87.91                      |                  |                                   |                            |
| 7                   | Madurai          | 320.00                            | 320.00                     |                  |                                   |                            |
| 8                   | Ambur            | 107.90                            | 50.9                       |                  |                                   |                            |
| 9                   | Thanjavur        | 175.00                            | 48.14                      |                  |                                   |                            |
| 10                  | Nagercoil        | 240.00                            | 223.44                     |                  |                                   |                            |
| 11                  | Tiruppur         | 230.00                            | 250.00                     |                  |                                   |                            |
| <b>Sewerage</b>     |                  |                                   |                            |                  |                                   |                            |
| 12                  | Velankanni       | 33.71                             | 23.32                      | Chennai          | 482.72                            | 223.00                     |
| 13                  |                  |                                   |                            | Coimbatore       | 322.83                            | -                          |
| 14                  |                  |                                   |                            | Kumbakonam       | 39.64                             | -                          |

| Rs.in Cr |                  |                                   |                            |                  |                                   |                            |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| S.n      | Name of the City | Projects Approved in SAAP 2015-16 | Projects Approved in SHPSC | Name of the City | Projects Approved in SAAP 2016-17 | Projects Approved in SHPSC |
|          |                  |                                   |                            | Trichirappalli   | 439.21                            | -                          |
|          |                  |                                   |                            | Tirunelveli      | 297.00                            | -                          |
|          |                  |                                   |                            | Vellore          | 348.00                            | 343.69                     |
|          |                  |                                   |                            | Rameswaram       | 45.02                             | -                          |

**10) List out the number of city-wise projects where the second and third installments were claimed. (Tabular form).**

It has been planned to claim the second installment during May- 2017 after the implementation of the projects.

**11) List out the city-wise completed projects. Was the targeted benchmark achieved? Explain the reasons for non-achievement (tabular form and 400 words)**

Nil. Due to the cyclone impact, the projects could not be commenced till Jan - 2017.

**12) List out the details of projects taken up in PPP model. Describe the type of PPP (tabular; 300 words)**

No projects have been taken up in PPP model.

**13) 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)**

It is proposed to include the smart solutions in water management and sewerage system apart from on-line consumer compliant redressal and billing / payment system.

## 2.2 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.

| Name of the ULBs    | Service Level Bench Mark                  | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                     |   |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
| <b>Water Supply</b> |   |                          |                          |  |   |
| Chennai Corporation | Household coverage of direct water supply | 55%                      | 100%                     | 55%                                      | 70%   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs | Service Level Bench Mark                              | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                  |   |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                  | connections   |                          |                          |  |   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 75.22                    | 135                      | 75                                       | 100   |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 92%                      | 100%                     | 94%                                      | 97%   |
| Pallavaram       | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 35%                      | 100%                     | 45%                                      | 70%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 30                       | 135                      | 30                                       | 60  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 99%                      | 100%                     | 99%                                      | 99%   |
| Tambaram         | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 39%                      | 100%                     | 42%                                      | 50%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 68.00                    | 135                      | 72                                       | 80  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 50%                      | 100%                     | 55%                                      | 70%   |
| Kumbakonam       | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 43%                      | 100%                     | 45%                                      | 55%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 113                      | 135                      | 113                                      | 120   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs | Service Level Bench Mark                              | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                  |   |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 100%                     | 100%                     | 100%                                     |   |
| Madurai          | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 53%                      | 100%                     | 53%                                      | 65%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 76                       | 135                      | 76                                       | 90  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 75%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 95%   |
| Coimbatore       | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 44%                      | 100%                     | 44%                                      | 60%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 39                       | 135                      | 40                                       | 60  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 75%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 90%   |
| Erode            | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 39%                      | 100%                     | 45%                                      | 55%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 64                       | 135                      | 64                                       | 80  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 62%                      | 100%                     | 62%                                      | 70%   |
| Hosur            | Household coverage of direct water                    | 38%                      | 100%                     | 39%                                      | 50%   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs | Service Level Bench Mark                              | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                  |   |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                  | supply connections                                    |                          |                          |  |   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 65                       | 135                      | 65                                       | 70  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 80%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 85%   |
| Madurai          | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 53%                      | 100%                     | 53%                                      | 65%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 76                       | 135                      | 76                                       | 90  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 75%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 95%   |
| Nagercoil        | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 57%                      | 100%                     | 57%                                      | 65%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 93                       | 135                      | 93                                       | 100   |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 95%                      | 100%                     | 95%                                      | 95%   |
| Rajapalayam      | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 49%                      | 100%                     | 53%                                      | 60%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied                  | 58                       | 135                      | 61                                       | 61  |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs | Service Level Bench Mark                              | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                  |   |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                  | LPCD  |                          |                          |  |   |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 60%                      | 100%                     | 70%                                      | 90%   |
| Thanjavur        | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%                      | 100%                     | 54%                                      | 60%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 88                       | 135                      | 88                                       | 110   |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 65%                      | 100%                     | 65%                                      | 80%   |
| Tripur           | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 76%                      | 100%                     | 78%                                      | 82%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 110                      | 135                      | 110                                      | 120   |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 95%                      | 100%                     | 95%                                      | 98%   |
| Vellore          | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 41%                      | 100%                     | 45%                                      | 55%   |
|                  | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 60                       | 135                      | 60                                       | 75  |
|                  | Quality of water supplied                             | 80%                      | 100%                     | 85%                                      | 90%   |
| <b>Sewerage</b>  |   |                          |                          |  |   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs                      | Service Level Bench Mark                       | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                                       |  |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
| Chennai Corporation                   | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 75%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 95%   |
|                                       | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 67%                      | 100%                     | 75%                                      | 90%   |
|                                       | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 88%                      | 100%                     | 95%                                      | 97%   |
|                                       | Efficiency in treatment                        | 53%                      | 100%                     | 65%                                      | 90%   |
| Coimbatore Municipal Corporation      | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 80%                      | 100%                     | 87%                                      | 92%   |
|                                       | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 28%                      | 100%                     | 30%                                      | 50%   |
|                                       | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 19%                      | 100%                     | 50%                                      | 77%   |
|                                       | Efficiency in treatment                        | 75%                      | 100%                     | 75%                                      | 85%   |
| Kumbakonam Municipality               | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 79%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 85%   |
|                                       | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 40%                      | 100%                     | 45%                                      | 70%   |
|                                       | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 69%                      | 100%                     | 69%                                      | 75%   |
|                                       | Efficiency in treatment                        | 86%                      | 100%                     | 86%                                      | 90%   |
| Tiruchirappalli Municipal Corporation | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 80%                      | 100%                     | 80%                                      | 90%   |
|                                       | Coverage of sewerage                           | 25%                      | 100%                     | 32%                                      | 55%   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| Name of the ULBs                  | Service Level Bench Mark                       | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                                   |  |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                                   | network services                               |                          |                          |  |   |
|                                   | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 26%                      | 100%                     | 35%                                      | 60%   |
|                                   | Efficiency in treatment                        | 69%                      | 100%                     | 72%                                      | 82%   |
| Tirunelveli Municipal Corporation | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 86%                      | 100%                     | 86%                                      | 90%   |
|                                   | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 16%                      | 100%                     | 25%                                      | 50%   |
|                                   | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 20%                      | 100%                     | 25%                                      | 45%   |
|                                   | Efficiency in treatment                        | 100%                     | 100%                     | 100%                                     | 100%  |
| Vellore Municipal Corporation     | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 72%                      | 100%                     | 73%                                      | 82%   |
|                                   | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 0%                       | 100%                     | 25%                                      | 35%   |
|                                   | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 0%                       | 100%                     | 7%                                       | 35%   |
|                                   | Efficiency in treatment                        | 100%                     | 100%                     | 100%                                     | 100%  |
| Rameswaram                        | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 44%                      | 100%                     | 44%                                      | 45%   |
|                                   | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 0%                       | 100%                     | 0%                                       | 25%   |
|                                   | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 0%                       | 100%                     | 0%                                       | 25%   |
|                                   | Efficiency in                                  | 0%                       | 100%                     | 0%                                       | 25%   |



| Name of the ULBs | Service Level Bench Mark | SAAP Baseline as in 2015 | SAAP Mission Target 2020 | For the last financial Year              |   |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|                  |                          |                          |                          | Target upto beginning of Current FY 2016 | Achievement upto beginning of current FY 2017 |
|                  | treatment                |                          |                          |  |   |

**14) 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)**

Once the projects are commenced, the target specified for each of the projects will be monitored and it will be ensured that all the projects are completed within the target period.

**15) What are the status of the ongoing DPR preparation and the plan of action for the pending DPRs? (300 words)**

DPRs have already been prepared. The Chennai Water Supply Projects and green space DPRs approved by the State Level High Powered Steering Committee. There pending DPRs may be approved by SLTC on Feb - 2017.

**2.3 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.

| SAAP 2017-20 |              |   |  |   |   |  |
|--------------|--------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| S.No         | 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  |
| 1            | Ambur        | Finance / Engineering/ Town Planning Administration | 70   | 20  | 20  | ESCI, Hyderabad, IHS, Bangalore, IIT – Roorkee, YASHADA, Pune, |
| 2            | Avadi        |   | 70   | 20  | 20  |  |
| 3            | Chennai      |   | 310  | 100   | 80  |  |
| 4            | Coimbatore   |   | 155  | 50  | 60  |  |
| 5            | Cuddalore    |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 6            | Dindigul     |   | 95   | 50  | 35  |  |
| 7            | Erode        |   | 105  | 50  | 35  |  |
| 8            | Hosur        |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 9            | Kancheepuram |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 10           | Karaikudi    |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 11           | Kumbakonam   |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 12           | Madurai      |   | 105  | 50  | 40  |  |
| 13           | Nagapattinam |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 14           | Nagercoil    |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 15           | Pallavaram   |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 16           | Pudukottai   |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |
| 17           | Rajapalayam  |   | 70   | 50  | 20  |  |

| SAAP 2017-20 |                 |                    |  |   |   |                         |            |  |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------|--|
| S.No         | 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 |            |  |
| 18           | Salem           |                    | 105  | 50  | 35  |                         |            |  |
| 19           | Tambaram        |                    | 70   | 50  | 20  |                         |            |  |
| 20           | Thanjavur       |                    | 95   | 50  | 35  |                         |            |  |
| 21           | Thiruvannamalai |                    | 70   | 50  | 20  |                         |            |  |
| 22           | Thoothukudi     |                    | 105  | 50  | 35  |                         |            |  |
| 23           | Tiruchirapalli  |                    | 105  | 50  | 35  |                         |            |  |
| 24           | Tirunelveli     |                    | 105  | 50  | 30  |                         |            |  |
| 25           | Tiruppur        |                    | 80   | 50  | 30  |                         |            |  |
| 26           | Velankanni TP   |                    | 65   | 10  | 20  |                         |            |  |
| 27           | Vellore         |                    | 105  | 50  | 30  |                         |            |  |
|              | <b>Total</b>    |                    |  | <b>2515</b>   | <b>1300</b>   |                         | <b>780</b> |  |

**16) 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)**

Training are being conducted in all the four departments viz., Finance , Engineering and Public Health, Town Planning and Administration

**17) 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)**

Nil

**18) What is the status of utilization of funds? (250 words)**

The fund utilized under capacity building during the FY – 2015-16 is Rs. 0.49 lakhs towards SMMU unit, Residential Training Programme and workshops.

**19) Have the participants visited best practice sites? Give details (350 words)**

An exposure visit to Ahmedabad for the Officials of ULBs was conducted between 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> November 2016. The officials were exposed to various successful project sites including the following:

1. Solid Waste Management / SBM Project
2. SNP / Housing Project
3. Sewerage Treatment Plant
4. E - Governance & CCRS
5. BRTS Control Room Visit & Presentation
6. Riverfront Park Visit

**20) Have the participants attended any national/international workshops, as per guideline (Annexure 7)? (350 words)**

A workshop on Making Chennai Smart in IT field for the officials of ULBs was conducted on 08.09.2016 at Hotel Rain Tree Chennai. The following were discussed during the workshop programme.

1. Basic Infrastructure required for Chennai City and ensuring how future requirements are to be met
2. Discussion on the application layer that will rest on top of this infrastructure.
3. Discussion on how to use these IT tools to make Chennai a Smart, Sensitive and Responsive City.

**21) What is the plan of action for the pending activities, if any? (400 words)**

There are no pending activities.

**2.4 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.n | Milestones  | Activities to be achieved  | Implementation Time Line       |   |                     |                         |    |
|-----|---|--|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|----|
|     |   |  | Target for last Financial Year | Achievement for the last financial year | No.of ULBs Achieved | No.of ULBs not Achieved |    |
| 1   | E-Governance  | 1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software<br>Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage<br>Water & Sewerage Charges<br>Grievance redressal<br>Property Tax<br>Advertisement Tax<br>Issuance of Licenses<br>Building permissions<br>Mutations<br>Payroll<br>Pension and e-procurement | 24 Months                      |   |                     |                         | 28 |
| 2   | Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre | Establishment of Municipal cadre   | 24 Months                      |   |                     | 28                      |    |
| 3   | Augmenting double entry accounting                      | Appointment of internal auditor  | 24 Months                      | Local Fund Auditor                      |                     | 28                      |    |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|    |  |   |           |                   |  |    |    |
|----|--|---|-----------|-------------------|--|----|----|
|    |  |   |           | already available |  |    |    |
| 4  | Urban Planning and City level Plans          | Make a State Level Policy for implementing the parameters given in the National mission for Sustainable Habitat   | 24 Months |                   |  |    | 28 |
| 5  | Devolution of Funds and Functions            | Implementation of SFC recommendations within timeline   | 24 Months | Already in Place  |  | 28 |    |
| 6  | Review of Building Bye Laws                  | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than 500 square meters and all public buildings                     | 24 Months | Already in place  |  | 28 |    |
|    |  | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rain water harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300 sq. meters and above. | 24 Months | Already in Place  |  | 28 |    |
| 8  | Set-up financial intermediary at state level | Establish and Operationalize Financial intermediary-pool, finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds   | 24 Months | Already in Place  |  | 28 |    |
| 9  | Credit Rating                                | Complete the credit ratings of the ULBs   | 24 Months |                   |  |    | 28 |
| 10 | Energy and Water audit                       | Give incentives for green buildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges).  |           |                   |  |    | 28 |

**1) Have the Reform formats prescribed by the TCPO furnished?**

Yes

**2) Did the State as a whole complete 70 percent of Reforms? If, yes was the incentive claimed? (100 words)**

Yes. For Year 2015-16 incentive grant is already achieved. The incentive fund for FY 2016-17 will be claimed separately.

**3) What was the amount of incentive claimed? How was it distributed among the ULBs and what was it used for? (tabular; 300 words)**

As per the MoUD guidelines in this regard, 10% of the annual budgetary allocation is admissible for incentive for reforms and same will be distributed to ULBs as per their achievement will be distributed to ULBs, as per the direction of State Level High Powered Sanctioning Committee.

**4) 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)**

80% of reforms are already achieved for the FY 2016-17 milestones. The State has plan of action to achieve as per the time line and as suggested by the TCPO. The following studies are under progress viz., credit rating, water audit, energy audit, GIS Master Plan etc.,

**5) Give any instances of innovation in Reform implementation. (300 words)**

There are no any instances of new innovation

**2.5 USE OF A&OE**

**6) What are the items for which the A&OE has been used? (tabular; 250 words)**

A&OE funds have been utilized viz.

1. Expenses incurred by State Mission Management Unit
2. Conduct National Workshop on Smart Solutions
3. Conduct Residential Training Programmes and visit to projects / utilities which are having best practices

**7) 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)**

Yes.

**8) What is the utilization status of funds? (tabular; 250 words)**

| S.No | Particulars  | Expenditure Amount Rs. In Cr. |
|------|--|-------------------------------|
| 1    | 2  | 3                             |
| 1    | State Mission Management   | 0.43                          |
| 2    | Conduct National Level Workshop on Smart Solutions   | 0.02                          |
| 3    | Conduct Residential Training Programme and visit to projects / utilities which are having best practices | 0.12                          |

**9) Has the IRMA been appointed? What was the procedure followed?(250 words)**

IRMA not appointed

**10) If not appointed, give reason for delay and the likely date of appointment (100 words)**

IRMA to be appointed by MoUD

**11) Have you taken up activities connected to E-Municipality as a Service (E-MAAS)? Please give details. (250 words)**

Commissionerate of Municipal Administration is in the process of developing Centralized Web Based Software consisting of 29 modules and it is proposed to be completed in 4 months.

**12) Have you displayed the logo and tagline of AMRUT prominently on all projects? Please give list. (tabular; 100 words)**

Already instructions have been issued to all the ULBs to display the logo and tag line of AMRUT prominently in the project sites.

**13) Have you utilized the funds on any of the inadmissible components (Para 4.4)? If yes, give list and reasons. (tabular; 350 words)**

No

**2.6 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. | Name of the ULBs | Project Name | Approved SAAP   |                 | Gol       |                 | State     |                 | ULB       |         | Total Fund flow of Project | Total Spend on Project |
|-------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------------------------|------------------------|
|       |                  |              | Amount Rs in Cr | Approved Amount | Disbursed | Approved Amount | Disbursed | Approved Amount | Disbursed |         |                            |                        |
| 1     | Chennai          | Water Supply | 723.96          | 238.91          | 47.78     | 144.79          | 28.96     | 340.26          | 102.08    | 723.96  | 178.82                     |                        |
| 2     | Pallavaram       |              | 274             | 137.00          | 27.40     | 54.8            | 10.96     | 82.20           | 24.66     | 274.00  | 63.02                      |                        |
| 3     | Tambaram         |              | 320             | 160.00          | 32.00     | 64              | 12.80     | 96.00           | 28.80     | 320.00  | 73.60                      |                        |
| 4     | Kumbakonam       |              | 25.67           | 12.84           | 2.57      | 5.134           | 1.03      | 7.70            | 2.31      | 25.67   | 5.90                       |                        |
| 5     | Madurai          |              | 437.3           | 144.31          | 28.86     | 87.46           | 17.49     | 205.53          | 61.66     | 437.30  | 108.01                     |                        |
|       | Total            |              | 1780.93         | 693.05          | 138.61    | 356.19          | 71.24     | 731.69          | 219.51    | 1780.93 | 429.36                     |                        |
| 1     | Chennai          | Sewer age    | 482.72          | 159.30          | 31.86     | 96.54           | 19.31     | 226.88          | 45.38     | 482.72  | 96.54                      |                        |
| 2     | Coimbatore       |              | 322.83          | 106.53          | 21.31     | 64.57           | 12.91     | 151.73          | 30.35     | 322.83  | 64.57                      |                        |
| 3     | Kumbakonam       |              | 39.64           | 19.82           | 3.96      | 7.93            | 1.59      | 11.89           | 2.38      | 39.64   | 7.93                       |                        |
| 4     | Tiruchirappalli  |              | 439.21          | 219.61          | 43.92     | 87.84           | 17.57     | 131.76          | 26.35     | 439.21  | 87.84                      |                        |
| 5     | Tirunelveli      |              | 297             | 148.50          | 29.70     | 59.4            | 11.88     | 89.10           | 17.82     | 297.00  | 59.40                      |                        |
| 6     | Vellore          |              | 348             | 174.00          | 34.80     | 69.6            | 13.92     | 104.40          | 20.88     | 348.00  | 69.60                      |                        |
| 7     | Rameswaram       |              | 45.02           | 22.51           | 4.50      | 9.004           | 1.80      | 13.51           | 2.70      | 45.02   | 9.00                       |                        |
|       | Total            |              | 1974.42         | 850.27          | 170.05    | 394.88          | 78.98     | 729.27          | 145.85    | 1974.42 | 394.88                     |                        |
| 1     | Ambur            | Green space  | 0               | 0.00            | 0         | 0               | 0         | 0               | 0         | 0.00    | 0.00                       |                        |
| 2     | Avadi            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 3     | Chennai          |              | 13.19           | 6.60            | 1.32      | 2.64            | 0.53      | 3.96            | 0.79      | 13.19   | 2.64                       |                        |
| 4     | Coimbatore       |              | 5.276           | 2.64            | 0.53      | 1.06            | 0.21      | 1.58            | 0.32      | 5.28    | 1.06                       |                        |
| 5     | Cuddalore        |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 6     | Dindigul         |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 7     | Erode            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 8     | Hosur            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 9     | Kancheepuram     |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |
| 10    | Karaikudi        |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26      | 0.53            | 0.11      | 0.79            | 0.16      | 2.64    | 0.53                       |                        |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| S.No. | Name of the ULBs   | Project Name | Approved SAAP   |                 | Gol           |                 | State         |                 | ULB           |                | Total Fund flow of Project | Total Spend on Project |
|-------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
|       |                    |              | Amount Rs in Cr | Approved Amount | Disbursed     | Approved Amount | Disbursed     | Approved Amount | Disbursed     |                |                            |                        |
| 11    | Kumbakonam         |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 12    | Madurai            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 13    | Nagapattinam       |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 14    | Nagercoil          |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 15    | Pallavaram         |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 16    | Pudukottai         |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 17    | Rajapalayam        |              | 0               | 0.00            | 0             | 0               | 0             | 0               | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00                       |                        |
| 18    | Salem              |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 19    | Tambram            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 20    | Thanjavur          |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 21    | Thiruvannamalai    |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 22    | Thoothukkudi       |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 23    | Tiruchirappalli    |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 24    | Tirunelveli        |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 25    | Tiruppur           |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 26    | Velankanni         |              | 0               | 0.00            | 0             | 0               | 0             | 0               | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00                       |                        |
| 27    | Vellore            |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
| 28    | Rameswaram         |              | 2.638           | 1.32            | 0.26          | 0.53            | 0.11          | 0.79            | 0.16          | 2.64           | 0.53                       |                        |
|       | Total Project Cost |              | <b>79.14</b>    | <b>39.57</b>    | <b>7.91</b>   | <b>15.83</b>    | <b>3.17</b>   | <b>23.74</b>    | <b>4.7484</b> | 79.14          | 15.83                      |                        |
|       | Grand Total        |              | <b>3834.49</b>  | <b>1582.89</b>  | <b>316.58</b> | <b>766.90</b>   | <b>153.38</b> | <b>1484.70</b>  | <b>370.11</b> | <b>3834.49</b> | <b>840.07</b>              |                        |

**14) In how many projects, city-wise, has the full funds been sanctioned and disbursed? (tabular form; 500 words)**

Nil. The projects are only in DPR finalization Stage only.

**15) Identify projects where delay in funds release led to delay in project implementation? (300 words)**

NA.

**16) Give instances of doing more with less during implementation. (400 words)**

Projects are in tender stage.

## 2.7 FUNDS DISBURSEMENTS AND CONDITIONS

### 17) How many project fund request has been made to the Gol? (250 words)

There is no request made to Gol so far.

### 18) How many installments the Gol has released? (250 words)

The Gol has released only the first installment (20%) of SAAP 2015-16 & SAAP 2016-17

### 19) Is there any observation from the Gol regarding the claims made? (350 words)

No.

### 20) 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)

APEX Committee General Conditions SAAP 2015-16 and SAAP 2016-17 for approval of SAAP - 2017-20

| S.No | Gol Condition  | Status   |
|------|--|--|
| 1    | Projects amounting to atleast 25% against SAAP I to be contracted  | Out of the sanctioned project cost of Rs.3316.22 Cr, projects Rs.295.27 Cr has been contracted (9%)  |
| 2    | Projects amounting to at least 50% of total approvals (SAAP I & II) to have the DPRs approved  | The total approved cost of SAAP I & II is Rs.7150.71 Cr. The SHPSC of AMRUT has approved projects at a cost of Rs.4217.43 Cr (50 % achieved) |
| 3    | 100% of Central fund and corresponding State share against the SAAP-I and SAAP-II to be transferred to the State Mission Directorate / ULBs / Parastatals (as the case may be) | GOI share – 591.04 crores received (SAAP I & 2)<br>GoTN share - SAAP 1 – Rs 352.53 crores received   |
| 4    | PDMC should have been appointed and be in place  | CMWSSB and TWAD are preparing the DPRs and executing the projects. Both are acting as PDMC for Tamil Nadu.<br>PDMC is in place.              |
| 5    | Regarding credit rating, work must be awarded for all Mission Cities and Credit Rating targeted to be completed by March 2017  | Credit Rating has been completed for all AMRUT Cities.   |



### 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.

**Table 1.3 SAAP –Master Plan of all projects to achieve universal coverage during the current Mission period based on Table 2.1 (FYs 2015-16 to 2019-20)**

| S.No | Name of the ULB (water Supply )                     | Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage | Estimated Cost in Crores | Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage |
|------|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1    | Chennai - Distribution System Improvement           | 1  | 88.70                    | 4   |
| 2    | Pudukottai - Dedicated water supply                 | 1  | 195.00                   | 4   |
| 3    | Madurai - Distribution System for newly added areas | 1  | 450.00                   | 4   |
| 4    | Chennai - Distribution System Improvement           | 3  | 733.70                   | 4   |

1  
88.70

| S.No | Name of the ULB ( Sewerage)                         | Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage | Estimated Cost in Crores | Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage |
|------|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1    | Chennai   | 1  | 317.29                   | 4   |
| 2    | Madurai - UGSS South part                           | 1  | 300.00                   | 4   |
| 3    | Nagercoil   | 1  | 310.00                   | 4   |
| 4    | Rajapalayam   | 1  | 194.00                   | 4   |
| 5    | Madurai - Distribution System for newly added areas | 1  | 260.00                   | 4   |
| 6    | Tiruchy   | 1  | 453.00                   | 4   |
| 7    | Ambur - UGSS  | 1  | 275.00                   | 4   |
| 8    | Vellore UGSS - Phase -III                           | 1  | 325.00                   | 4   |
| 9    | Tiruppur -UGSS - Phase II                           | 1  | 415.00                   | 4   |
| 10   | Coimbatore UGSS - Phase IV                          | 1  | 331.00                   | 4   |
| 11   | Tamparam  | 1  | 35.00                    | 4   |
| 12   | Pallavaram  | 1  | 22.00                    | 4   |
| 13   | Kancheepuram  | 1  | 50.00                    | 4   |
|      | Total   | 10   | 3287.29                  |   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| S.No | Name of the AMRUT Cities (Green Space) | Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage | Estimated Cost in Crores | Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage |
|------|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1    | Ambur                                  | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 2    | Avadi                                  | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 3    | Chennai                                | 1  | 13.65                    | 4   |
| 4    | Coimbatore                             | 1  | 5.46                     | 4   |
| 5    | Cuddalore                              | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 6    | Dindigul                               | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 7    | Erode                                  | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 8    | Hosur                                  | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 9    | Kancheepuram                           | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 10   | Karaikudi                              | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 11   | Kumbakonam                             | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 12   | Madurai                                | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 13   | Nagapattinam                           | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 14   | Nagercoil                              | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 15   | Pallavaram                             | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 16   | Pudukottai                             | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 17   | Rajapalayam                            | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 18   | Salem                                  | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 19   | Tambaram                               | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 20   | Thanjavur                              | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 21   | Thiruvannamalai                        | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 22   | Thoothukkudi                           | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 23   | Tiruchirappalli                        | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 24   | Tirunelveli                            | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 25   | Tiruppur                               | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 26   | Velankanni                             | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 27   | Vellore                                | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
| 28   | Rameswaram                             | 1  | 2.73                     | 4   |
|      | Total Project Cost                     | 28   | 90.07                    |   |

| Proposed Priority Projects | Total Project Cost | Indicator  | Baseline | Annual Targets                      |     |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
|                            |                    |  |          | (Increment from the Baseline Value) |     |      |      |      |      |
|                            |                    |  |          | FY 2016                             |     | FY   | FY   | FY   | FY   |
|                            |                    |  |          | H1                                  | H2  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Water Supply               | 733.70             | 1. Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%      | 55%                                 | 58% | 65%  | 73%  | 78%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 2. Per capita quantum of water supplied                  | 74       | 74                                  | 77  | 87   | 97   | 122  | 135  |
|                            |                    | 3. Quality of water supplied                             | 79%      | 81%                                 | 85% | 87%  | 93%  | 95%  | 100% |
| Sewerage                   | 3287.29            | 4. Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)        | 82%      | 84%                                 | 86% | 90%  | 94%  | 98%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 5. Coverage of sewerage network services                 | 23%      | 29%                                 | 33% | 51%  | 66%  | 83%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage                  | 23%      | 32%                                 | 36% | 55%  | 66%  | 79%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 7. Efficiency in treatment                               | 49%      | 49%                                 | 51% | 66%  | 75%  | 82%  | 100% |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|                     | Name of the ULB                                     | Project Name          |        |        |        |        | Parameters  | Existing  | After Completion of Projects |      |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|------------------------------|------|
|                     |   |                       | GoI    | State  | ULB    | Total  |   |   |                              |      |
| <b>Water Supply</b> |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   |   |                              |      |
| 1                   | chennai - Distribution System Improvement           | Water Supply Projects | 29.27  | 17.74  | 41.69  | 88.70  | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 70%   | 100%                         |      |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 100   | 135                          |      |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        | Quality of water supplied                             | 97%   | 100%                         |      |
| 2                   | Madurai - Distribution System for newly added areas |                       |        | 148.50 | 90.00  | 211.50 | 450.00  | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 65%                          | 100% |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 90                           | 135  |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   | Quality of water supplied                             | 95%                          | 100% |
| 3                   | Pudukottai  |                       |        | 97.50  | 39.00  | 58.50  | 195.00  | Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%                          | 100% |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   | Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD             | 71                           | 135  |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   | Quality of water supplied                             | 70%                          | 100% |
| <b>Sewerage</b>     |   |                       |        |        |        |        |   |   |                              |      |
| 1                   | Chennai   |                       | 224.17 | 135.86 | 319.27 | 679.29 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)        | 95%   | 100%                         |      |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services                 | 90%   | 100%                         |      |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage                  | 97%   | 100%                         |      |
|                     |   |                       |        |        |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                               | 90%   | 100%                         |      |
| 2                   | Madurai - UGSS South part                           |                       | 99.00  | 60.00  | 141.00 | 300.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or                   | 90%   | 100%                         |      |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|   | Name of the ULB | Project Name |        |       |        |        | Parameters                                     | Existing | After Completion of Projects |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--|----------|------------------------------|
|   |                 |              | GoI    | State | ULB    | Total  |  |          |                              |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | community)                                     |          |                              |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 55%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 60%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 90%      | 100%                         |
| 3 | Nagercoil       |              | 161.50 | 64.60 | 96.90  | 323.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 90%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 70%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 75%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 70%      | 100%                         |
| 4 | Rajapalayam     |              | 97.50  | 39.00 | 58.50  | 195.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 77%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 25%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 0%       | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 0%       | 100%                         |
| 5 | Thiruvannamalai |              | 130.00 | 52.00 | 78.00  | 260.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 90%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 40%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 50%      | 100%                         |
|   |                 |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 70%      | 100%                         |
| 6 | Tirchy          |              | 226.28 | 90.51 | 135.77 | 452.56 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or            | 90%      | 100%                         |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|   | Name of the ULB           | Project Name |        |       |        |        | Parameters                                     | Existing | After Completion of Projects |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--|----------|------------------------------|
|   |                           |              | GoI    | State | ULB    | Total  |  |          |                              |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | community)                                     |          |                              |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 55%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 60%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 82%      | 100%                         |
| 7 | Ambur - UGSS              |              | 137.50 | 55.00 | 82.50  | 275.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 95%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 45%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 50%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 60%      | 100%                         |
| 8 | Vellore UGSS - Phase -III |              | 162.50 | 65.00 | 97.50  | 325.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 82%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 35%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 35%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 100%     | 100%                         |
| 9 | Tiruppur -UGSS - Phase II |              | 212.50 | 85.00 | 127.50 | 425.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 95%      | 100%                         |
|   |                           |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 45%      | 100%                         |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|    | Name of the ULB            | Project Name |        |       |        |        | Parameters                                     | Existing | After Completion of Projects |
|----|----------------------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--|----------|------------------------------|
|    |                            |              | GoI    | State | ULB    | Total  |  |          |                              |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 50%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 35%      | 100%                         |
| 10 | Coimbatore UGSS - Phase IV |              | 115.50 | 70.00 | 164.50 | 350.00 | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 92%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 50%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 77%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency in treatment                        | 85%      | 100%                         |
|    | Tambaram                   | UGSS         | 17.50  | 7.00  | 10.50  | 35.00  | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 80%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 0%       | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 0%       | 100%                         |
|    | Pallavaram                 | UGSS         | 11.00  | 4.40  | 6.60   | 22.00  | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 36%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage network services          | 78%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage           | 75%      | 100%                         |
|    | Kancheepuram Municipality  | UGSS         | 25.00  | 10.00 | 15.00  | 50.00  | Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community) | 95%      | 100%                         |
|    |                            |              |        |       |        |        | Coverage of sewerage                           | 45%      | 100%                         |

|  | Name of the ULB | Project Name |     |       |     |       | Parameters                           | Existing | After Completion of Projects |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
|  |                 |              | GoI | State | ULB | Total |                                      |          |                              |
|  |                 |              |     |       |     |       | network services                     |          |                              |
|  |                 |              |     |       |     |       | Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage | 52%      | 100%                         |

### 3.1 PRINCIPLES OF PRIORITIZATION

**1) 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)**

Yes. The Service Level Improvement Plan has been presented before the elected representatives and Commissioners of respective Cities. A detailed consultation for prioritization of projects has been taken place for the year 2017-20. In addition to that, the State has analyzed the inter-ULB allocation based on gap analysis, financial strength of ULBs, priority to Smart Cities, and choose those ULBs which are having higher gaps in provision of drinking water supply and sewerage.

**2) Has financially weaker ULBs given priority for financing? Please give list.(200 words)**

Yes, the financially weaker ULBs have been given the priority for allocation of funds.

**3) Is the ULB with a high proportion of urban poor has received higher share? Please give list. (250 words)**

Yes. The cities with higher share of urban poor have been given priority like Chennai, Coimbatore and Madurai.

**4) Has the potential Smart cities been given preference? Please give list (200 words)**

Yes. Out of shortlisted 12 Smart Cities, Six cities has been considered under this programme viz., Chennai, Vellore, Madurai, Coimbatore, Tirunelveli and Trichy. While preparing SLIP, they have been kept on list of priorities, with focus on universal coverage of drinking water and sewerage.

**5) What is the quantum of Central Assistance (CA) allocated to the State during 2017-20? (100 words)**

MoUD, GoI, vide D.O.No.K-14012/95/2015-AMRUT-I dated June 6th 2016 has allocated an amount of Rs. 1801.37 Crores to Projects and A&OE of Rs.144.11 Cr for Tamil Nadu.



**6) Has the allocation to different ULBs within State is consistent with the urban profile of the state? (260 words)**

Yes. The fund allocation has been considered based on some crucial urban parameters like urban poor, urban revenue potential, urbanization trend etc.

**3.2 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.

**1) Do projects proposed in the SAAP include O&M for at least five years?What is the nature of O&M? (tabular; 300 words)**

Yes. All projects being proposed in the SAAP include O & M for five years. Tenders and bids will be invited considering that Operation and Maintenance would be the responsibility of the contractor / agency, who will implement the project. ULB will take care of expenses for O & M by ways of recovery of user charges etc.

**2) How O&M expenditures are propose to be funded by ULBs/ parastatal? (200 words)**

As stated above, O & M expenditure of the assets created under AMRUT Scheme are proposed to recover through user charges and one time connection charges.

**3) Is it by way of levy of user charges or other revenue streams? (100 words)**

The prime source of revenue is through user charges. It is also planned to meet O&M through expanding the connection/ service network, strengthening billing and collection systems and cross verification with other data bases like Property Tax assessment etc. and through expenditure reduction by way of redeployment of man power, energy conservation and efficiency improvement, reduction of NRW (Non- Revenue Water), reuse and recycling of waste water, Metering, SCADA etc.

**4) Has O&M cost been excluded from project cost for the purpose of funding? (100 words)**

Yes, O&M cost has been excluded from project cost for the purpose of funding and shall be borne by ULB through user charges.

**5) What kind of model been proposed by States/ULBs to fund the O&M? Please discuss. (250 words)**

Project contract will include responsibility of 5 years O& M liability. Innovative mechanism & cost effective technology will be adopted for deigning the project.

**6) Is it through an appropriate cost recovery mechanism in order to make them self-reliant and cost-effective? How? (250 words)**

Yes. As stated above, efforts will be made for 100% O & M recovery. It is proposed to adopt appropriate strategies to meet the O&M costs through user charges, effective billing and collection, tariff rationalization, reduce unauthorized connections, use ICT solutions like SMART Meter, SCADA etc..

### 3.3 REFORM IMPLEMENTATION

In order to become eligible to claim the 10% incentive, the State is required to implement the Reforms prescribed by Gol. 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:

- 1) Fill out the tables prescribed by the TCPO. What are the Reform type, steps and Target for 2016-17? (tabular; 300 words)

| S.n | Milestones  | Activities to be achieved   |           | Implementation Time Line                 |                                   |                             |                      |
|-----|---|---|-----------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
|     |   |   |           | April -Sept - 2015                       | Oct -2015 to March- 2016          | April to Sept 2016          | Oct 2016 to Mar 2017 |
| 1   | E-Governance  | 1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software  | 24 Months | E-Governanc e Modules under Preparatio n |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Water & Sewerage Charges  |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Grievance redressal   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Property Tax  |           |  | Rolling out of software & testing |                             |                      |
|     |   | Advertisement Tax   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Issuance of Licenses  |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Building permissions  |           |  |                                   | Commis sioning and Training |                      |
|     |   | Mutations   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Payroll   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
|     |   | Pension and e-procurement   |           |  |                                   |                             |                      |
| 2   | Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre | Establishment of Municipal cadre  | 24 Months | Already in Place                         |                                   |                             |                      |
| 3   | Augmenting double entry accounting                      | Appointment of internal auditor   | 24 Months | Local Fund Auditor already available     |                                   |                             |                      |
| 4   | Urban Planning and City level Plans                     | Make a State Level Policy for implementing the parameters given in the National mission for Sustainable Habitat | 24 Months |  |                                   |                             |                      |
| 5   | Devolution of Funds and Functions                       | Implementation of SFC recommendations within timeline   | 24 Months | Already in Place                         |                                   |                             |                      |

| S.n | Milestones                                   | Activities to be achieved   | Implementation Time Line |                          |                    |                      |  |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|
|     |  |   | April -Sept - 2015       | Oct -2015 to March- 2016 | April to Sept 2016 | Oct 2016 to Mar 2017 |  |
| 6   | Review of Building Bye Laws                  | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than 500 square meters and all public buildings                     | 24 Months                | Already in place         |                    |                      |  |
|     |  | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rain water harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300 sq. meters and above. | 24 Months                | Already in Place         |                    |                      |  |
| 8   | Set-up financial intermediary at state level | Establish and Operationalize Financial intermediary-pool, finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds   | 24 Months                | Already in Place         |                    |                      |  |
| 9   | Credit Rating                                | Complete the credit ratings of the ULBs   | 24 Months                |                          |                    |                      |  |
| 10  | Energy and Water audit                       | Give incentives for green buildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges).  |                          |                          |                    |                      |  |

**2) 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)**

Out of 28 milestones, to be completed by March 2016, Tamil Nadu has completed 27 Milestones, which scores about 94.05%. The process has already been initiated to complete the remaining Milestones.

**3) Have any issues been identified during the review by HPSC on Reforms implementation? What are the issues? (250 words)**

No issues have been identified by HPSC.

**4) Have these issues been considered while planning for reform implementation? How? (tabular; 250 words)**

Not Applicable

### **3.4 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.

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

Memorandum of Understanding [MOU] has been entered into the following 11 training entities empanelled by the Ministry of Urban Development, New Delhi for imparting capacity building programmes for the ULB functionaries under CBUD of AMRUT Scheme.

- 1). ESCI, Hyderabad
- 2). IHS, Bangalore
- 3). IIT, Roorkee
- 4). YASHADA, Pune
- 5). IMG, Thiruvananthapuram
- 6). RCEUS, Lucknow
- 7). AILSG, Mumbai
- 8). ASCI, Hyderabad
- 9). Dr MCR HRD Institute, Hyderabad
- 10). ISPER, Panchkula
- 11). TNIUS, Coimbatore

Subsequently, the following are the training Programmes conducted

- Training Programme on Engineering and Public Health for the Commissioners, Engineers and Public Health Officers of ULBs through IIT – Roorkee [Capsule – I completed] covering 90 participants in 3 batches
- Training Course on Finance and Revenue for the Officials of ULBs through YASHADA, Pune [Capsule – I & II completed] covering 90 participants in 3 batches
- Training Programmes for the Assistant Engineers and Public Health Officers of ULBs through ESCI, Hyderabad [Capsule – I & II completed] covering 90 participants in 3 batches
- Training Programmes for the Town Planning Officers of ULBs through IHS, Bangalore [Capsule – I & II completed] covering 90 participants in 3 batches
- Training Programmes for the Administrative Staff of ULBs through IMG, Thiruvananthapuram [Capsule – I] to be conducted during February 2017 covering 90 participants in 3 batches
- Training Programmes for the Town Planning Officers of ULBs through ISPER, Panchkula [Capsule – I] to be conducted during February 2017 covering 90 participants in 3 batches.
- Training Programme for the Sanitary Workers of ULBs through TNIUS, Coimbatore during February – March 2017 covering 2100 participants in 70 batches.

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

No

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

There are no issues.

**8) Have the activities in your current year Capacity Building Plan – training, exposure visits (ULB staff and elected representatives), seminars/workshops, etc. – been vetted/approved by NIUA?**

The training plan being sent to NIUA for vetting and approval

**9) 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?**

The erstwhile State Reforms Performance Management Cell has been converted into State Mission Management Unit

**10) 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)**

- ASCI, Hyderabad has been appointed as handholding agency for preparation of Smart City Proposal for the Smart Cities selection competition.
- Assisting in implementing the reform agenda focusing on outcomes, as given in AMRUT Reforms and identified indicators in the CCBP toolkit<sup>15</sup>.
- Providing all kind of support to the Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to be established under the Smart City Mission.
- Develop multi-layer GIS maps connected to data (attribute tables) in order to enable ULBs to use GIS for decision-making – Tender Process Initiated

**11) Attach the Quarterly Score Cards on p. 73 of the Mission Guidelines.**

Nil

**12) Have those issues been addressed? How? (500 words)**

There are no issues.

### **3.5 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.

| <i>(Rs. in Cr.)</i> |  |                  |   |  |                          |              |              |
|---------------------|--|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| S.N                 | Items proposed for A&OE  | Total Allocation | Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any) | Proposed spending for Current Financial year | Balance to Carry Forward |              |              |
|                     |  |                  |   |  | FY 2018                  | FY 2019      | FY 2020      |
| 1                   | Preparation of SLIP and SAAP                                   | 34.25            | 0   | 6.85   | 6.85                     | 6.85         | 6.85         |
| 2                   | PDMC   | 23.76            | 0   | 4.75   | 4.75                     | 4.75         | 4.75         |
| 3                   | Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency | 5.00             | 0   | 1.00   | 1.00                     | 1.00         | 1.00         |
| 4                   | Publications (e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures etc.)        | 15.00            | 0   | 3.00   | 3.00                     | 3.00         | 3.00         |
| 5                   | Capacity Building and Training - CCBP, if Applicable - Others  | 15.91            | 0   | 3.58   | 3.58                     | 3.58         | 5.17         |
| 6                   | Reform implementation  | 37.80            | 0   | 7.56   | 7.56                     | 7.56         | 7.56         |
| 7                   | DPR Preparation  | 78.65            | 15.73   | 15.73  | 15.73                    | 15.73        | 15.73        |
| <b>Total</b>        |  | <b>210.37</b>    | <b>15.73</b>                                      | <b>41.97</b>                                 | <b>41.97</b>             | <b>41.97</b> | <b>44.06</b> |

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

Nil

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

There are no issues

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

Yes

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

The IRMA/PDMC/CMMU will be established through Tender.

### **3.6 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:

**1) What is the State contribution to the SAAP? (should be greater than 20 percent, Para 7.4 of AMRUT Guidelines) (150 words)**

As per the Mission Guidelines, the State contribution to the SAAP will not be less than 20 percent of the total project cost. The Tamil Nadu Government has already contributed 20 percent of share in the first installment release.

**2) 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)**

Residual financing shall be meet out through debt funding viz., KFW, TNSUDP, and from 14th Finance Commission, MP, MLA Funds, own income etc.

**3) 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)**

The State fund requirements will be meet out through debt funding viz., KFW, TNSUDP, and from 14th Finance Commission, MP, MLA Funds, own income etc.

**4) Whether complete project cost is linked with revenue sources in SAAP? Please describe? (250 words)**

Yes. The SAAP has been prepared accordingly.

**5) Has projects been dovetailed with other sectoral and financial programme of the Centre and State Governments? (250 words)**

Yes. The projects are converged with various GoI/GoTN programmes like Smart Cities programme, Integrated Urban Development Mission and through external financial assistance viz., World Bank , KFW JICA etc.

**6) Has States/UTs explored the possibility of using Public Private Partnerships (PPP), as a preferred execution model? Please discuss. (300 words)**

Yes. Public Private Partnership model has been considered for the prioritized projects for operation and maintenance. Based on the approval of prioritized projects under AMRUT, the detailed feasibility study will be undertaken.

**7) Are PPP options included appropriate Service Level Agreements (SLAs) which may lead to the People Public Private Partnership (PPPP) model? How? (300 words)**

PPP options with added dimension of involvement of People are at pilot stage. Performance monitoring by people and outcome basis of work is at serious consideration. An attempt will be made for making appropriate Service Level Agreement in future projects..

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

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

| FY-2017-20 – Amount in Cr.             |  |   |                            |                 |                                      |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Total Central Funds allocated to State | Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total given in coloumn 1) | Allocation of Funds for AMRUT (Central Share) | Project proposal Submitted | State/ULB share | Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5) |
| 1                                      | 2  | 3   | 4                          | 5               | 6                                    |
| 1801.370                               | 144.11   | 1801.37                                       | 1802.74                    | 2308.32         | 4255.17                              |



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

(Amount in Rs.) FY2017-20

| <i>(Amount in Crores) – Year 2017-20</i> |                                 |                      |                |               |                |                    |                |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>S.No</b>                              | <b>Sector</b>                   | <b>No.of Project</b> | <b>GoI</b>     | <b>State</b>  | <b>ULB</b>     | <b>Convergence</b> | <b>Total</b>   |
| 1  | Water supply                    | 3                    | 275.27         | 146.74        | 311.69         | 0.00               | 733.70         |
| 2  | Sewerage and Septage management | 13                   | 1482.44        | 657.46        | 1147.40        | 0.00               | 3287.29        |
| 3  | Storm Water Drainage            | 0                    | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00               | 0.00           |
| 4  | Non-Motorized transport         | 0                    | 0.00           | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00               | 0.00           |
| 5  | Green Space                     | 28                   | 45.03          | 18.01         | 27.02          | 0.00               | 90.07          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                       |                                 | <b>44</b>            | <b>1802.74</b> | <b>822.21</b> | <b>1486.11</b> | <b>0.00</b>        | <b>4111.06</b> |

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

(Amount in Rs.) 2017-20

| <b>Table 1.3 Abstract-Use of Funds on Projects: On Going and New</b> |              |                          |   |          |       |       |          |       |        |   |          |        |        |          |        |         |         |          |  |         |          |         |         |  |
|--|--------------|--------------------------|---|----------|-------|-------|----------|-------|--------|---|----------|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------|---------|----------|--|---------|----------|---------|---------|--|
| S.N o.   | Sector       | Total Project Investment | Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year) |          |       |       |          |       |        | Proposed Spending during current financial year |          |        |        |          |        |         |         |          | Balance Carry Forward for the next 3 yrs upto 2020 |         |          |         |         |  |
|  |              |                          | Center  | State    |       |       | ULB      |       |        | Center  | State    |        |        | ULB      |        |         | Center  | State    |  |         | ULB      |         |         |  |
|  |              |                          |   | 14 th FC | Other | Total | 14 th FC | Other | Total  |   | 14 th FC | Other  | Total  | 14 th FC | Other  | Total   |         | 14 th FC | Other  | Total   | 14 th FC | Other   | Total   |  |
| 1  | Water supply | 5661.67                  | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 0      | 457.93  | 0        | 305.93 | 305.93 | 0.0      | 368.47 | 368.47  | 1831.72 | 0        | 1223.73  | 1223.73 | 0        | 1473.88 | 1473.88 |  |
| 2  | Sewerage     | 5295.42                  | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 0      | 469.91  | 0        | 211.82 | 211.82 | 0.0      | 377.36 | 377.36  | 1879.65 | 0        | 847.27   | 847.27  | 0        | 1509.42 | 1509.42 |  |
| 3  | Drainage     | 0.00                     | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 0.00   | 0   | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0.0    | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0.00    | 0       | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0       | 0.00     | 0.00    |         |  |
| 4  | NMT          | 0.00                     | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 0.00   | 0   | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0.0    | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0.00    | 0       | 0.00     | 0.00   | 0       | 0.00     | 0.00    |         |  |
| 5  | Green space  | 237.69                   | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 23.77  | 0   | 9.51     | 9.51   | 0.0    | 14.26    | 14.26  | 95.08   | 0       | 38.03    | 38.03  | 0       | 57.04    | 57.04   |         |  |
|  | Total        | <b>11194.78</b>          | 0   | 0        | 0     | 0     | 0        | 0     | 951.61 | 0   | 527.26   | 527.26 | 0      | 760.09   | 760.09 | 3806.45 | 0       | 2109.03  | 2109.03  | 0       | 3040.34  | 3040.34 |         |  |

Table 1.4: Abstract-Plan for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks

| Proposed Priority Projects | Total Project Cost | Indicator   | Baseline | Annual Targets                      |     |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
|                            |                    |   |          | (Increment from the Baseline Value) |     |      |      |      |      |
|                            |                    |   |          | FY 2016                             |     | FY   | FY   | FY   | FY   |
|                            |                    |   |          | H1                                  | H2  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Water Supply               | 733.70             | 1.Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%      | 55%                                 | 58% | 65%  | 73%  | 78%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 2.Per capita quantum of water supplied                  | 74       | 74                                  | 77  | 87   | 97   | 122  | 135  |
|                            |                    | 3.Quality of water supplied                             | 79%      | 81%                                 | 85% | 87%  | 93%  | 95%  | 100% |
| Sewerage                   | 3287.29            | 4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)        | 82%      | 84%                                 | 86% | 90%  | 94%  | 98%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 5.Coverage of sewerage network services                 | 23%      | 29%                                 | 33% | 51%  | 66%  | 83%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 6.Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage                  | 23%      | 32%                                 | 36% | 55%  | 66%  | 79%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 7.Efficiency in treatment                               | 49%      | 49%                                 | 51% | 66%  | 75%  | 82%  | 100% |

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**

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

FY 2017-20

(Amount in Rs.Cr)

|                                  |                  |               |                |             |             |              | Rs.in Cr       |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| S.n                              | Name of the City | Water supply  | Sewerage       | Drainage    | NMT         | Green space  | Grand Total    |
| 1                                | Ambur            | 0.00          | 275.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 277.73         |
| 2                                | Avadi            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 3                                | Chennai          | 88.70         | 317.29         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 13.65        | 419.64         |
| 4                                | Coimbatore       | 0.00          | 331.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 5.46         | 336.46         |
| 5                                | Cuddalore        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 6                                | Dindigul         | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 7                                | Erode            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 8                                | Hosur            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 9                                | Kancheepuram     | 0.00          | 50.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 52.73          |
| 10                               | Karaikudi        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 11                               | Kumbakonam       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 12                               | Madurai          | 450.00        | 300.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 752.73         |
| 13                               | Nagapattinam     | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 14                               | Nagercoil        | 0.00          | 310.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 312.73         |
| 15                               | Pallavaram       | 0.00          | 22.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 24.73          |
| 16                               | Pudukottai       | 195.00        | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 197.73         |
| 17                               | Rajapalayam      | 0.00          | 194.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 196.73         |
| 18                               | Salem            | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 19                               | Tamparam         | 0.00          | 35.00          | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 37.73          |
| 20                               | Thanjavur        | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 21                               | Thiruvannamalai  | 0.00          | 260.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 262.73         |
| 22                               | Thoothukkudi     | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 23                               | Tiruchirappalli  | 0.00          | 453.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 455.73         |
| 24                               | Tirunelveli      | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 25                               | Tiruppur         | 0.00          | 415.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 417.73         |
| 26                               | Velankanni       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| 27                               | Vellore          | 0.00          | 325.00         | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 327.73         |
| 28                               | Rameswaram       | 0.00          | 0.00           | 0.00        | 0.00        | 2.73         | 2.73           |
| <b>Total Project Investments</b> |                  | <b>733.70</b> | <b>3287.29</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>0.00</b> | <b>90.07</b> | <b>4111.06</b> |
| <b>A &amp;OE</b>                 |                  |               |                |             |             |              | <b>144.11</b>  |
| <b>Grand Total</b>               |                  |               |                |             |             |              | <b>4255.17</b> |

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

FY 2017-20

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

(Amount in Rs.)

| S. No | Name of the Cities | Total Project Investment | Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year) |         |       |       |         |       | Proposed Spending during current financial year |        |         |        |        |         | Balance Carry Forward for the next Year |        |        |         |        |        |      |        |        |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|---------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|
|       |                    |                          | Center  | State   |       |       | ULB     |       |   | Center | State   |        |        | ULB     |   |        | Center | State   |        |        | ULB  |        |        |
|       |                    |                          |   | 14th FC | Other | Total | 14th FC | Other | Total   |        | 14th FC | Other  | Total  | 14th FC | Other                                   | Total  |        | 14th FC | Other  | Total  |      |        |        |
| 1     | Ambur              | 387.77                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 38.78  | 0.00    | 15.51  | 15.51  | 0.00    | 23.27                                   | 23.27  | 155.11 | 0.00    | 62.04  | 62.04  | 0.00 | 93.06  | 93.06  |
| 2     | Avadi              | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00   | 0.00    | 1.20   | 1.20   | 0.00 | 1.80   | 1.80   |
| 3     | Chennai            | 2391.35                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 159.15 | 0.00    | 164.83 | 164.83 | 0.00    | 154.29                                  | 154.29 | 636.60 | 0.00    | 659.31 | 659.31 | 0.00 | 617.17 | 617.17 |
| 4     | Coimbatore         | 1120.84                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 74.61  | 0.00    | 50.86  | 50.86  | 0.00    | 98.70                                   | 98.70  | 298.43 | 0.00    | 203.44 | 203.44 | 0.00 | 394.80 | 394.80 |
| 5     | Cuddalore          | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00   | 0.00    | 1.20   | 1.20   | 0.00 | 1.80   | 1.80   |
| 6     | Dindigul           | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00   | 0.00    | 1.20   | 1.20   | 0.00 | 1.80   | 1.80   |
| 7     | Erode              | 249.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 24.95  | 0.00    | 9.98   | 9.98   | 0.00    | 14.97                                   | 14.97  | 99.80  | 0.00    | 39.92  | 39.92  | 0.00 | 59.88  | 59.88  |
| 8     | Hosur              | 151.51                   | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 15.15  | 0.00    | 6.06   | 6.06   | 0.00    | 9.09                                    | 9.09   | 60.60  | 0.00    | 24.24  | 24.24  | 0.00 | 36.36  | 36.36  |
| 9     | Kancheepura        | 57.51                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5.75   | 0.00    | 2.30   | 2.30   | 0.00    | 3.45                                    | 3.45   | 23.00  | 0.00    | 9.20   | 9.20   | 0.00 | 13.80  | 13.80  |
| 10    | Karaikudi          | 7.51                     | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.75   | 0.00    | 0.30   | 0.30   | 0.00    | 0.45                                    | 0.45   | 3.00   | 0.00    | 1.20   | 1.20   | 0.00 | 1.80   | 1.80   |
| 11    | Kumbakonam         | 72.82                    | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 7.28   | 0.00    | 2.91   | 2.91   | 0.00    | 4.37                                    | 4.37   | 29.13  | 0.00    | 11.65  | 11.65  | 0.00 | 17.48  | 17.48  |
| 12    | Madurai            | 1514.81                  | 0   | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00    | 0.00  | 0.00  | 100.   | 0.00    | 64.    | 64.    | 0.00    | 137                                     | 137    | 401.   | 0.00    | 259.   | 259.   | 0.00 | 550.   | 550.   |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

|    |                 |          |      |      |     |     |      |     |     |        |      |        |        |      |        |        |         |      |         |         |      |         |         |
|----|-----------------|----------|------|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|--------|------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|---------|------|---------|---------|------|---------|---------|
|    |                 |          |      |      | 0   | 0   |      | 0   | 0   | 36     |      | 86     | 86     |      | .75    | .75    | 42      |      | 44      | 44      |      | 99      | 99      |
| 13 | Nagapattinam    | 7.51     | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.3    | 0.3    | 0.00 | 0.4    | 0.4    | 3.00    | 0.00 | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 14 | Nagercoil       | 557.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.7   | 0.00 | 22.30  | 22.30  | 0.00 | 33.45  | 33.45  | 223.00  | 0.00 | 89.20   | 89.20   | 0.00 | 133.80  | 133.80  |
| 15 | Pallavaram      | 303.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.3   | 0.00 | 12.14  | 12.14  | 0.00 | 18.21  | 18.21  | 121.40  | 0.00 | 48.56   | 48.56   | 0.00 | 72.84   | 72.84   |
| 16 | Pudukottai      | 202.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.2   | 0.00 | 8.1    | 8.1    | 0.00 | 12.15  | 12.15  | 81.0    | 0.00 | 32.4    | 32.4    | 0.00 | 48.6    | 48.6    |
| 17 | Rajapalayam     | 443.87   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 44.3   | 0.00 | 17.75  | 17.75  | 0.00 | 26.63  | 26.63  | 177.55  | 0.00 | 71.02   | 71.02   | 0.00 | 106.53  | 106.53  |
| 18 | Salem           | 7.51     | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.3    | 0.3    | 0.00 | 0.4    | 0.4    | 3.00    | 0.00 | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 19 | Tambraram       | 362.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.2   | 0.00 | 14.50  | 14.50  | 0.00 | 21.75  | 21.75  | 145.00  | 0.00 | 58.0    | 58.0    | 0.00 | 87.0    | 87.0    |
| 20 | Thanjavur       | 182.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2   | 0.00 | 7.3    | 7.3    | 0.00 | 10.95  | 10.95  | 73.0    | 0.00 | 29.2    | 29.2    | 0.00 | 43.8    | 43.8    |
| 21 | Thiruvannamalai | 267.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.7   | 0.00 | 10.70  | 10.70  | 0.00 | 16.05  | 16.05  | 107.00  | 0.00 | 42.8    | 42.8    | 0.00 | 64.2    | 64.2    |
| 22 | Thoothukudi     | 7.51     | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.75   | 0.00 | 0.3    | 0.3    | 0.00 | 0.4    | 0.4    | 3.00    | 0.00 | 1.20    | 1.20    | 0.00 | 1.80    | 1.80    |
| 23 | Tiruchirappalli | 899.72   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.9   | 0.00 | 35.99  | 35.99  | 0.00 | 53.98  | 53.98  | 359.89  | 0.00 | 143.95  | 143.95  | 0.00 | 215.93  | 215.93  |
| 24 | Tirunelveli     | 304.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.4   | 0.00 | 12.18  | 12.18  | 0.00 | 18.27  | 18.27  | 121.80  | 0.00 | 48.72   | 48.72   | 0.00 | 73.08   | 73.08   |
| 25 | Tiruppur        | 652.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.2   | 0.00 | 26.10  | 26.10  | 0.00 | 39.15  | 39.15  | 261.00  | 0.00 | 104.40  | 104.40  | 0.00 | 156.60  | 156.60  |
| 26 | Velankanni      | 38.58    | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.86   | 0.00 | 1.54   | 1.54   | 0.00 | 2.31   | 2.31   | 15.43   | 0.00 | 6.17    | 6.17    | 0.00 | 9.26    | 9.26    |
| 27 | Vellore         | 930.51   | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 93.0   | 0.00 | 37.22  | 37.22  | 0.00 | 55.83  | 55.83  | 372.20  | 0.00 | 148.88  | 148.88  | 0.00 | 223.32  | 223.32  |
| 28 | Rameswaram      | 50.39    | 0    | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.04   | 0.00 | 2.02   | 2.02   | 0.00 | 3.02   | 3.02   | 20.15   | 0.00 | 8.06    | 8.06    | 0.00 | 12.09   | 12.09   |
|    |                 | 11194.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 950.89 | 0.00 | 527.26 | 527.26 | 0.00 | 760.81 | 760.81 | 3803.57 | 0.00 | 2109.03 | 2109.03 | 0.00 | 3043.22 | 3043.22 |



**Table 7.4: Quarterly Score Cards for States**  
**Financial and physical progress on capacity building (State level)**

**Total number of ULBs:28**  
**Quarter ending-March 2016**

| 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             | 1300               | 325                               | 15.20 Cr                      | 3.8                               | 1537  |                                   |
|  | Institutional capacity building |                    |                                   |                               |                                   |   |                                   |
| Below  | RPMC and UMC                    |                    |                                   |                               | 0.14                              |   |                                   |
|  | 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: Tamil Nadu Current Mission period 2015-20**

| S.No | Name of the ULB (water Supply )                     | Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage | Estimated Cost in Crores | Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage |
|------|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1    | chennai - Distribution System Improvement           | 1  | 88.70                    | 4   |
| 2    | Pudukottai - Dedicated water supply                 | 1  | 195.00                   | 4   |
| 3    | Madurai - Distribution System for newly added areas | 1  | 450.00                   | 4   |
|      | chennai - Distribution System Improvement           | 1  | 88.70                    | 4   |

| S.No | Name of the ULB ( Sewerage) | Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage | Estimated Cost in Crores | Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage |
|------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1    | Chennai                     | 1  | 317.29                   | 4   |
| 2    | Madurai - UGSS South part   | 1  | 300.00                   | 4   |
| 3    | Nagercoil                   | 1  | 310.00                   | 4   |
| 4    | Rajapalayam                 | 1  | 194.00                   | 4   |
| 5    | Thiruvannamalai             | 1  | 260.00                   | 4   |
| 6    | Tirchy                      | 1  | 453.00                   | 4   |
| 7    | Ambur - UGSS                | 1  | 275.00                   | 4   |
| 8    | Vellore UGSS - Phase -III   | 1  | 325.00                   | 4   |
| 9    | Tiruppur -UGSS - Phase II   | 1  | 415.00                   | 4   |
| 10   | Coimbatore UGSS - Phase IV  | 1  | 331.00                   | 4   |
| 11   | Tambaram                    | 1  | 35.00                    | 4   |
| 12   | Pallavaram                  | 1  | 22.00                    | 4   |
| 13   | Kancheepuram                | 1  | 50.00                    | 4   |
|      |                             |  |                          |   |
|      | Total                       | 10   | 3287.29                  |   |

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

Name of State – Tamil Nadu

Mission Period- 2017-20

| Proposed Priority Projects | Total Project Cost | Indicator  | Baseline | Annual Targets                      |     |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--|----------|-------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
|                            |                    |  |          | (Increment from the Baseline Value) |     |      |      |      |      |
|                            |                    |  |          | FY 2016                             |     | FY   | FY   | FY   | FY   |
|                            |                    |  |          | H1                                  | H2  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Water Supply               | 733.70             | 1. Household coverage of direct water supply connections | 54%      | 54%                                 | 58% | 65%  | 73%  | 78%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 2. Per capita quantum of water supplied                  | 74       | 74                                  | 77  | 87   | 97   | 122  | 135  |
|                            |                    | 3. Quality of water supplied                             | 79%      | 81%                                 | 85% | 87%  | 93%  | 95%  | 100% |
| Sewerage                   | 3329.85            | 4. Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)        | 82%      | 84%                                 | 86% | 90%  | 94%  | 98%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 5. Coverage of sewerage network services                 | 23%      | 29%                                 | 33% | 51%  | 66%  | 83%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage                  | 23%      | 32%                                 | 36% | 55%  | 66%  | 79%  | 100% |
|                            |                    | 7. Efficiency in treatment                               | 49%      | 49%                                 | 51% | 66%  | 75%  | 82%  | 100% |

**Table 4: SAAP - Broad Proposed Allocations for  
Administrative and Other Expenses  
(Amount in Rs.)**

FY:2016-17

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

| Sr.   | Items Proposed for A&OE  | Total Allocation | Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any) | Proposed spending for Current Financial year | Balance to Carry |       |       |       |
|-------|--|------------------|---|--|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|       |  |                  |   |  | Forward          |       |       |       |
|       |  |                  |   |  | FY               | FY    | FY    | FY    |
|       |  |                  |   |  | 2017             | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  |
| 1     | Preparation of SLIP and SAAP                                   | 34.25            | 0   | 6.85   | 6.85             | 6.85  | 6.85  | 6.85  |
| 2     | PDMC   | 23.76            | 0   | 4.75   | 4.75             | 4.75  | 4.75  | 4.75  |
| 3     | Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency | 5                | 0   | 1  | 1                | 1     | 1     | 1     |
| 5     | Publications (e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures etc.)        | 15               | 0   | 3  | 3                | 3     | 3     | 3     |
| 6     | Capacity Building and Training - CCBP, if Applicable - Others  | 15.91            | 0   | 3.58   | 3.08             | 3.08  | 3.08  | 3.08  |
| 7     | Reform implementation  | 37.8             | 0   | 7.56   | 7.56             | 7.56  | 7.56  | 7.56  |
| 8     | DPR Preparation  | 78.65            | 0   | 15.73  | 15.73            | 15.73 | 15.73 | 15.73 |
| Total |  | 210.37           | 0   | 42.47  | 41.97            | 41.97 | 41.97 | 41.97 |

**Table 5.2: SAAP-Reforms Type, Steps and Target for AMRUT Cities FY-2017-20**

| S.n | Milestones  | Activities to be achieved   | Implementation Time Line |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|-----|---|---|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
|     |   |   |                          | April -Sept – 2015                     | Oct -2015 to March-2016           | April to Sept 2016         | Oct 2016 to Mar 2017 |
| 1   | E-Governance  | 1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software  | 24 Months                | E-Governance Modules under Preparation |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Water & Sewerage Charges  |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Grievance redressal   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Property Tax  |                          |  | Rolling out of software & testing |                            |                      |
|     |   | Advertisement Tax   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Issuance of Licenses  |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Building permissions  |                          |  |                                   | Commissioning and Training |                      |
|     |   | Mutations   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Payroll   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
|     |   | Pension and e-procurement   |                          |  |                                   |                            |                      |
| 2   | Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre | Establishment of Municipal cadre  | 24 Months                | Already in Place                       |                                   |                            |                      |
| 3   | Augmenting double entry accounting                      | Appointment of internal auditor   | 24 Months                | Local Fund Auditor already available   |                                   |                            |                      |
| 4   | Urban Planning and City level Plans                     | Make a State Level Policy for implementing the parameters given in the National mission for Sustainable Habitat   | 24 Months                |  |                                   |                            |                      |
| 5   | Devolution of Funds and Functions                       | Implementation of SFC recommendations within timeline   | 24 Months                | Already in Place                       |                                   |                            |                      |
| 6   | Review of Building Bye Laws                             | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than 500 square meters and all public buildings | 24 Months                | Already in place                       |                                   |                            |                      |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| S.n | Milestones                                   | Activities to be achieved   | Implementation Time Line |                    |                         |                    |                      |
|-----|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
|     |  |   |                          | April -Sept – 2015 | Oct -2015 to March-2016 | April to Sept 2016 | Oct 2016 to Mar 2017 |
|     |  | State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rain water harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300 sq. meters and above. | 24 Months                | Already in Place   |                         |                    |                      |
| 8   | Set-up financial intermediary at state level | Establish and Operationalize Financial intermediary-pool, finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds   | 24 Months                | Already in Place   |                         |                    |                      |
| 9   | Credit Rating                                | Complete the credit ratings of the ULBs   | 24 Months                |                    |                         |                    |                      |
| 10  | Energy and Water audit                       | Give incentives for green buildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges).  |                          |                    |                         |                    |                      |

**Table5.5:SAAP- Self- Evaluation for Reporting Progress on Reform  
Implementation For Financial Year 2017-20 (Last financial year)**

There forms 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                 | Noof milestones | MaximumScore |
|------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1    | 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 28              | 280          |
| 2    | 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 13              | 130          |
| 3    | 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | 8               | 80           |
| 4    | 4 <sup>th</sup> year | 3               | 30           |

**Incentive based grant release calculation:**

The States will be required to fill the following Self-Assessment Form. Step1:Fill the following table

| S.No | Name ofULBs  | Maximum Score possible during the year<br>Years 3 (80)+4 (30)=110 | Score obtained ULB Wise ( <i>tentative</i> ) |
|------|--------------|---|--|
| (1)  | (2)          | (3)   | (4)  |
| 1    | Ambur        | 110   | 110  |
| 2    | Avadi        | 110   | 110  |
| 3    | Chennai      | 110   | 110  |
| 4    | Coimbatore   | 110   | 110  |
| 5    | Cuddalore    | 110   | 110  |
| 6    | Dindigul     | 110   | 110  |
| 7    | Erode        | 110   | 110  |
| 8    | Hosur        | 110   | 110  |
| 9    | Kancheepuram | 110   | 110  |
| 10   | Karaikudi    | 110   | 110  |
| 11   | Kumbakonam   | 110   | 110  |
| 12   | Madurai      | 110   | 110  |

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

| S.No            | Name of ULBs     | Maximum Score possible during the year<br>Years 3 (80)+4 (30)=110 | Score obtained ULB Wise ( <i>tentative</i> ) |
|-----------------|------------------|---|--|
| (1)             | (2)              | (3)   | (4)  |
| 13              | Nagapattinam     | 110   | 110  |
| 14              | Nagercoil        | 110   | 110  |
| 15              | Pallavaram       | 110   | 110  |
| 16              | Pudukottai       | 110   | 110  |
| 17              | Rajapalayam      | 110   | 110  |
| 18              | Salem            | 110   | 110  |
| 19              | Tambaram         | 110   | 110  |
| 20              | Thanjavur        | 110   | 110  |
| 21              | Thiruvannamalai  | 110   | 110  |
| 22              | Thoothukkudi     | 110   | 110  |
| 23              | Tiruchirappalli  | 110   | 110  |
| 24              | Tirunelveli      | 110   | 110  |
| 25              | Tiruppur         | 110   | 110  |
| 26              | Velankanni       | 110   | 110  |
| 27              | Vellore          | 110   | 110  |
| 28              | Rameswaram       | 110   | 110  |
| Subtotal ULB    |                  | 110   | 110  |
| 1               | Average of State | 110   | 110  |
| Sub total State |                  | 110   | 110  |
| Overall         |                  | 110   | 110  |

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 –Tamil Nadu

FY- 2017-20

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

| S.No | Name of ULB     | Total Numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise |            |             |               |            |             | Name of the Training Institution Identified | No. of Training programmes to be conducted | Funds Required in Current FY |
|------|-----------------|---|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|-------------|---|--|------------------------------|
|      |                 | Ele.Reps  | Finance    | Engineering | Town Planning | Admin      | Total       |   |  |                              |
| 1    | Ambur           | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 1. ESCI,                                    |  | 15.91 Crore                  |
| 2    | Avadi           | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | Hyderabad,                                  |  |                              |
| 3    | Chennai         | 10  | 25         | 250         | 10            | 15         | 310         | 2. RCEUS,                                   |  |                              |
| 4    | Coimbatore      | 10  | 20         | 100         | 10            | 15         | 155         | Lucknow                                     |  |                              |
| 5    | Cuddalore       | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 3. AILSG, Mumbai                            |  |                              |
| 6    | Dindigul        | 10  | 10         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 95          | 4. ATI, WB                                  |  |                              |
| 7    | Erode           | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         | 5. YASHADA,                                 |  |                              |
| 8    | Hosur           | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | Pune  |  |                              |
| 9    | Kancheepuram    | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 6. IMG, Trivandrum                          |  |                              |
| 10   | Karaikudi       | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 7.IIHS, Bangalore                           |  |                              |
| 11   | Kumbakonam      | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 8.Dr.MCR HRD,                               |  |                              |
| 12   | Madurai         | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         | Hyd   |  |                              |
| 13   | Nagapattinam    | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 9.IIT, Roorkee                              |  |                              |
| 14   | Nagercoil       | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 10. TNIUS,                                  |  |                              |
| 15   | Pallavaram      | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | Coimbatore                                  |  |                              |
| 16   | Pudukottai      | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 11.IITM, Chennai                            |  |                              |
| 17   | Rajapalayam     | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          | 12. IRT, Chennai                            |  |                              |
| 18   | Salem           | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         |   |  |                              |
| 19   | Tambaram        | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          |   |  |                              |
| 20   | Thanjavur       | 10  | 10         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 95          |   |  |                              |
| 21   | Thiruvannamalai | 10  | 10         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 70          |   |  |                              |
| 22   | Thoothukudi     | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         |   |  |                              |
| 23   | Tiruchirapalli  | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         |   |  |                              |
| 24   | Tirunelveli     | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         |   |  |                              |
| 25   | Tiruppur        | 10  | 20         | 25          | 10            | 15         | 80          |   |  |                              |
| 26   | Velankanni TP   | 10  | 10         | 20          | 10            | 15         | 65          |   |  |                              |
| 27   | Vellore         | 10  | 20         | 50          | 10            | 15         | 105         |   |  |                              |
|      | <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>270</b>  | <b>375</b> | <b>1195</b> | <b>270</b>    | <b>405</b> | <b>2515</b> |   |  |                              |



**Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building**

Name of State –Tamil Nadu

FY- 2015-16

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

| <b>S. No.</b> | <b>State Level activities</b>                           | <b>Total expenditure upto current FY</b> | <b>Unspent funds available from earlier releases</b> | <b>Funds required for the current FY (In Crore)</b> |
|---------------|---|--|--|---|
| 1             | RPMC (SMMU)   | 0.43                                     |  | 0.82  |
| 2             | UMC   | 0.76                                     |  | ----  |
| 3             | Others (Workshops, Seminars, etc.) are approved by NIUA | 0.49                                     |  | 15.20   |
| 4             | Institutional/Reform                                    | .....                                    |  | 1.32  |
|               | <b>Total</b>  | <b>1.68</b>                              |  | <b>17.34</b>  |

**Table 7.2.3: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building**

Name of State – Tamil Nadu

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                                   | 15.20                            | 5.25                  | -              | -      | -                |
| 5       | Total fund required for capacity building in current FY 2015-16 | <b>15.20</b>                     | 5.25                  | <b>2.14</b>    |        | <b>22.59</b>     |

### **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?**

Already in place.

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

The consultants are appointed to undertake the credit rating study for all the AMRUT Cities. Based on the credit rating, the ULBs will decide 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?**

GIS Master Plan for AMRUT Cities are under preparation

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

Yes.

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

No

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

Yes. Tamil Nadu has Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board and Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board for implementing the water supply projects. The ULBs are maintaining the water supply system created by the above mentioned Boards. The State Government have initiated various actions to reduce the NRW. However State is also eager to learn better technology and options to reduce NRW and losses.

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

Yes with the help of GIS, the property tax assessment will be improved. The E-Governance initiatives will enhance collection in the ULBs.

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

No. Tamil Nadu Urban Finance and Infrastructure Development Corporation and Tamil Nadu Urban Infrastructure Financial Services Limited are acting as financial intermediaries in Tamil Nadu.

| Rs.in Cr |                  |              |          |          |      |             |             |
|----------|------------------|--------------|----------|----------|------|-------------|-------------|
| S.n      | Name of the City | Water supply | Sewerage | Drainage | NMT  | Green space | Grand Total |
| 1        | Ambur            | 0.00         | 275.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 277.73      |
| 2        | Avadi            | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 3        | Chennai          | 88.70        | 317.29   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 13.65       | 419.64      |
| 4        | Coimbatore       | 0.00         | 331.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 5.46        | 336.46      |
| 5        | Cuddalore        | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 6        | Dindigul         | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 7        | Erode            | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 8        | Hosur            | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 9        | Kancheepuram     | 0.00         | 50.00    | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 52.73       |
| 10       | Karaikudi        | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 11       | Kumbakonam       | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 12       | Madurai          | 450.00       | 300.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 752.73      |
| 13       | Nagapattinam     | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 14       | Nagercoil        | 0.00         | 310.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 312.73      |
| 15       | Pallavaram       | 0.00         | 22.00    | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 24.73       |
| 16       | Pudukottai       | 195.00       | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 197.73      |
| 17       | Rajapalayam      | 0.00         | 194.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 196.73      |
| 18       | Salem            | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 19       | Tambaram         | 0.00         | 35.00    | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 37.73       |
| 20       | Thanjavur        | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 21       | Thiruvannamalai  | 0.00         | 260.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 262.73      |
| 22       | Thoothukkudi     | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 23       | Tiruchirappalli  | 0.00         | 453.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 455.73      |
| 24       | Tirunelveli      | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 25       | Tiruppur         | 0.00         | 415.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 417.73      |
| 26       | Velankanni       | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |
| 27       | Vellore          | 0.00         | 325.00   | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 327.73      |
| 28       | Rameswaram       | 0.00         | 0.00     | 0.00     | 0.00 | 2.73        | 2.73        |