

# Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission

## Looking Back to Look Ahead Background Paper on CDP Appraisals

Paramita Datta Dey  
Email: [pdey@niua.org](mailto:pdey@niua.org)

Usha P Raghupathi  
Email: [uraghupathi@niua.org](mailto:uraghupathi@niua.org)

Sandeep Thakur  
Email: [sthakur@niua.org](mailto:sthakur@niua.org)

Shreekant Gupta  
Email: [sgupta@niua.org](mailto:sgupta@niua.org)



National Institute of Urban Affairs  
Core 4B, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road  
New Delhi 110003

This paper can be downloaded electronically at [www.niua.org](http://www.niua.org)

Working papers are research materials circulated by their authors for purposes of information and discussion who alone are responsible for the views expressed therein. These papers have not undergone formal peer review

# Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission

## Looking Back to Look Ahead Background Paper on CDP Appraisals

Paramita Datta Dey<sup>\*</sup>, Usha P Raghupathi<sup>•</sup>, Sandeep Thakur<sup>■</sup>

and

Shreekant Gupta<sup>◆</sup>

### Abstract

A City Development Plan (CDP) is a document of the city which attempts to answer three main questions – where is the city now? where does it want to go? and how does it want to go from 'here' to 'there'? Under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), a CDP is the document that would guide the development of a city to the future.

The National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA) has been involved in appraising the quality of CDPs that have been submitted to the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India. This paper provides a detailed comparative assessment of a sample of ten CDPs. The assessment has been done with respect to three aspects – an examination of the baseline scenario (i.e. where is the city now?), vision of the city (where does it want to go?) and what are the projects envisaged (how does it want to go from here to there?). The paper begins by a scrutiny of how the CDP has looked at the fundamental issues - demography (current population and trend of growth in the core and peripheral areas of the city), economic base (the predominant sector – manufacturing / industrial / service that runs the economy of the city, role of informal sector etc.), the institutional set-up (role of multiple agencies for provision of services like the parastatals) and most importantly the financial health of a city (e.g. the income-expenditure pattern and credit-worthiness of the city).

Each aspect is further appraised sector-wise. It includes water supply and sanitation, drainage, solid waste management, roads and transport etc. An overall assessment based on the above reveals that, in most of the CDPs the baseline scenario is dealt with in considerable detail. However, certain areas need strengthening. Since a CDP is a document of the people of the city, the vision should be shared and collective. This requires extensive consultation with the stakeholders. This aspect was not given due

---

<sup>\*</sup> Senior Research Officer, National Institute of Urban Affairs

<sup>•</sup> Professor, National Institute of Urban Affairs

<sup>■</sup> Senior Research Officer, National Institute of Urban Affairs

<sup>◆</sup> Director, National Institute of Urban Affairs

importance in many cities and the scenario was better dealt-with in case of cities, which already had gone through the preparation of similar processes. An example is Hyderabad, which already had a city development strategy in place. Another important finding has been that in most CDPs the vision translates into more capital-intensive projects, rather than smaller and self-sustaining endeavours, which involves greater community participation. For example, most cities have talked of tapping water from far-fetched sources, which is an expensive proposition. They have not only failed to anticipate the increase in generation of wastewater, but have not adequately formulated projects on recycle and reuse of wastewater. This in turn when related with the financial status of cities reveals that there is over-emphasis on creation of assets and lack of stress on operation and maintenance of the already existing ones. The CDPs have also not been able to connect with policy issues e.g. the road projects proposed are not well related to the basic postulates of the National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP). The paper ends with the positive note that a CDP is not an end in itself, it's a means to an end and is a living document that is open to criticism and is founded on the dynamics of urban development.

**Keywords:** City Development Plan, appraisal, JNNURM

## **Present Urban Scenario**

India's population is growing fast. In March 2001, it crossed a billion (more accurately 1027.02 million, as per Census 2001). The urban population of India has increased to 285.3 million in 2001 from 217.6 million in 1991, showing an increase of 67.8 million in absolute terms. The proportion of urban population to total population in the country in 2001 stands at 27.8 percent. In the 1991 census it was 25.7 percent. Thus, there has been an increase of 2.1 percent in the proportion of urban population in the country during 1991 – 2001. While the proportion of urban population may appear low as compared to many other developed and developing countries, what is significant is the net addition every year, which signifies a gigantic effort, required to accommodate and service them in urban areas.

The process of urbanisation is expected to continue unabated. By the year 2021, about 40% of the total population of the country is expected to live in cities.

Urban centres of India are increasing in size and number. India today has seven mega cities and 35 metropolitan cities (with a population of more than 1million). In 1991, there were 23 metropolitan cities and 4 mega cities. The proportion of urban population living in the metros is about 38% The 7 mega cities alone contain 23% of the total urban population of the country.

The contribution of the urban sector to India's GDP has increased from 29% in 1951 to about 60 percent in 2001 and is expected to grow further. As centres of education, health care, technological innovation, entrepreneurship, governance and major generators of economic growth, urban centres provide access to large markets for goods and services and communication with the rest of the world. Despite these advantages, most of our rapidly growing cities face significant problems. Infrastructure is inadequate – particularly water supply, sanitation, drainage and waste management services. Most of the cities suffer from poor standards of public health and hygiene, degraded urban environment, prevalence of slum housing, severe traffic congestion, poor air quality and effective land management. The immediate need of the hour is therefore to promote liveable, safe and well-managed cities free from poverty.

## **Need for JNNURM**

There has been a wide gap between the requirement and allocation of funds. The assistance provided by the Central government has been unevenly spread and thus failed to bring about any noticeable improvement in urban infrastructure. Due to the shortcomings in the existing programmes, the Central government has drawn up a comprehensive programme of urban renewal, in keeping with the commitment given in the Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government. In this revised strategy, a two-track approach has been envisaged. In the first prong of the strategy, the *Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM)* has been sanctioned to provide financial support of about Rs. 50,000 Crores to 63 cities for up gradation and improvement of infrastructure in a planned and integrated manner. The programme is phased over a period of seven years. The chosen cities comprise the State Capitals, cities with one million plus population and some selected cities of religious, tourist, cultural and heritage importance. It is expected that these cities will have a demonstration effect on others. In the second prong of the strategy, the need for other

cities and towns, which are not included in the mission, would be addressed through another scheme of assistance known as '*Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT)*'

### **Objectives of JNNURM**

The Government of India launched the JNNURM almost a year ago, on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2005. The mission aims to create '*economically productive, efficient, equitable and responsive cities*'. The main thrust of the mission is to:

1. Improve and augment the economic and social infrastructure of cities
2. Ensure basic services to the urban poor including security of tenure at affordable prices
3. Initiate wide-ranging urban sector reforms to eliminate legal, institutional and financial constraints that have impeded investment in urban infrastructure and services
4. Strengthen municipal governments and their functioning in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution (seventy-fourth) Amendment Act, 1992.

The Mission has three basic elements:

**(a) Integrated development of infrastructure** services by providing adequate funds to meet the deficiencies in urban infrastructure services. This includes funding infrastructure projects relating to water supply and sanitation, sewerage, solid waste management, road network, urban transport, and redevelopment of old city areas. The programme lays special emphasis on urban renewal programme for the old city areas to reduce congestion. It also attempts to ensure planned development of cities including peri-urban areas, outgrowths and urban corridors leading to dispersed urbanisation.

**(b) Provision of Basic services to the urban poor** by up scaling the delivery of civic amenities and provision of utilities. The emphasis is on universal access and includes security of tenure at affordable prices, improved housing, water supply and sanitation, and delivery of other existing services of the government for education, health and social security.

**(c) Adoption of wide ranging urban sector reforms**, which will facilitate establishment of linkages between asset-creation and asset-management and ensure long-term project sustainability. The thrust is to ensure improvement in urban governance and service delivery so that ULBs become financially sound and sustainable for undertaking new programmes. A set of *thirteen mandatory reforms* at State and Central level and *ten optional reforms* at the level of State, ULB and Parastatal Agency is listed in the *Toolkit*. All the twenty-three reforms need to be implemented in the mission period. Cities have the freedom to opt for any two reforms from the optional category in each year of implementation of JNNURM.

The Toolkit (a complete document containing eligibility criteria, guidelines etc. Associated with JNNURM) prepared by the Government of India contains the outline of the JNNURM framework, methodology for preparation of CDPs, project proposals, and timeline for preparation of the Reform Agenda.

## **Steps in the JNNURM process - CDP, DPRs, MoA**

The objective of the Mission would be met through preparation of City Development Plans (CDPs), Detailed Project Reports (DPR) and signing of MoA between the Centre, State, and Urban Local Body (ULB). Every city is expected to formulate a City Development Plan (CDP) indicating policies, programmes and strategies, and financing plans. The CDP would include identification of projects leading to the formulation of Detailed Project Reports (DPRs). The Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) / Parastatal agencies have to prepare DPRs for undertaking projects in the identified spheres. The projects should be planned so as to optimize the life-cycle costs. A revolving fund would be created to meet the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) requirements of assets created, over the planning horizon. In order to seek JNNURM assistance, projects need to be developed in a manner that would ensure and demonstrate optimization of the life-cycle costs over the planning horizon of the project. On approval of the CDPs and DPRs, the State Government and ULBs including Parastatal agencies, where necessary would execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) with the Government of India (GoI) indicating commitment along with a timeline to implement identified reforms.

## **Institutional Arrangement under JNNURM**

At the National level, the JNNURM is steered by the **National Steering Group (NSG)**, headed by the Minister for Urban Development. As a coordinating arm of the GoI, the NSG will review the progress of the mission along with the agenda for reforms. In the tier beneath the NSG, are two Sub Mission Directorates – one for **Urban Infrastructure and Governance** and the other for **Basic Services to the Urban Poor**. The former is under the charge of the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD) and the latter under the Ministry of Housing, Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation (MoHUEPA). Each of these Sub-Missions has separate **Central Sanctioning and Monitoring Committees**. These committees are responsible for sanctioning and monitoring of projects and associated reforms.

At the State level, are **State Level Steering Committees** who would screen and prioritize identified projects. The projects would be implemented by **State Level Nodal Agencies** (SLNA).

At each of the three tiers of governance, i.e. Central, State and Local, advisory assistance and support is provided by **expert groups and agencies** and the **Technical Advisory Group (TAG)**. The TAG is headed by a Technical Advisor drawn from Civil Society with proven experience in mobilizing collective action for reforms in urban governance.

The cities eligible for seeking financial assistance under JNNURM are compulsorily required to formulate a City Development Plan (CDP) indicating policies, programmes, strategies and financial plans. The CDP should also be linked to the Reform Agenda. The Reform Agenda would include the strategy to implement reforms, in a phased manner. The CDPs would facilitate identification of projects and ULBs are required to prepare Detailed Project Reports (DPRs). The funds for identified projects across cities would be disbursed to the ULB/ Parastatal agency through the designated SLNA as soft loan or grant-cum-loan or grant. The SLNA / ULB in turn, would leverage additional resources from other sources.

Immediately after the launch of the Mission, the states and ULBs were sensitized about JNNURM through seven regional workshops spread over seven major zones of the country – central, north, south, east, west, northwest, and northeast. A city represented each zone.

### **Appraisal of City Development Plans (CDPs)**

The CDPs and DPRs have to go through a process of appraisal by an independent agency. In the first lap (i.e. upto 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006) two agencies, the National Institute of Urban affairs (NIUA) and the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP) have been entrusted this work by the Ministry of Urban Development. NIUA and NIPFP have together appraised around 16 CDPs by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006. Post 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006, other agencies like The Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIM-A), Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) and Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI), Hyderabad were also brought on board in the CDP appraisal process.

The paper presents the observations and findings about approximately twenty CDPs that have been appraised by NIUA.

### **Key Role of CDP in JNNURM Process**

A City Development Plan (CDP) is an action plan for equitable growth in a city, developed and sustained through public participation to improve the quality of life for all citizens. 'A City Development Plan (CDP) is both a perspective and a vision for the future development of a city. It presents the current stage of the city's development – *where is the city now?* It sets out the directions of change – *where does the city want to go?* It identifies the thrust areas — *what does the city need to address on a priority basis?* It also suggests *alternative routes, strategies, and interventions* for bringing about the change – *what interventions should be made in order to attain the vision?* It provides a framework and vision within which projects need to be identified and implemented. It establishes a logical and consistent framework for evaluation of investment decisions.

The CDP is therefore the crucial link that weaves together the three basic elements of the mission - namely *integrated development of infrastructure, basic services for the poor and adoption of urban sector reforms*, into an integrated whole. It lays the foundation from which would follow DPRs not only for the mission period but also for the near future (say next decade or so). The quality of the CDP, therefore, is one of the most imperative links on which the success of the mission would depend. It may also be used by the city to promote itself to potential investors.

### **Components of a CDP**

The main components of a CDP include:

1. A detailed analysis of the **current situation** with particular emphasis on the demography, economy, finance, infrastructure, physical, environmental and institutional aspects that gives an insight into *where the city is today*
2. A **vision** that is *shared* and *collective* and discusses the future growth of the city. This would describe *where the city wants to go*
3. A **strategy** that qualifies the vision, evaluates options, takes into consideration views of the citizens and says *how* the city would move from *here to there*

4. A **City Investment Plan and a financing strategy** that talks of the *financial resources* needed by the city to attain its vision

An important component of the CDP is a *continuous participatory consultative process* involving the entire gamut of stakeholders of the city, throughout its preparation. The vision and strategies presented in the CDP should therefore be one that has been arrived at with a consensus from the stakeholders.

### **Looking Back - CDPs appraised by NIUA**

The CDPs appraised at NIUA till date (i.e. November 2006) include the following:

Gujarat - Ahmedabad, Surat, Vadodara, Rajkot  
Chattisgarh – Raipur  
Andhra Pradesh - Visakhapatnam, Vijaywada and Hyderabad  
Nagaland – Kohima  
Tamil Nadu - Madurai and Coimbatore  
J & K – Srinagar (in progress)  
Assam – Guwahati  
Karnataka – Mysore  
Chandigarh  
Rajasthan – Ajmer – Pushkar  
Uttaranchal (in progress) – Dehradun, Haridwar, Nainital

The appraisal was carried out based on the guidelines presented in *JNNURM Toolkit Number 2*. While appraising, particular emphasis was laid on appreciating how the city's vision took off from the present scenario. i.e. *how* the city wishes '*to go where it wants to go*' from '*where it is*'. This in turn was related to the present '*financial health*' of the city. Attention was also paid on assessing whether the city is credit-worthy.

The assessment of CDPs was grouped into the following broad heads – Overall Quality, Description of Baseline, Vision, Strategies to achieve vision / goals, and the Financial Plan. The summary assessment of a sample of CDPs of ten cities is presented in the Annexure attached with this paper.

#### ***Overall Quality***

On an overall, the quality of these '*first generation CDPs*' has been good, given the constraints of time and budget. The analysis of the baseline scenario, which contained the analyses of the present situation, is fairly comprehensive. Most of the cities present an ambitious vision. The strategies and investment plans are generally sound.

#### ***Description of Baseline (Current Situation)***

The main aspects dealt within the baseline scenario include demography, economic base, institutional setup, financial health, land-use and sectoral analyses (water supply, sewerage facility, storm water drainage, solid waste management, roads and transport, lakes and water bodies, social infrastructure), overall environmental status, heritage sites and urban poor.

*Demography*: a number of the CDPs have analyzed the trend of population growth in the core and periphery areas separately. Except for Ahmedabad, Surat and Raipur the

components of increase in population is well analyzed. In the rest of the cities where this information is given, most of the increase in population growth is natural increase – 57% in Vadodara to as high as 70% in Visakhapatnam. Only in case of Vijaywada, immigration and natural increase are equally responsible for population growth since the last decade. Different methods have been used to project the population growth – geometric, annual compound growth rate, graphical method etc. however, in case of a number of cities, the methodology for population projection needs to be elaborated upon and the method used to project population should be carefully selected to avoid over or under-estimation.

*Economic Base:* In most of the CDPs assessed, the occupational structure elucidating the classification of workers by categories and its corresponding analysis missing. Among the cities cited in the matrix attached to this paper, a number of them have a strong industrial base and a major mass of the population is engaged in industrial activities. The situation is slightly different in Hyderabad where almost 70% of the workforce is engaged in the Tertiary sector. A large proportion of the urban poor are employed in the informal sector. Though some of the CDPs have mentioned this argument is not backed by adequate data.

*Institutional set-up:* In some of the CDPs assessed, an institutional matrix is given. The CDPs have highlighted the importance of multiple agencies engaged in the provision of basic services and infrastructure. For example, the CDP of Vijaywada presents an understanding of the problems of overlapping functional jurisdictions and the difficulties faced by these agencies in working together for the provision of basic services in the city. One of the items on the reform agenda is to minimize the ambiguities and overlapping of functions between urban local bodies (ULBs) and other agencies by transferring the functions under the Twelfth Schedule of 74<sup>th</sup> Constitution Amendment to ULBs. In the state of Andhra Pradesh so far actual transfer of these functions has not been made due to constraints on institutional capacity and financial resources at the ULB level. Therefore, the transfer of such functions is only on paper. Practically, they have remained with the existing agencies. Similar situations are seen in case of Surat and Vijaywada. An example on the positive side is that of Vadodara. Vadodara Municipal Corporation (VMC) is involved in planning, design, capital works and operation and maintenance for all basic infrastructure services, except for public transport. Ahmedabad and Raipur have not provided institutional matrices. Details on private sector participation are missing in most of the CDPs.

*Land use:* Information on land-use in the city, like distribution (in terms of area) and maps is not given in majority of the CDPs. It is important to not only elaborate on the land-use details within the municipal limits of the city in question, corresponding figures and maps for the peripheral areas which fall outside the municipal limits and are under the jurisdiction of parastatal agencies like development authorities needs to be integrated. In addition, compliance of the city's growth as per the Master Plan of the city needs to be indicated. This helps understand the growth dynamics of the city. None of the cities have provided future land-use maps and other details.

*Financial Health:* Among the cities where there is a revenue surplus, a major portion of the revenue comes from Octroi e.g. Ahmedabad, Surat - 57%, Vadodara 72%. The Vajaywada shows high dependency on state grants (about 51%). For example, in Vijaywada, 49% of the revenue is generated by the Vijayawada Municipal Corporation (VMC) from its own resources whereas dependency on state transfers is to the tune of

51% for the year 2004-05. There is a surplus on revenue account for all the past four years. In reality, however, if state transfers are excluded (and only own resources are considered) the revenue account is in deficit.

### **Sectoral Analyses**

*Water Supply:* The indicators to assess this sector include the source of supply, gap between demand and supply, geographic and population coverage, per capita supply, duration and frequency of supply. Information on unaccounted-for water (UFW) and cost recovery is also provided by many cities. Most of the cities depend primarily on surface water (above 70%), augmented by groundwater. The city of Rajkot depends completely on water from River Narmada. Vadodara too, depends on its lakes and groundwater is used in times of crisis during the peak of summer. On an overall, the present level of coverage of water supply is above 85% in the cities of Gujarat. In most of the cities there is a gap in demand and supply. To a large extent the reason for the widening gap is due to the substantial amount of unaccounted for water. The share of UFW is as high as 60% in Vijaywada! In Surat, Vadodara and Visakhapatnam, it varies from 30% to 40%. Information on cost recovery is not available for Ahmedabad and Surat. In the cities where such information is given (e.g. Vadodara), the present cost recovery is rather low and varies between 20% to In Rajkot it is as low as 12.5%. The situation in the southern cities of Vijaywada and Hyderabad is rather positive and hovers around 63% to 66%

On an overall, in the CDPs appraised by NIUA so far, details on revenue and expenditure on water supply and cost recovery is mostly inadequate. This issue needs to be supported by more concrete data.

*Sewerage Facility:* The information on sewerage facility is not clear in some cases. The data collated and main parameters analyzed for sewerage include the gap in the amount of sewage-generated vis-à-vis treated, sewerage facility available in the city and coverage of sewerage network. The amount to sewage treated in comparison to the amount generated is as low as 10% in Vijaywada. In the others, it varies between 38% in Hyderabad to about 80% in Ahmedabad. None of the cities have facilities for recycling and reuse of wastewater. The sewerage network spans half to one-third of the city's municipal area and is available to about 60% of the of the city's population residing within municipal limits, incase of Vadodara, Rajkot and Hyderabad. The situation is particularly dismal in Visakhapatnam. Only 10.5% of the municipal area is sewered and caters to 17% of the people residing in this area. In most cities, the peripheral areas are not sewered and people use soak pits and flush latrines. In Vadodara the sewage treatment plant is not used to its full capacity because the entire city is not connected to the network.

*Storm Water Drainage:* In all the eight cities, storm water drainage is highly inadequate and the network of drains cover one-third or even lesser area of the city. The drains are poorly maintained, clogged by solid waste and face common problems of water logging during monsoons. Exceptions are Surat and Vijaywada, where storm water drains cover 85% and 60% of the city respectively.

*Solid Waste Management:* Though the picture of this segment of infrastructure is not as bleak as sewerage or drainage, it is not satisfactory either. In none of the cities, all the solid waste generated is collected. The best example of maximum collection efficiency is Ahmedabad. 98% of the waste generated by the city is collected. However, areas that

need attention in Ahmedabad are scientific disposal and treatment. In Vadodara, though 85% of the waste is collected and landfilled, the landfill site is not engineered. In Rajkot, house-to-house system is prevalent only among 25% of the city's households. Hyderabad presents an encouraging picture. According to the CDP, a waste-to-energy plant is successfully operating in the city since December 1999.

In cases of water, sanitation and solid waste management, in a large number of cities, the present situation is not very clearly linked by elaborating with information on with ongoing projects or already sanctioned projects. In case of solid waste management, the adequacy of present landfill sites is not always discussed.

*Roads and Transport:* In most of the CDPs, an inventory of the present condition of roads is discussed in considerable detail. The problems flagged are that of inadequate linking of the peripheral areas to the core, insufficient connectivity of ring roads with link roads. Another problem common to all the cities is the lack of maintenance of the existing roads. A major portion of the total investment sought is in roads in most cities.

*Lakes and Water Bodies:* A number of cities whose CDPs have been appraised at NIUA have either rivers or lakes or either within or on the periphery of the city limits. Cities have concentrated on improvement in the water quality of these water bodies and their conservation. Vadodara for example, has a number of lakes within the city. These lakes are not linked to the storm water drainage system of the city, which causes stagnation of water in pockets and leads to flooding. Not only this, the lakes are also being misused for dumping untreated waste water mixed with substantial amount of solid waste. The fact that holistic developments of the main infrastructure sectors like water supply, drainage, sewerage, development of water bodies and solid waste management is required has been brought out well in many of the CDPs. In some cities like Guwahati, however, the storm water drainage system has not been adequately linked with the rejuvenation of water bodies. One reason is because cities that already had sectoral master plans (e.g. for water supply, sewerage, solid waste etc.) already in place, it was a bottom up approach and linkages with the CDP has been fairly comprehensive. But in others, this was a weak area in the CDP.

*Social Infrastructure:* The CDPs of Ahmedabad, Surat, Vadodara, Rajkot, Vijaywada have provided separate sections on the status of social infrastructure available in the city. Since this sector is not eligible for funding the other cities have not collated and presented this information. In order to make the CDP a comprehensive document, this information should be provided.

*Overall Environmental Status:* All the CDPs reviewed have talked of air and water pollution. Statistics on the air quality and water quality of main water bodies has been presented. Information on noise pollution is given in the CDPs of Hyderabad and Ahmedabad. Problems of hazardous and bio-medical waste management are also discussed in the CDP of Hyderabad, in addition to the others.

*Heritage sites:* A separate section on heritage areas is given only in a few CDPs – Ahmedabad, Rajkot, Visakhapatnam and Hyderabad. However, mostly these are mere listings. Arguments for the need to conserve heritage sites and measures to do the same are missing in the CDPs. Almost all Indian cities have heritage structures that need to be preserved. But adequate attention has not been paid in integrating heritage preservation issues with urban up-gradation or renewal.

*Urban Poor:* The population living in slums have been considered as the 'urban poor' of the cities. They form approximately 20% to 25% of the total municipal population of Surat and Ahmedabad, Vadodara and Rajkot. In Visakhapatnam and Vijaywada it is approximately 25% to 30%. Only in some of the CDPs, the problems of the urban poor have been dealt with separately. All aspects of the urban poor have not been covered in detail in most CDPs. Since the analysis done in the CDPs is mainly based on secondary data, for cities where the information base is good the chapter on urban poor is fairly detailed. However in cities where this information is limited, the discussion on urban poor has been found to be limited.

### ***Vision and Strategies to achieve Vision***

Role of stakeholder consultations, prioritization of sector-wise strategies for water supply, sewerage facility, storm water drainage, solid waste management, roads and transport, lakes and water bodies has been assessed. Some cities have taken off from the existing programmes for improvement of infrastructure. For example, Vadodara already had Master Plans for various sectors (water supply, sewerage, drainage and solid waste management) in place. Some of the components of these Master Plans could not be taken up due to inadequate availability of funds. These are well linked with the further developments prescribed for the city in the CDP. While assessing the CDPs, it was clarified from the city about this aspect so that there is no duplicity.

A crisp vision statement is missing in many of the CDPs. Most of the time it is a long and complex wish list of a number of issues combined in a complex manner. Moreover, the goals are not phased in terms of short, medium and long-term goals.

*Stakeholder Consultations:* Stakeholder consultation is one of the most important aspects of a CDP. In to be make the CDP an inclusive document, the major groups residing in the city like major investors, service providers, NGOs, urban poor etc. were consulted while preparing the CDP. While assessing the CDP, attempts were made to see that the stakeholders were selected from all over the city and there was socio-economic diversity among the participants involved in the consultative process (meetings, workshops, melas etc.). That is, attention was paid in checking whether the CDP contained information on where, when and how community consultations were held, how many times they were held and last but not the least, whether representatives of the urban poor were also present in the consultations. Convergence in the views presented in the CDP and that of stakeholders is also an important issue, which was looked into. In some CDPs, there was a clear consensus and in others it was partial. Good examples of convergence are the CDPs of Hyderabad and Vadodara.

*Prioritization of Strategies:* Except for Ahmedabad, all the CDPs contained prioritization of strategies. However, most of them have focused more on capital works as compared to repair and maintenance or operation and maintenance. The emphasis therefore is more on asset creation.

*Water Supply:* Almost all the cities feel that water supply is of top priority and they hope to attain 100% coverage by the end of the mission period. Ahmedabad believes they will be able to attain full cost recovery by the end of the mission period. Measures of reducing unaccounted-for water like water metering, water auditing, tariff revision is also proposed. Almost all cities have proposed augmentation of supply and omission of the

gap between demand and supply by surface source. Some cities have been ambitious and want to provide 24X7 water supply to all in the next seven years.

*Storm Water Drainage:* The plans of some cities are comprehensive. For example, Vadodara has proposed a systematic plan, which contains development of the drainage system interlinked with water bodies. Similarly, Surat proposes augmentation and rehabilitation of the existing system within the flood protection scheme.

*Solid Waste Management:* The CDPs have rightly addressed the need to achieve 100% door-to-door collection, ensure segregation of waste at source and improve methods of disposal. A prominent element rightly identified by all cities is the need to have engineered landfill sites. A number of cities have proposed identification of new and engineered landfill sites. However, adequate focus has not been laid on alternative and cost-effective methods of treatment of waste.

*Roads and Transport:* The emphasis in this sector was on improving accessibility and reducing congestion.

*Lakes and Water Bodies:* River Front development has been envisioned by cities where the river flows within its municipal limits. For example Sabarmati River Front Development in Ahmedabad, Tapi River Front Development in Surat, Vadodara has proposes to interlink the lakes and storm water drains. They have also stated that this will also aid in alleviating the ground water table of the city.

*Urban Poor:* At present, the access of the slum population to basic amenities is dismal. A case in point is Vijaywada, where, only 2% people have access to sewerage facilities and only 20% of the people living in slums have access to drinking water supply. In most of the cities, emphasis is laid on provision of sanitation facilities and development of better housing for the slum population. Some cities have presented an integrated plan for the 'urban poor'. For example, Hyderabad wishes to be a 'city without slums' by 2021. The city's vision has been appropriately put into achievable goals. The strategies that follow have been suitably formulated and fit into the vision. In Vadodara, *in situ* development of slums has been proposed for the large majority of the slum population. Relocation has been suggested only in case of areas where slums have to be relocated to ensure development of lakes.

*Financial Plan (City Investment Plan):* The funding capacity of ULBs, prioritization and phasing of projects and Financial Operating Plans were critically analyzed. Alternative scenarios have been worked out by cities to assess the investment sustaining capacity of the urban local bodies. The investment funds have been phased over a time period of seven years. However, a financial risk mitigation strategy in case the projected sources of income fall short of their target has not been worked out by any city. For instance, In Vadodara, 72% of the revenue comes from Octroi, at present. How would the municipal body meet its financial contribution if Octroi were abolished? Such explanations are not included in any of the Financial Operating Plans. For example there is a need to workout how efficiency in collection of property taxes, user charges etc. can augment revenue collection to the optimum level.

## **Looking ahead**

### **Lessons learnt from ‘1<sup>st</sup> generation CDPs’**

Though the overall quality of these *‘first generation CDPs’* was good, certain areas need strengthening. Though the CDPs reflect some degree of stakeholder participation, there was no way of assessing the extent of participation of the ULBs in the CDP preparation process.

The vision presented in the CDPs did not always revolve around the aspects like improving the efficiency and equitability of infrastructure. In-depth analysis and understanding of the deficits in terms of institutional set up and finances does not seem to have been carried out, while preparing the CDPs. For example, in cities where the collection of taxes was low and the reason was fragmentation of responsibilities or jurisdictional problems - clear explanations were not given about the reasons for low efficiency.

The extent of transfer of functions under the 12th Schedule of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act remains an ambiguous area in all CDPs. While discussing municipal assets, there is no information about whether the assets available with ULBs are being used to its full potential.

The reform agenda talks of aiming at 100% collection of tax. However, if the state is empowering the city to increase the tax on property, the significance of 100% tax collection gets undermined.

It is not only important for the CDPs to be a rational and practical wish list of the city, it is also equally important that adequate attention is paid on the implementation mechanisms so that the DPRs that would emerge out of these, would lead to realistic projects with practically achievable targets - sustainable and under the full control of the ULBs. The immediate area of concern is therefore the capacity building of the ULBs. The synergy with donor agencies in this regard is therefore very significant. Funding agencies can play a significant role in helping cities adopt the reforms under JNNURM. One of the most important considerations in achieving this is gradual and steady assistance to the ULBs in capacity building. Another important area of contribution from donor agencies is in Management Information Systems (MIS) to monitor reforms.

A CDP is not a stand-alone document. It is a *‘living’* document, which should capture the complexities of the existing situation. The visions and strategies should be firmly linked with the City Investment Plan and financing strategy.

### **References:**

1. City Development Plans for Ahmedabad, Surat, Vadodara, Rajkot, Raipur , Visakhapatnam, Vijaywada, Hyderabad, Kohima, Madurai, Coimbatore Srinagar Guwahati, Mysore, Chandigarh, Ajmer – Pushkar , Dehradun, Haridwar and Nainital.
2. Toolkit for Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM).
3. The State of Indian Cities – 2001, Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO), New Delhi and United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), Nairobi, Kenya, 2001

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Ahmedabad	Surat
<b>1. Overall quality</b>	<b>Very good:</b> The CDP has been prepared in a professional manner and gives the clear picture of where the city is today, where it wants to go, and the strategies for achieving the vision. The financial aspects have been dealt with in great detail in the CDP and gives a comprehensive picture of the finances including capital investment requirements.	<b>Very good:</b> The CDP has been prepared comprehensively and in a professional manner. It gives a clear picture of the existing situation in the city, its vision, strategies and the capital investment plan. Each sector has been dealt with in detail giving the emerging issues in the sector. The strategies have been given clearly with the action plans/ tasks and the institutions responsible for implementation. The
<b>2. Description of baseline (current)</b>		
<b>2.1 Demography</b>		
2.1.1 Core & periphery population	Population of core and periphery given with growth rates. Maps also provided.	Clearly gives the population and growth rates for the core and periphery areas. Maps provided.
2.1.2 Components of Growth (natural/migrants/ jurisdictional change)	Not given.	Not given.
2.1.3 Methodology for population projection	Not given.	Have used annual compound growth rate, within which trend based and stabilized growth rates have been used to project two different scenarios.
<b>2.2 Economic Base</b>		
2.2.1 Main Economic Activity	Dealt with marginally.	Given in detail. Main Industries – textile and diamond cutting and polishing. Slow down in these has lead to industrial diversification.
2.2.2 Occupational Structure	Details given. Changing occupational structure indicated in table.	Details given only for 1991. Data for 2001 not given.
<b>2.3 Institutional Set-up</b>		
2.3.1 Functions as per 12 Schedule of 74 <sup>th</sup> CAA	Not given.	Functions as per 12 <sup>th</sup> Schedule not mentioned. But problems of partial devolvement mentioned.
2.3.2 Institutions involved & functions (ULB/ Parastatal agencies)	Institutional matrix not given.	Governance structure of SMC given very well and in detail. Institutional responsibility matrix not provided in the initial report. Multiplicity of line agencies mentioned as an issue.
2.3.3 Private Sector Participation	Not given.	Not given.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Ahmedabad	Surat
<b>2.4 Financial Health</b>		
2.4.1 Revenue Income / Expenditure Details	Given in detail. Revenue surplus at Rs. 209.7 cr. Octroi contributes 57% to revenue. Establishment exp. 42%, with repair and maintenance at about 4%.	Presented in detail. Revenue surplus at Rs. 180 cr. Octroi major source of revenue (57% share). Establishment exp. 46%, with repair and maintenance at 9%.
2.4.2 Capital income / Expenditure Details	Given in detail.	Presented in detail. Expenditure on roads and bridges 37% and exp. on water supply 23%.
<b>2.5 Land Use (Details of area, map)</b>	Land use given for AMC and AUDA area. Maps provided.	Land use details provided, with map. Land use information provided for both core and periphery areas.
<b>2.6 Sectoral Analyses</b>		
<b>2.6.1 Water Supply</b>	Aspects like demand-supply gap & cost recovery not included.	On an overall, well articulated.
Source of supply (surface / ground)	Both surface and ground water used. Surface water has a larger share in the drawal.	Mainly surface source - Tapi river (94%)
Demand-supply gap	Not given.	Present supply 580 mld (sufficient). Demand - 956 mld in 2011.
Coverage (% population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	95% population covered, 86% area covered. Supply is 143 lpcd, 2 hours/day	Coverage – 97% area, 95% population, gross daily supply – 195 lpcd. Duration: 2-3 hrs/daily
Cost Recovery	Not given	Not given
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	15-20%	30%
<b>2.6.2 Sewerage Facility</b>	All sewage generated not treated. All areas not sewerred.	All sewage generated not treated. All areas not sewerred.
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	500 mld generated. Capacity of STP 395 mld (79% of generation).	Sewage generated - 390 mld. Capacity of STPs - 562 mld
Coverage (%population, area coverage);	75% area covered. 90% population covered.	Pop. Covered - 97%, area covered - 92%
Existence of Low Cost Sanitation	Not given.	Not given.
<b>2.6.3 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Covers only 23% of the roads. 40-50% area covered. SWD poorly developed, leading to water-logging in many parts.	Details given. 85% of city covered.
<b>2.6.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Discussed well. 2100 MT generated daily, 98% collection efficiency. Disposal not scientific.	Discussed in detail. Daily generation – 1000 MT. Collection efficiency 98%.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Ahmedabad	Surat
<b>2.6.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Described in detail for both AMC and AUDA area, with maps.	Discussed in detail, maps provided. Connectivity with periphery a problem. O&M of roads a major expenditure.
<b>2.6.6 Lakes and Water bodies</b>	River conservation project proposed.	River conservation project proposed.
<b>2.6.7 Social Infrastructure (Education, health, community facilities)</b>	Separate chapter on Social Amenities given.	Social Development issues discussed in a separate chapter.
<b>2.7 Overall Environmental Status (land, air, water)</b>	Water quality, air quality and noise pollution discussed.	Air quality data given. Water pollution discussed briefly.
<b>2.8 Heritage Sites (If any)</b>	Discussed in a separate chapter.	Not given.
<b>2.9 Urban Poor</b>	Separate chapter on Urban Poor and Housing given.	CDP has a separate chapter on Housing and Slums. Map provided
2.9.1 Population / Households	Slum population – about 9 lakhs. 1.76 lakh slum households - i.e. approximately 1/4th of the population of AMC and 1/5th of the population of AUDA.	312 slums, population 5.69 lakhs (19% of total population), 93,655 households
2.9.2 Access to Basic services	Details given. Deficient in terms of basic facilities.	Discussed, given as table. 72% households have private water taps and 35% have private latrines
<b>3. Vision (long term / short term – next 7 years)</b>		
<b>3.1 Stakeholder Consultation</b>		
3.1.1 Spatial Spread & Socio-economic diversity	Series of broad-based consultations held. Stakeholders included elected representatives, professionals, NGOs and government officials etc. Details of stakeholders not provided.	Details of stakeholder consultations not given. Stakeholders included officials, commercial organizations, technocrats, eminent citizens, councilors and NGOs. SMC distributed 30,000 copies of questionnaire to identified stakeholders. About 13% filled questionnaires were received and analysed.
3.1.2 Convergence between CDP & stakeholder consultation	The details of consultations not available in the CDP.	CDP only states that the vision for the city is based on the vision articulated by the citizens.
<b>4. Strategies to achieve vision/goals</b>		
<b>4.1 Prioritization of Strategies</b>	Not given.	While phasing of projects is given, prioritization of sectors not given in CDP.
<b>4.2 Sectoral Strategies</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Water Supply (capital works / O &amp; M)</b>	Water supply for all. Full cost recovery.	Action plans provided for each sector. Water supply for all. Full cost recovery.
Source of supply (ground / surface)	Protect and secure source. Reduce dependency on ground water.	Not Given.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Ahmedabad	Surat
Reduction in demand supply gap	Not Given.	Not Given.
Coverage (%population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	100% coverage. 24x7 supply, 100% metering.	Not Given.
Cost Recovery	Full cost recovery.	Not Given.
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	Water auditing.	Water auditing, metering of all connections, tariff revision
<b>4.2.2 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Storm water drainage project – details not given	Extension, augmentation and rehabilitation of existing systems. Implementation of flood protection scheme.
<b>4.2.3 Sewerage System</b>	Zero open defecation.	Extension, augmentation and rehabilitation of system.
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	100% treatment of wastewater	Augmentation of capacity
Coverage (%population, areal coverage);	100% coverage (collection)	Extension, augmentation and rehabilitation of existing systems.
<b>4.2.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	100% segregated waste collection through door to door collection, scientific disposal of waste.	Improving waste collection methods, increase in door-to-door collection, introduction of scientific waste disposal methods.
<b>4.2.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Improve accessibility, reduce congestion. An integrated transport system planned.	Improve connectivity, expand major roads to 4-lane roads and convert them to cement concrete roads. Prepare a traffic and transportation master plan, provide adequate footpaths and pedestrian ways.
<b>4.2.6 Lakes and Water Bodies</b>	Deepening of lakes and protection of lake banks. Sabarmati River Front Development project.	Tapi River Front Development scheme.
<b>4.3 Urban Poor</b>	Zero open defecation.	Move towards city without slums.
4.3.1 Access to Basic Services	Slum networking project to cover slums not yet covered.	Slums taken up for in-situ development to be provided all basic services. Creation of community development groups and capacity building of these groups. T.P.
4.3.2 Housing facilities	EWS housing and chawl reconstruction programme.	Introduction of new EWS housing scheme.
<b>5. Financial plan (City Investment Plan)</b>		
5.1 Funding capacity of ULB	Good. Revenue surplus in last five years. Can sustain investments.	Both SMC and SUDA are financially healthy with positive opening balance.
5.2. Prioritization & phasing of projects	Not given.	Estimated capital investment required given as Rs. 463920 cr for SMC and Rs. 2517.25 cr for SUDA area. Phasing of projects given in the strategies section.
5.3 Financial Operating Plan	Given in detail.	Financial Operating Plan given in detail – indicates SMC's capacity to sustain investments.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Vadodara	Rajkot
<b>1. Overall quality</b>	<b>Excellent: Existing scenario well analysed (sector-wise); Recommendations follow in a rational manner from the present status; Scenarios of proposed financial profile well presented wrt advantages and drawbacks under each;</b>	<b>Very Good: The CDP has been prepared in a comprehensive manner covering all services and all aspects. Each sector has been dealt with in detail with SWOT analysis and performance assessment. The strategies have been given clearly with outcomes, outputs and inputs. The financial aspects have also been dealt with in detail in the CDP.</b>
<b>2. Description of baseline (current)</b>		
<b>2.1 Demography</b>		
2.1.1 Core & periphery population	Population of VMC & VUDA given and analysed; accompanied by map; gives an idea of the growth pattern of the city	Temporal changes in municipal area and its population have been given from 1901 to 2001. Doesn't mention the periphery population, area & its temporal changes
2.1.2 Components of Growth (natural/migrants/ jurisdictional change)	Well analyzed. 14% growth rate; Out of the total increase natural increase (57%), in-migration (43%); boundary of VMC changed in 2002	Components of growth given. Jurisdictional change contributed 44% increase in population (June 1998) during 1991-2001.
2.1.3 Methodology for population projection	Average of geometric & polynomial	Have used ratio method, geometric growth method, incremental increase method & graphical method for projecting high, medium & low growth rates for old area & newly merged area.
<b>2.2 Economic Base</b>		
2.2.1 Main Economic Activity	Discussed crisply. Mainly industrial city; Slack in economic growth since last decade.	Main economic base - Manufacturing with many small and medium industries. Type of industries described well ; size of informal sector not given.
2.2.2 Occupational Structure	Trend of last 10 years given. 1/3 <sup>rd</sup> workers engaged in manufacturing sector.	Well covered. About 56% people engaged in manufacturing and services
<b>2.3 Institutional Set-up</b>		
2.3.1 Functions as per 12 Schedule of 74 <sup>th</sup> CAA	Not given separately.	Not mentioned separately.
2.3.2 Institutions involved & functions (ULB/ Parastatal agencies)	Well detailed out. Except Public Transport, VMC is involved in planning & design, capital works and O & M of other sectors	3 agencies including Rajkot Municipal Corporation have been mentioned
2.3.3 Private Sector Participation	Details given. At present, efforts on to engage private sector for Solid Waste Management.	Involved in O&M of water supply, sewerage, maintenance of roads, O&M of street lights, O&M of community toilets, primary , secondary & tertiary SWM.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Vadodara	Rajkot
<b>2.4 Financial Health</b>		
2.4.1 Revenue Income / Expenditure Details	Provided in detail. Revenue surplus over expenditure. Octroi constitutes 72% share of tax income.	Shows surplus with major contribution of tax (83%)
2.4.2 Capital income / Expenditure Details	Details given in a separate section. Lesser amount of receipts from financial institutions and larger reliance on state govt. grants.	Details given. Shows average growth rate of expenditure slightly higher than income.
<b>2.5 Land Use (Details of area, map)</b>	Detailed Land use break up given for VMC area, well correlated map showing both Vadodara Municipal Corporation (VMC) and Vadodara Urban Development Corporation (VUDC).	Map provided shows land use in of RMC & RUDA area.
<b>2.6 Sectoral Analyses</b>		
<b>2.6.1 Water Supply</b>	Well integrated analysis with other related sectors - drainage and sewerage.	Good coverage (population & area both) and low access to individual connections, moderate non-revenue water, low cost recovery
Source of supply (surface / ground)	Mainly surface water. Details regarding sources well explained.	Surface water (100%)
Demand-supply gap	Presently negligible, projected to grow in future. Measures to diminish gap adequately addressed	Properly assessed using the norm of 135 lpcd.
Coverage (% population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	Details well elaborated. (75%; 180 lpcd; daily for 0.75 hrs)	73% population covered, , 110 lpcd, 20 minutes duration
Cost Recovery	20% of operation expenses	12.50%
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	30 – 35 %	28%
<b>2.6.2 Sewerage Facility</b>	All sewage generated not treated. All areas not sewered.	Medium coverage (population 60% & area 55%), has treatment capacity which is yet to be utilized fully, no recycling of water, slightly better cost recovery (40%) than water supply
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	215 MLD; not used to its full capacity as the entire city is not	31 mgd
Coverage (%population, area coverage);	60% pop covered; 40% of area does not have access to sewerage facility	Coverage of population 60% & area 55%
Existence of Low Cost Sanitation	40% of the city has soak pits.	Not given.
<b>2.6.3 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Not well laid in the city. Causes frequent flooding. Problems well brought out in the CDP. Covers 150 km roads out of a total of 711 km of roads in the city.	Presented issues properly. 20% coverage, low capacity, 10% of the area affected by flooding
<b>2.6.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	85% of waste generated collected and landfilled. Landfill site not engineered.	Well presented on map as well. Waste collected in 80% of the total area. House to house collection in 25% area.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Vadodara	Rajkot
<b>2.6.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Need for better connectivity between core and peripheral areas, especially VMC and VUDA area.	Well presented. Road network map also presented.
<b>2.6.6 Lakes and Water bodies</b>	Lakes not cleaned, need for interlinking between drainage network and water bodies well brought out.	No separate explanation given.
<b>2.6.7 Social Infrastructure (Education, health, community facilities)</b>	Presently sufficient. Discussed as a separate section in the CDP.	Covered fairly well.
<b>2.7 Overall Environmental Status (land, air, water)</b>	Air and water pollution status data given and analyzed. Need to clean lakes and reduce SPM stressed.	Covered well. Details of air pollution, water pollution and pollution from solid waste management given.
<b>2.8 Heritage Sites (If any)</b>	None important.	3 heritage sites
<b>2.9 Urban Poor</b>	Status well examined. Details provided. Separate section on "Urban poor" added in the CDP.	Status well presented and map provided. 20% of RMC population resides in slum areas
2.9.1 Population / Households	336 slums involving 51439 families; comprise 20% of city's population	84 notified slum areas as of 2001. .
2.9.2 Access to Basic services	88% have access to water, 46% to drainage, 42% to toilets	10% slum population with no access to water, 6% households defecating in open.
<b>3. Vision (long term / short term – next 7 years)</b>		
<b>3.1 Stakeholder Consultation</b>		
3.1.1 Spatial Spread & Socio-economic diversity	6 groups consulted comprising a sample of 5000 residents covering different sections of society(NGOs, industrialists, builders, urban poor etc) consulted; 1825 samples collected from all wards & zones of Vadodara	4 group meetings were held with stakeholders & RMC.
3.1.2 Convergence between CDP & stakeholder consultation	Well correlated and explained.	Well correlated and explained.
<b>4. Strategies to achieve vision/goals</b>		
<b>4.1 Prioritization of Strategies</b>	Well prioritized. Priorities perceived by stakeholders and those presented in CDP are in consonance with each other.	Well prioritized. Water supply at the highest priority.
<b>4.2 Sectoral Strategies</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Water Supply (capital works / O &amp; M)</b>	Thrust is on daily supply for a fixed duration & 100% coverage; reduction in unaccounted for water etc. covered in second phase Both capital works & repair and maintenance considered.	Explained and detailed out elaborately. More projects of capital work nature & and few of repair and maintenance.
Source of supply (ground / surface)	Augmentation of supply from only surface water sources. Ground water to be used only in case of exigency.	Only Surface Water

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Vadodara	Rajkot
Reduction in demand supply gap	Augmentation suggested.	No gap by 2010
Coverage (%population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	100% coverage envisioned & accordingly projects proposed.	95% coverage by 2011, 135 lpcd, duration of supply - 1hr/day
Cost Recovery	Full recovery of O & M envisaged.	Not mentioned
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	Reduction from 30 – 35 % to 20 – 25 % proposed	10% by 2010
<b>4.2.2 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Well structured vision; 100 % coverage in VMC area; prevention of local flooding and rejuvenation of water bodies.	Full protection to urban poor from flood ensuring adequate outlet to drain out rain water.
<b>4.2.3 Sewerage System</b>	Ensure coverage to all; improve quality of life of urban poor.	Full sanitation service to be achieved.
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	Utilisation of present STP of 215 MLD capacity to full capacity; treated sewage reuse from 10 MLD to 50 MLD.	150 mld (100% treatment)
Coverage (%population, areal coverage);	Increase geographical coverage from 60% to 80%;	95% coverage by 2011
<b>4.2.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Safe & scientific disposal; engineered land fill site proposed, involvement of private sector in collection & transportation.	Strategies given for optimum use of manpower, improvement collection, transportation & disposal.
<b>4.2.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Proposal for feeder roads and completing a ring road on the periphery of the city.	All weather roads for all.
<b>4.2.6 Lakes and Water Bodies</b>	Project of interlinking of water bodies proposed to stop flooding in the city; lake development for ground water recharge.	No special strategy
<b>4.3 Urban Poor</b>	190 slums identified for providing 'on-site' services.	Slum improvement dealt separately indicating projects to be undertaken with criteria of creating zero slum area & access to all basic services.
4.3.1 Access to Basic Services	Basic infrastructure proposed with respect to sanitation facilities.	100% basic service to urban poor.
4.3.2 Housing facilities	Housing facilities along-with basic infrastructure proposed for slums around lakes which need to be relocated to ensure	Construction of new houses. 30,000 houses to be constructed
<b>5. Financial plan (City Investment Plan)</b>		
5.1 Funding capacity of ULB	Revenue surplus over expenditure. Four scenarios analyzed.	Financing pattern of ULB is adequate.
5.2. Prioritization & phasing of projects	In the initial years, focus would be on completing sewerage services, shifting of slums etc. On completion of these road construction would start.	Well presented and fully covered
5.3 Financial Operating Plan	A total of Rs. 1897 Crore for VMC area and Rs. 494.52 Crore for VUDA area are proposed. Break up for each sector along with projects well detailed out.	Total capital investment fund requirement to finance the capital works is projected at Rs. 763.74 crores.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Visakapatnam	Vijayawada
<b>1. Overall quality</b>	<b>Very Good: The CDP has been prepared well and gives a comprehensive picture of the city's existing status, vision, strategies and investment plans, which have been done sector-wise. The strategies contain vision outcome for each sector and sub-sector and includes the capacity building component.</b>	<b>Excellent: The CDP has been prepared well and gives a comprehensive picture of the city's existing status, vision, strategies and investment plans, which have been done sector-wise. The strategies contain vision outcome for each sector and sub-sector and includes the capacity building component</b>
<b>2. Description of baseline (current)</b>		
<b>2.1 Demography</b>		
2.1.1 Core & periphery population	Details of core and periphery given. Temporal changes in municipal area given.	Well provided. Separate projections for municipal and peripheral areas.
2.1.2 Components of Growth (natural/migrants/ jurisdictional change)	Components of growth given. Natural increase contributed 70% in 1981-91 and 47% in 1991-2001. Jurisdictional change contributed the maximum to population growth in 2005.	Almost equal proportion of growth due to natural increase and immigration.
2.1.3 Methodology for population projection	Method not mentioned. Population growth rate of 26% envisaged between 2006 and 2011.	Methodology not given.
<b>2.2 Economic Base</b>		
2.2.1 Main Economic Activity	Economy driven by industries, services, transport, trade and business	Well covered, very well explained. Agro-based industries dominate the industrial scene.
2.2.2 Occupational Structure	Well covered. 30% engaged in services, 20% in primary sector	Well covered. 70% workers engaged in the tertiary sector.
<b>2.3 Institutional Set-up</b>		
2.3.1 Functions as per 12 Schedule of 74 <sup>th</sup> CAA	In 2004 five more functions, apart from those of 12th Schedule, were devolved but compliance is only on paper	In 2003 five functions of 12th Schedule devolved but only on paper, de facto remains with the existing agencies.
2.3.2 Institutions involved & functions (ULB/ Parastatal agencies)	7 parastatals apart from Greater Visakahapatnam Municipal Corporation are associated with development and service delivery.	Five types of agencies involved
2.3.3 Private Sector Participation	Involved in maintenance of parks, street lighting, and sanitation.	No major role but three projects under SWM sector with PSP.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Visakapatnam	Vijayawada
<b>2.4 Financial Health</b>		
2.4.1 Revenue Income / Expenditure Details	Details given. GVMC generating 77% of total receipts from own sources. Shows revenue surplus between 2000-01 and 2004-05. Surplus grew from Rs. 24.43 cr. to Rs. 74.84cr.	Shows surpluses but high dependency on state grants
2.4.2 Capital income / Expenditure Details	Capital income grew from Rs. 1.47 cr to Rs. 15.21 cr. during above period while expenditure grew from Rs. 12.39 cr to Rs. 106.32 cr	Well provided. Capital receipts are from State Govt grants, and loans. 38%Capital expenditure is from revenue transfers.
<b>2.5 Land Use (Details of area, map)</b>	Landuse explained in text only. Master Plan 2001 and Master Plan 2011 exist, but details in text or map not given in the report.	Well explained for core and periphery areas together with a vision for 2021
<b>2.6 Sectoral Analyses</b>		
<b>2.6.1 Water Supply</b>	Covered all the aspects of water supply, presentation on map would have further helped in visualizing the problem areas	Low coverage and low access to individual connections, high non-revenue water but good cost recovery because of recent initiatives for tariff revision and increase in tax net.
Source of supply (surface / ground)	Mainly surface water (80%)	Mainly from Krishna river (75%), rest from ground water.
Demand-supply gap	Deficit of 46.75 mgd for 2005-2006.	Only in periphery areas. Supply of 100 lpcd in peripheral areas as against a minimum requirement of 140 lpcd
Coverage (% population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	85% population of core area of GVMC covered, low coverage in extended areas, 62 lpcd, 45 minutes duration.	coverage 70%, access to individual connections 50%, percapita supply 157 lpcd ( municipal area), 4hrs/day
Cost Recovery	Cost recovery very good. In 2004-05 it was Rs. 51.36 crore against an expenditure of Rs. 24.00 crore	63%
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	40%	60%
<b>2.6.2 Sewerage Facility</b>	Low coverage in GVMC including core area, data on sewerage connections not available, low recycling and reuse of wastewater.	Extremely low coverage and poor access to individual connections, low treatment capacity, no recycling of water, good cost recovery
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	32 mld - not utilized fully due to insufficient network	Capacity of treatemnt plant - 20 MLD, 10% of the total sewage
Coverage (%population, area coverage);	Only 10.5% of GVMC area covered and 17% population covered.	Coverage - 30%, access to individual connections - 10%, no recycling of wastewater.
Existence of Low Cost Sanitation	Not given.	Absence of sewerage network in peripheral areas, mainly soak pits and flush latrines.
<b>2.6.3 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Well covered and issues and challenges highlighted. 20% coverage, flooding due to encrochments	Total coverage 60%, pukka network area 20%, canal reclamation 5%
<b>2.6.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Well covered and issues and challenges highlighted.Waste collected in 65% of the total area. House to house collection in	Covered very well, three projects proposed with private sector participation

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Visakapatnam	Vijayawada
<b>2.6.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Well covered. Issues and challenges highlighted. Heavy cargo transit to be streamlined. Road infrastructure inadequate.	Well explained. Focus on traffic flows and travel demand, road network, vehicular growth and composition, and public transport system etc.
<b>2.6.6 Lakes and Water bodies</b>	No separate explanation given.	Not provided
<b>2.6.7 Social Infrastructure (Education, health, community facilities)</b>	No separate explanation given.	Well provided.
<b>2.7 Overall Environmental Status (land, air, water)</b>	Dealt separately and quite elaborately.	Well covered and status of environmental pollution and related details well provided.
<b>2.8 Heritage Sites (If any)</b>	list of 27 heritage sites given	None discussed
<b>2.9 Urban Poor</b>	Status presented elaborately. 24% of total population lives in slums as per 2001 data	Well provided. Information of poverty reduction initiatives and schemes also discussed
2.9.1 Population / Households	472 slums in GVMC, 41% of GVMC population resides in slums as per 2005 data.	30% slum population in municipal area and 52% in peripheral areas
2.9.2 Access to Basic services	60% covered with drinking water and 25% covered by sewerage system.	water supply - 20%, sewerage facility 2%, access to community toilets 75%
<b>3. Vision (long term / short term – next 7 years)</b>		
<b>3.1 Stakeholder Consultation</b>		
3.1.1 Spatial Spread & Socio-economic diversity	Broad-based stakeholder consultations held. Stakeholders included all sections of society and economy including the poor.	10 working groups formed for consultations. A separate consultative process was adopted for periphery municipalities.
3.1.2 Convergence between CDP & stakeholder consultation	Not clear.	Stakeholder views and priorities are in consonance with prioritization arrived at in the CDP.
<b>4. Strategies to achieve vision/goals</b>		
<b>4.1 Prioritization of Strategies</b>	Well prioritized. Water supply given the top priority followed by sewerage, SWM, traffic and transportation, drainage and urban	Prioritization within the sector given well.
<b>4.2 Sectoral Strategies</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Water Supply (capital works / O &amp; M)</b>	Explained well and detailed out elaborately. Most of the projects involve capital works	Balanced focus on both capital works and O&M. Comprehensive water sector development plan provided.
Source of supply (ground / surface)	Only Surface Water	Separate work plans provided. 3/4th from surface sources and 1/4 from ground water sources

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Visakapatnam	Vijayawada
Reduction in demand supply gap	59% gap by 2011	Separate work plans provided, no gap will exist
Coverage (%population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	70% by 2011, 120 lpcd, 9 to 10 hours/day	75% coverage, 75% access, 160 lpcd, 12 hrs/day
Cost Recovery	Not mentioned	Separate work plans provided. 80% cost recovery
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	38% by 2011	Plan for reducing unaccounted for water to 30%
<b>4.2.2 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Covered well with focus on increasing the safety of city from flooding	80% coverage, 50% pucca network, 75% canal reclamation, comprehensive storm water drainage plan provided.
<b>4.2.3 Sewerage System</b>	Covered well with focus on increasing the sewerage network coverage and access.	Comprehensive sewerage master plan provided.
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	60% treatment by 2011	80% area to be sewerred.
Coverage (%population, areal coverage);	45% household connection by 2011	50% sewage to be treated by 2010.
<b>4.2.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	An integrated solid waste management system being proposed.	Integrated solid waste management plan, vermi-composting plant, bio-methanization plant
<b>4.2.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Covered well. Improvement in public transport facility. Better transport infrastructure.	Constitution and operationalisation of unified Vijayawada Traffic and Transport Authority. Detailed strategies provided.
<b>4.2.6 Lakes and Water Bodies</b>	No special strategy	No demand for funding under JNNURM
<b>4.3 Urban Poor</b>	City without slums by 2021 vision has been properly put into achievable goals and strategies formulated	Comprehensive plan for urban poor given.
4.3.1 Access to Basic Services	Briefly presented. 100% basic service to urban poor	Strategies well provided. 100% coverage and access to basic amenities for poor, 100% literacy, livelihood to all poor, access to primary health,
4.3.2 Housing facilities	Briefly presented. 50,000 houses to be constructed	Strategies well provided. Development of housing by ppp, relocation of slums, tenurial security and affordable housing etc.
<b>5. Financial plan (City Investment Plan)</b>		
5.1 Funding capacity of ULB	Well explained	Well explained in the provided set of new data sheets
5.2. Prioritization & phasing of projects	Projects and the funds required have been phased over 7 year period.	Prioritization given well.
5.3 Financial Operating Plan	4 scenarios worked out to assess the investment sustaining capacity of GVMC. Total capital investment fund required is Rs. 8747.7 crores	Total projects proposed for Rs. 7300 cr.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Raipur	Hyderabad
<b>1. Overall quality</b>	<b>Fair: The CDP gives a fair idea about the city; Existing situation analysis together with perspective and a vision of the city has not been adequately presented. The CDP needs revision.</b>	<b>The CDP has been prepared very well. It gives a comprehensive picture of the city's existing status, vision, strategies and investment plans - all sector-wise. A separate chapter has been devoted to Basic Services to the Urban Poor. The strategies not only include projects for improving service delivery but also include the capacity building component.</b>
<b>2. Description of baseline (current)</b>		
<b>2.1 Demography</b>		
2.1.1 Core & periphery population	Core and periphery areas are not distinguished.	Population of core and periphery given with growth rates. Map and graphs provided
2.1.2 Components of Growth (natural/migrants/ jurisdictional change)	Explained for the past two decades but the relation with future growth not given.	Components of growth given. Natural growth contributes 60% to population growth.
2.1.3 Methodology for population projection	Methodology is not mentioned.	Not given
<b>2.2 Economic Base</b>		
2.2.1 Main Economic Activity	Weakly presented, more details needed.	Detailed out well. The most dominant sector is the tertiary or service sector.
2.2.2 Occupational Structure	Analytical presentation missing.	Details given. Service sector dominates, contributing more than 72% of the city's total workforce.
<b>2.3 Institutional Set-up</b>		
2.3.1 Functions as per 12 Schedule of 74 <sup>th</sup> CAA	Functional domain not provided, does not clearly explain the functions of multiple agencies.	Detailed out.
2.3.2 Institutions involved & functions (ULB/ Parastatal agencies)	Many agencies involved but exact functions not explained.	Institutional matrix given in detail and presented well. The functional overlaps presented very clearly.
2.3.3 Private Sector Participation	Not highlighted	Given as a part of discussion on individual services.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Raipur	Hyderabad
<b>2.4 Financial Health</b>		
2.4.1 Revenue Income / Expenditure Details	High dependency on state grants. On per capita basis, own revenues are declining. Most of the revenue expenditure is on establishment and salaries. Expenditure on O & M is only 1/3 <sup>rd</sup> .	Given in detail for HMC and surrounding municipalities
2.4.2 Capital income / Expenditure Details	Capital expenditure details and pattern not provided.	Given in detail.
<b>2.5 Land Use (Details of area, map)</b>	Explained and land use development plan for 2011 also provided.	Land use structure and pattern given of Hyderabad Urban Agglomeration . Percentage area under different uses not given.
<b>2.6 Sectoral Analyses</b>		
<b>2.6.1 Water Supply</b>	State government provides this service. This function is not transferred to RMC. City specific financial profile for this sector not provided. No details provided on non-revenue water and on demand-supply gap.	The CDP provides a very good assessment of the water sector.
Source of supply (surface / ground)	Mainly from river Kharun but details not provided.	Mainly surface source.
Demand-supply gap	Methodology for working out deficiency not clear.	Demand: 245 mld, supply: 231 mld
Coverage (% population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	Coverage and level of service are not provided.	90% population covered, access to piped water 70%. Average supply: 162 lpcd, 1-2 hours supply every alternate day.
Cost Recovery	Not provided	66% without debt servicing
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	Not provided	40% (estimated)
<b>2.6.2 Sewerage Facility</b>	Responsible agency not mentioned. Coverage and level of service not provided in the CDP.	Analysed in substantial detail
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	Not provided.	350 mld generated. Capacity of STP 133 mld (38% of generation).
Coverage (%population, area coverage);	Not provided	62% area covered. 90% population covered.
Existence of Low Cost Sanitation	Not provided.	Not given.
<b>2.6.3 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Not provided.	Cover only 30% of the roads. Inadequate drainage system. Low coverage and low capacity.
<b>2.6.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Not given clearly. Details of collection, transportation and disposal not provided. Performance indicators not	Discussed well. 2240 MT generated daily, 91% collection efficiency. Waste-to-energy plant working since Dec. 1999. No engineered

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Raipur	Hyderabad
<b>2.6.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Details provided but problem areas not highlighted. Discussion very general.	Described in detail, with maps.
<b>2.6.6 Lakes and Water bodies</b>	Details of water bodies well presented. Restoration plans, river front development and initiation of rainwater harvesting measures also provided.	Discussed under environment.
<b>2.6.7 Social Infrastructure (Education, health, community facilities)</b>	Brief analysis presented.	Not given for the city, but partly discussed in the chapter on poor.
<b>2.7 Overall Environmental Status (land, air, water)</b>	Problems identified relate to water pollution and vehicular pollution.	Water pollution, air pollution and noise pollution discussed. The chapter also discussed hazardous and bio-medical waste. Examines other aspects of environment also such as urban greening,
<b>2.8 Heritage Sites (If any)</b>	None discussed	Heritage sites discussed.
<b>2.9 Urban Poor</b>	The section on urban poor provides only the list of slums etc. Details not provided.	Separate chapter on Basic Services to the Urban Poor provided.
2.9.1 Population / Households	Not provided	The Corporation area has 14% BPL population, 39% slum population.
2.9.2 Access to Basic services	Not provided	Details given. Basic infrastructure in slum minimal and inadequate.
<b>3. Vision (long term / short term – next 7 years)</b>		
<b>3.1 Stakeholder Consultation</b>		
3.1.1 Spatial Spread & Socio-economic diversity	Stakeholder consultations not undertaken, therefore the CDP completely misses the opinion and views of the people of the city.	Series of broad-based consultations held. Key stakeholders included officials, representatives of business and trade, public representatives, experts, NGOs/ agencies involved in service delivery etc.
3.1.2 Convergence between CDP & stakeholder consultation	Not provided	The CDP indicates a convergence.
<b>4. Strategies to achieve vision/goals</b>		
<b>4.1 Prioritization of Strategies</b>	No prioritization and weak focus of the strategies.	Given. Water supply top priority followed by sewerage and solid waste management.
<b>4.2 Sectoral Strategies</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Water Supply (capital works / O &amp; M)</b>	Presented in a very generalized manner and no specific details are provided.	Dealt with in a comprehensive manner
Source of supply (ground / surface)	Not provided	Not indicated specifically.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Raipur	Hyderabad
Reduction in demand supply gap	Not provided	Implicit, but not given explicitly.
Coverage (%population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	Not provided	100% coverage by 2016. 24x7 supply by 2021.
Cost Recovery	Not provided	Full cost recovery.
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	Not provided	20% by 2016.
<b>4.2.2 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Not provided	Drainage rehabilitation programme, conservation of water bodies.
<b>4.2.3 Sewerage System</b>	Presented in a very generalized manner and no specific details are provided.	Well detailed out
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	Not provided.	80% treatment of wastewater by 2011 and 90% by 2016.
Coverage (%population, areal coverage);	Not provided.	80% coverage by 2011 and 90% by 2016.
<b>4.2.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Presented in a very generalized manner. Specific details on strategies not provided.	100% door to door collection, scientific disposal and source segregation by 2015. Private sector participation for disposal by 2010.
<b>4.2.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Strategies not well provided. Vision is absent.	Safe, reliable, eco friendly and speedy transport system.
<b>4.2.6 Lakes and Water Bodies</b>	Presented in a generalized manner. Specific details on strategies not provided.	Deepening of lakes and protection of environmental resources.
<b>4.3 Urban Poor</b>	Presented in a generalized manner. Specific details on strategies are not provided.	Separate plan for urban poor envisioned
4.3.1 Access to Basic Services	Not provided	All poor to have access to qualitative and affordable basic services, slum networking to be taken up.
4.3.2 Housing facilities	Not provided	Provision of security of land tenure, development of housing through PPP.
<b>5. Financial plan (City Investment Plan)</b>		
5.1 Funding capacity of ULB	Not explained as it lacks the past performance.	Can sustain investments.
5.2. Prioritization & phasing of projects	Prioritization given.	Phasing given in the investment plan.
5.3 Financial Operating Plan	Total projects proposed for Rs. 1454 cr.	Not given for MCH.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Coimbatore	Madurai
<b>1. Overall quality</b>	<b>The CDP is well prepared. It gives a comprehensive picture of the city's existing status, strategies and investment plans - all sector-wise. A separate chapter has been devoted to Basic Services to the Urban Poor.</b>	<b>Good: The CCP has been prepared well and gives a comprehensive picture of the city's existing status, vision, strategies and investment plans, which have been done sector-wise.</b>
<b>2. Description of baseline (current)</b>		
<b>2.1 Demography</b>		
2.1.1 Core & periphery population	Temporal changes in municipal population have been given from 1911 to 2001. <b>The temporal changes in area of Municipality is not given</b> . Also the periphery population, area & its temporal changes haven't been mentioned	Well provided. Projections focused only core of the city area, nothing is mentioned about periphery population
2.1.2 Components of Growth (natural/migrants/ jurisdictional change)	Components of growth not given.	not provided
2.1.3 Methodology for population projection	Have used Geometric Increase Method, from the three adopted methods of population projections-arithmetic increase method, Incremental increase method and geometric increase method. Projections has been done only for Corporation's population.	semi-log line of best fit method, projections seems to be on higher side
<b>2.2 Economic Base</b>		
2.2.1 Main Economic Activity	Brief socio-economic profile provided. Industries & related ancillary are major employment provider	Well covered, very well explained. An important trading center for handlooms, silk weaving, pottery, leather industry etc.
2.2.2 Occupational Structure	Mentioned two decades (1981, 2001) work force participation. Maximum workforce (89%) in tertiary sector.	Well covered. Work force participation is only 34% . mainly in the tertiary sector.
<b>2.3 Institutional Set-up</b>		
2.3.1 Functions as per 12 Schedule of 74 <sup>th</sup> CAA	Except for Fire Services other 17 functions being performed by ULBs. Details provided in Annexure II.	well explained in the reform agenda section, The CCP should also contain details about the functional domain
2.3.2 Institutions involved & functions (ULB/ Parastatal agencies)	Apart from ULB five parastatal agencies involved in service delivery. The agencies along with their major functions have been listed.	Many agencies involved and detailed functioning is explained well.
2.3.3 Private Sector Participation	Not given.	Not highlighted

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Coimbatore	Madurai
<b>2.4 Financial Health</b>		
2.4.1 Revenue Income / Expenditure Details	Details given. CMC generates 65.5% of total receipts from own sources. Shows revenue surplus between 2000-01 and 2003-04. Surplus grew from Rs. 10.13 cr. to Rs. 15.89 cr with a maximum of Rs. 25.92 cr in FY 2002-03.	High dependency on state grants. Mostly surpluses Most of the revenue expenditure is on establishment and salaries.
2.4.2 Capital income / Expenditure Details	Capital Account improved from deficit of Rs. 12.54 cr to surplus of Rs. 2.42 cr during the above period	Well provided. Capital receipts are from State Govt grants, and loans and from revenue account transfers also. Sector wise pattern for capital expenditure is well provided.
<b>2.5 Land Use (Details of area, map)</b>	Landuse has been tabulated and shown on map also, but for Corporation area only	Well explained for the MMC area together with a vision for 2021
<b>2.6 Sectoral Analyses</b>		
<b>2.6.1 Water Supply</b>	Low coverage of households and access to individual connections less than 50% , 30% non-revenue water. Existing demand-supply gap in mld & cost recovery have not been given.	once in three days, only 75 lpcd, low coverage and low access to individual connections. Details on non revenue water and cost recovery issues not provided.
Source of supply (surface / ground)	Totally surface source	through surface and sub-surface sources.
Demand-supply gap	Not given.	huge demand and supply gaps, situation becomes worse in summer season
Coverage (% population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	43% household covered, Supply 152 lpcd in normal season while 60 lpcd during scarcity	coverage 36%, slum coverage not available, percapita supply 75 lpcd, once in three days
Cost Recovery	Not given.	Not provided
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	30%	Not provided
<b>2.6.2 Sewerage Facility</b>	Low coverage of population, very low coverage of area, low treatment capacity, data on recycling and reuse of wastewater not available,	Low coverage and slum coverage not available, low treatment capacity, details on recycling of water and cost recovery issues not available
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated		Capacity of treatemnt plant - 26 MLD, 43% of the total
Coverage (%population, area coverage);	22% area covered 54% population covered	Coverage - 55%, 13 wards have no under ground drainage out of 72 wards. System is in a dilapidated condition
Existence of Low Cost Sanitation	1573 toilet seats of which 1495 toilet seats in 147 Toilet blocks are in slums	not available
<b>2.6.3 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Well covered. Drains cover 92 % of road length, good drainage coverage	28% of the road length only. Inadequate coverage, frequent floods. Choking of the drains lines and overflowing problems etc.
<b>2.6.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Well covered. Collected efficiency 80%. Low house to house collection	91% collection efficiency, inadequate dumping sites and lack of scientific waste disposal.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Coimbatore	Madurai
<b>2.6.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	Well covered. Surfaced roads 94.2% ; Per capita road length is low (1.5 m)	Well explained. Key issues-inadequate coverage, high congestion, encroachments etc. comprehensive study was done and future travel demands were calculated etc.
<b>2.6.6 Lakes and Water bodies</b>	Well covered.Eight major water bodies within corporation ; 23 flood spots identified within corporation	Details of water bodies well presented. Rejuvenation of water bodies explained well.
<b>2.6.7 Social Infrastructure (Education, health, community facilities)</b>	Covered briefly as part of urban basic services for poor. Issues have not been given.	Well provided but the CCP has not highlighted any deficiencies in these sectors.
<b>2.7 Overall Environmental Status (land, air, water)</b>	Not given.	separate section on environmental health of the city not provided.
<b>2.8 Heritage Sites (If any)</b>	Not discussed	None discussed
<b>2.9 Urban Poor</b>		key issues are poor access to basic services, high density and poor infrastructure though the exact details are not provided
2.9.1 Population / Households	20% of total population reside in slums	22% slum population in municipal area.
2.9.2 Access to Basic services	Covered properly but briefly. Water Supply coverage of households less than 5% ; Open defecation along tank bunds & nallahs ; Improper maintenance of toilet blocks	not provided
<b>3. Vision (long term / short term – next 7 years)</b>		
<b>3.1 Stakeholder Consultation</b>		
3.1.1 Spatial Spread & Socio-economic diversity	Public consultations have been conducted with municipal councillors, officials and identified stakeholders. Details not provided.	public consultations have been conducted with municipal councillors, officials and identified stakeholders. Details are not provided.
3.1.2 Convergence between CDP & stakeholder consultation	Not given.	not provided
<b>4. Strategies to achieve vision/goals</b>		
<b>4.1 Prioritization of Strategies</b>	Prioritization within the sector given well.	Prioritization of the projects not provided.
<b>4.2 Sectoral Strategies</b>		
<b>4.2.1 Water Supply (capital works / O &amp; M)</b>	Asset management plan, rehabilitation, leak detection plan, mapping and GIS and augmentation works focused	asset management plan, leak detection plan, mapping and GIS etc. to be focused
Source of supply (ground / surface)	Only Surface Water ; Plans for surface source augmentation.	plans for source augmentation and network coverage presented.

## Annexure : Matrix on CDP Appraisal

	Coimbatore	Madurai
Reduction in demand supply gap	Not mentioned	target to reduce the gaps
Coverage (%population, lpcd, duration, frequency);	100% coverage by 2016. 135 lpcd supply by 2016.	100% coverage, 70% slum coverage, 110 lpcd, 10% to be achieved of 24x7 supply
Cost Recovery	Not provided	cost recovery to be increased to 75%
UFW (unaccounted-for-water)	15% by 2016	Plan for reducing unaccounted for water to 20%
<b>4.2.2 Storm Water Drainage</b>	Increasing the drainage coverage, rehabilitation of nallahs & water bodies.	100% coverage of the road length, rehabilitation of water bodies and nallahs, usage of water bodies as water recharge structure (50%)
<b>4.2.3 Sewerage System</b>	Asset management plan, rehabilitation, UGD for unsewered areas, mapping and GIS, etc. focused	90% coverage, 60% slum coverage, 90% treatment and disposal, recycling 40% and cost recovery 50%.
Capacity of STP / Sewage generated	100% treatment & disposal by 2016.	90% treatment and disposal.
Coverage (%population, areal coverage);	100% coverage by 2016.	90% and 60% coverage for general and slum areas
<b>4.2.4 Solid Waste Management</b>	Door to door collection, source segregation, twin bin system at storage etc. focused	door to door collection, source segregation, development of scientific landfill site
<b>4.2.5 Roads &amp; Transport</b>	road coverage to improve to 10km/sqkm by 2016 ; Strengthening of int	Detailed strategies provided.
<b>4.2.6 Lakes and Water Bodies</b>	Rejuvenation and rehabilitation work for water bodies	No demand for funding under JNNURM
<b>4.3 Urban Poor</b>	Separate strategies for providing basic services for poor given	better access to basic services and provision of housing
4.3.1 Access to Basic Services	Briefly presented. 100% basic service to urban poor by 2016	90% coverage and access to basic amenities for poor, 100% adequately lit slums, education for all
4.3.2 Housing facilities	80% pucca houses by 2011 and 100% by 2016	80% pucca houses by 2011.
<b>5. Financial plan (City Investment Plan)</b>		
5.1 Funding capacity of ULB	Well explained	Well explained but needs clarifications (pl see the appraisal)
5.2.Prioritization & phasing of projects	Projects and the funds required have been phased over 7 year period.	Prioritization of the projects not discussed.
5.3 Financial Operating Plan	Total projects proposed for Rs. 3,029.31 cr .	Total projects proposed for Rs. 2361 cr on behalf of the MMC and state level agencies.