

Appraisal of City Development Plan Raipur

March 2006



National Institute of Urban Affairs

Core 4B, India Habitat Centre
Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003

In case of any query, please contact Mr. Sandeep Thakur (email: sthakur@niua.org)

Appraisal of City Development Plan: Raipur

The City Development Plan (CDP) of Raipur gives a fairly good idea about the Raipur city on issues like city assessment and analysis, future perspective and vision, strategies for development and city investment plan. However there are certain information gaps, which should have been incorporated at this stage. These are discussed below.

Stakeholder Consultations

1. As per the Tool Kit 2 (Formulation of City Development Plan) of the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), it was expected to carry out stakeholders' consultations in the preparation of the CDP. However it is observed that this exercise has not been undertaken by CDP and section 1.11 on "limitations of the study" of CDP (long term plan) mentions, "to understand the area, field visits to the area will be conducted and interaction with various authorities, public representatives and eminent citizens and personalities will be held". However the details of such meetings are not provided in the CDP.

Analysis of the Existing Situation

Institutional arrangements

2. The section on urban governance does not provide the functional domain of Raipur Municipal Corporation (RMC), which would have given a clear picture of the responsibilities of the RMC. It would also have highlighted the status of incorporation of eighteen functions of the Twelfth Schedule of the Seventy Fourth Constitutional Amendment. It is important to know at this stage which of the eighteen functions are being performed by RMC level and which other agencies are the involved in performing these functions.

Section 2.9 of the CDP does not clearly explain the functioning of multiple agencies and their overlapping functional domains etc. Organisational structure of these multiple agencies and functioning of line departments has also not been produced in the CDP.

Population

3. Section 2.1 of the short-term plan of CDP (CDP-STP) does not adequately highlight the demography, population growth rates and composition of population growth of the city, as it is not clear whether the analysis is for Raipur Urban Agglomeration (RUA) or for Raipur Municipal Corporation (RMC).

The city's population mentioned in the CDP for 2001 does not match with the population of RUA or RMC as per the census, 2001. Although there are 12 outgrowths and two census towns at the periphery of the RMC, however it is not clear whether they are merged in the RMC or not.

Year	Population	Decadal Growth	Annual exponential growth rate (%)
1981	338000		
1991	461000	36.4	3.1
2001	670042	45.4	3.7
2011 (proj)	1307019	95.1*	6.7*

Source: Table 2.1, CDP (short term plan)

Note: * assumed decadal and annual exponential growth rates

Methodology used by the CDP for projections of the population is not clear. The decadal growth rates are applied for the projecting population estimates for the midyear of the next decade, i.e., for the year 2005 (see the table 2.1 of the CDP). The result of applying decadal growth for the projections of mid year population has led to 95 percent decadal change for the period of 2001-2011, which seems to be doubtful. Secondly,

even if we assume that the periphery areas are added in RMC's jurisdiction in mid of the present decade, the would be role of the jurisdictional change needs to be clarified.

	Status	Population			Decadal growth %	
		1981	1991	2001	81-91	91-2001
Raipur	U.A	338,291	462,782	699,264	36.8	51.1
Raipur	M.Corp.	331,695	438,501	605,131	32.2	38.0
(i) Changera	O.G			11,716		
(ii) Hirapur Jarwai	O.G			10,002		
(iii) Purena	O.G			9,550		
(iv) Rajpura	O.G			9,169		
(v) Telibandha	O.G		1,154	8,374		625.6
(vi) Khamtarai	O.G		602	4,571		659.3
(vii) Shankarnagar	O.G			3,332		
(viii) Rawabhatwa	O.G			3,108		
(ix) Amlidih	O.G		1,910	2,324		21.7
(x) Tatibandh	O.G			1,044		
(xi) Labhandih	O.G		1,525	752		-50.7
(xii) Raipurkhas	O.G			137		
(b) Bhanpuri	C.T			16,357		
(c) Mowa	C.T			13,697		

Source: Census of India, 2001 (On CD)

4. Section 2.1.3 discusses the “results of migration on basic services”. It shows that there is an increase of 1.21 lakh slum dwellers from 1991 to 2001 whereas the population growth is 1.67 lakh for RMC area and population growth is 2.36 lakh for RUA area. Again there is rise of 1.20 lakh slum dwellers from 2001 to 2005. These estimates seem to be on higher side. Analytical base together with supporting data should have been presented in this section

5. Section 2.5 has focused on the core area of the city whereas the population and area details of the core city have not been provided in the CDP. Moreover this section has not adequately analysed the existing situation in the core area of the city. The situation in the periphery areas with respect to coverage and level of services needs to be given in details.

An estimate of one million population for the year 2005 seems to be very high as it has resulted in a lower per capita availability of water in 2005 (table 2.9). Since the estimated demand in the core sectors depends crucially on the estimated population therefore population projections must be estimated carefully. More discussions on these analytical issues will need to be incorporated in the CDP.

Financial profile of the city

6. Section 2.3 on “financial profile of RMC” needs more details to be presented, as it does not provide the sources of tax, non-tax incomes, tax rates and especially the break-up of state transfers. State transfers represents 65 percent of revenue income compared to 28 percent and 7 percent of revenue receipts from tax and non-tax sources respectively. This indicates a very high dependency on state government.

The conclusions drawn on page 6 under section 2.3.1 highlight that there is a reduction in the proportion of grants and indicates it as “a good financial health of local body”. This conclusion does not seem to be correct because there is no reduction in grants as it continued to contribute 65 percent of revenue receipts for 2001-02 to 2004-05 except for the year 2003-04, when there was a decline on all the heads. Huge grants are received on capital account also whereas the capital expenditure pattern is not provided in the CDP.

Interestingly, assuming their population actuals/estimates for the year 2001 and 2005 to be correct, i.e., 6.7 lakh and 10.0 lakh respectively; RMC generates merely Rs.237.40 on per capita basis from its own

resources. Secondly the capacity to generate revenue from own resources on per capita basis is on decline even on the current prices for same period (see the above table).

Raipur Municipal Corporation	Amounts in Rupees lakh			
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Own resources	1590.56	1964.02	1618.33	1902.52
Tax income	1024.14	1202.32	1072.78	1579.69
Non-tax income	566.42	761.70	545.55	322.83
State transfers (grants etc.)	3001.25	3825.92	2489.34	3575.16
Total revenue receipts	4591.81	5789.94	4107.67	5477.68
	Percentage from total revenue receipts			
Own resources	34.64	33.92	39.40	34.73
Tax income	22.30	20.77	26.12	28.84
Non-tax income	12.34	13.16	13.28	5.89
State transfers (grants etc.)	65.36	66.08	60.60	65.27
Total revenue receipts	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Per Capita Amounts in Rupees			
Own resources	237.40			190.25
Tax income	152.86			157.97
Non-tax income	84.54			32.28
State transfers (grants etc.)	447.95			357.52
Total revenue receipts	685.34			547.77
	Actual/Projected Population in lakh			
	6.70			10.00

Further, the CDP highlights that 67 percent of the revenue expenditure goes on wages & salaries and merely 28 percent is allocated to operation and maintenance works. With these kinds of financial results RMC will continue to be dependent on state transfers, as there are no proposals for increasing RMC's own sources of revenue.

Quotation made in section 2.4.1.1 "the above table shows the efforts of MC to collect capital from market and introduce PPP in developmental projects" is very puzzling and not evident from the table. The repaying capability of loans by RMC is also not discussed in the CDP. The fiscal health of RMC as emerges from the CDP, is not very good.

Water Supply and Sewerage

7. Water supply does not come in the functional domain of the RMC. The responsibility of provision of water supply comes under PHE department of state government and there is a water supply and sewerage board for this purpose for RMC area. However the finances of city-level water supply and sewerage board (table 2.8 page 8), shows that the cost recovery is more than 100 percent for the year of 2004-05, which does not seem to be feasible as there are a few parastatal agencies in the country who can recover more than ninety percent of the cost incurred. A break-up of the income and expenditure of the water board should be provided in the CDP for a clear understanding of financial issues of the water sector.

The present analysis on Infrastructure of water supply (page 7&8) could have been presented in a more refined manner. There is no explanation on the difference between the present water supply and the original capacity. Distribution and transmission losses are not provided in the CDP. Zone-wise demand and supply gap should have been provided in this section to bring out the real deficiencies in water supply sector and the reasons for these deficiencies should have been analysed.

The PHE department of the state government is looking after the capital and O&M works of water sector in the entire state of Chattisgarh including urban and rural areas. Therefore working out of strategies for RMC area should have been presented separately .

8. The section on sewerage and drainage systems has not highlighted the agency responsible for this service. The coverage and the level of this service are not provided in the CDP, i.e., what percentage of population and what percentage of road length is covered at present etc. The past financial performances together with the financial constraints of this sector are not provided in the CDP. Similar details need to be provided for storm water drainage sector also.

Solid Waste Management:

9. Section 2.4.4 of the CDP has not dealt adequately the issues related to solid waste management. Subsections 2.4.4.1, 2.4.4.4 and 2.4.4.5 are quite reductant. The existing situation with respect to this service sector is not clear. This section should indicate how the SWM service is being provided. The details of collection, transportation and disposal should also be provided in the CDP. Performance indicators for this sector need to be provided and discussed in the CDP.

Urban Poor

10. The section on urban poor in Raipur City (Section 2.7.3) provides only the list of slums and squatter settlements. No specific details and estimates are provided in this section on the coverage and level of services in these slum areas. The financial planning for addressing the problems of slum dwellers has not been provided in the CDP.

Future Perspective and Vision, Strategies for Development and City Investment Plan

Future Perspective and Vision

11. Section 3.1 of Chapter 3 on vision and goals has been presented in a generalised manner. The chapter merely provides the vision such as water lines for the length of 176 kms without giving the background of existing coverage in kilometres. The vision for other sectors has also not been presented well. The details linking the present situation to future goals should have been presented clearly.

Strategies for Development:

12. Chapter 4 is on “Strategies for Development”. The main focus of these strategies seems to be on the core of the city and strategies for the periphery areas has not been explained. Further these strategies are on behalf of RMC or on the behalf of all the multiple agencies together are not clear from the CDP. Although table 4.9 under the section 4.4 gives some idea about the total amount required for its different components but detailed break-up for these projects would have been provided. The column 2 and 3 are of nodal agency and implementing agency whereas distinction between the two has not been explained.

Sector-wise Funding

Raipur (CDP)	Required Investment	
	Rs. Crore	%
Roads etc.	326.00	22.42
Slums	232.00	15.95
Augmentation of water supply	223.12	15.34
Urban renewal	168.00	11.55
Sewerage & drainage	130.80	8.99
Storm water drainage	110.37	7.59
Solid waste management	104.00	7.15
Street lights	75.00	5.16
Civic amenities	30.50	2.10
Socio-Cultural Infrastructure	26.00	1.79
Urban transport	25.00	1.72
Slaughter houses	3.50	0.24
Total	1454.29	100.00

13. The above table gives details of sector wise funding requirements and shows the main focus is on roads followed by slums, augmentation of water supply, urban renewal for the core of the city, sewerage and drainage and so on. However the detailed city investment plan (CIP) with break-up of its components for augmentation of water supply, sewerage and drainage, physical up-gradation of slums and storm water drainage has not been given. This section does not provide adequate reasoning and background for working out of these plans, i.e., what kinds of assumptions are made for estimation of financial requirements etc.

Moreover, the investments sought for the water sector are for new distribution lines and new water plant of capacity 45.6 mgd. No work plan is provided on reduction of non-revenue water and on bridging the gap between cost and recovery. The strategies for resource augmentation and impact of reform agenda at RMC level are not produced in this section.

Expected Improvements

14. The CDP should have been prepared as per the guidelines issued in the Toolkit 2 of JNNURM. The CDP should be able to present the current stage of the city's development – where is the city now in terms of level of services, finances etc? It should set out the clear directions of change –where does the city want to reach? It should identify the thrust areas- what needs to be done on priority basis? And what interventions do the city make in order to attain the vision?

The CDP can be cleared once the following points are addressed and appraised.

1. In-depth analysis of the existing situation, covering the demographic, economic, financial, infrastructure, physical, environmental and institutional aspects.
2. Explanations on physical and financial inefficiencies in the provision of services at the city level.
3. Development of a perspective and a vision for the city combined with consultation with stakeholders and civil society.
4. Functional domain of the agencies involved in the provision of basic services in the city especially the problems related to the working of multiple agencies together such as overlapping functional domain etc.
5. Make appropriate population projections for JNNURM time period.
6. Strategies for resource augmentation at RMC level to reduce the dependency on state government's grants and other transfers.
7. Sector wise financial analysis for the past five years giving financial constraints for the sectors related to water supply, sanitation, sewerage and drainage, solid waste management, roads, streetlight etc.
8. Status of urban poor in the city with respect to housing, coverage and level of services etc. Financial constraints for improving level of services of the urban poor.
9. Detailed information on agency wise strategies and capital investment plan.
10. Prioritisation of projects and with adequate reasoning.

NIUA: The compliance report of the city is enclosed below.

The CDP is now in accordance with the JNNURM Toolkit Number 2.

COMPLIANCE NOTE

The City Development Plan of Raipur (Draft) having 5 chapters and necessary sub-sections was submitted on February 2006. Based on the comments/ observations, the CDP has been modified. 3 new chapters on Municipal Infrastructure (*Chapter No: IV*), Finance and Investment Plan (*Chapter No: VII*) and Capital Improvement Programme (*Chapter No: VIII*) have been added in the final CDP while the other sections have been suitably modified in the final CDP.

The detailed compliance note on the observations/ comments made in the appraisal of City Development Plan, Raipur has been presented in the subsequent table

Appraisal Of City Development Plan: Raipur

Sl.No.	Comments / Observations	Compliances
1	<p>Stakeholder consultations: As per the tool Kit 2 (formulation of City Development Plan) of the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), it was expected to carry out stakeholders' consultations in the preparation of the CDP. However it is observed that this exercise has not been undertaken by CDP and section 1.11 on "limitations of the study" of CDP (Long term Plan) mentions, "to understand the area, field visits to the area will be conducted and interaction with various authorities, public representatives and eminent citizens and personalities will be held". However the details of such meetings are not provided in the CDP.</p>	<p>The consultancy have carried out the stakeholders consultation (As per Tool Kit-2.JNNURM) the details of which presented in final CDP (Kindly refer Chapter No-I, Page No-8)</p>
2	Analysis of the Existing Situation	
2.1	<p>Institutional arrangements : The section on urban governance does not provide the functional domain of Raipur Municipal Corporation (RMC), which would have given a clear picture of the responsibilities of the RMC. It would also have highlighted the status of incorporation of eighteen functions of the Twelfth Schedule of the Seventy Fourth Constitutional Amendment. It is important to know at this stage which of the eighteen functions are being performed by RMC level and which other agencies are the involved in performing these functions.</p> <p>Section 2.9 of the CDP does not clearly explain the functioning of multiple agencies and their overlapping functional domains etc. Organisational structure of these multiple agencies and functioning of line departments has also not been produced in the CDP.</p>	<p>The details have been incorporated in the final CDP (Kindly refer Chapter No-III, Page No - 28-34)</p>
2.2	<p>Population: Section 2.1 of the short-term plan of CDP (CDP -STP) does not adequately highlight the demography, population growth rates and composition of population growth of the city, as it is not clear whether the analysis is for Raipur Urban Agglomeration (RUA) or for Raipur Municipal Corporation (RMC).</p> <p>The city's population mentioned in the CDP for 2001 does not match with the population of RUA or RMC as per the census, 2001. Although there are 12 outgrowths and two census towns at the periphery of the RMC, however it is not clear whether they are merged in the RMC or not.</p>	<p>The population data pertains to Raipur Municipal Corporation (RMC). However the Chapter on Demographic, Economic and Land use has been revised, necessary observation/ suggestions have been incorporated the same can be referred from Chapter-II of Final CDP</p>
	<p>Methodology used by the CDP for projections of the population is not clear. The decadal growth rates are applied for the projecting population estimates for the midyear of the next decade, i.e., for the year 2005 (see the table 2.1 of the CDP). The result of applying decadal growth for the projections of mid year population has led to 95 percent decadal change for the period of 2001-2011, which seems to be doubtful. Secondly, even if we assume that the periphery areas are added in RMC's jurisdiction in mid of the present decade, the would be role of the jurisdictional change needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Population projection has been done using Compound Growth Rate Method that works out to be 4.12 per annum, the details can referred from Chapter-II of Final CDP</p>

	<p>Section 2.1.3 discusses the “results of migration on basic services”. It shows that there is an increase of 1.21 lakh slum dwellers from 1991 to 2001 whereas the population growth is 1.67 lakh for RMC area and population growth is 2.36 lakh for RUA area. Again there is rise of 1.20 lakh slum dwellers from 2001 to 2005. These estimates seem to be on higher side. Analytical base together with supporting data should have been presented in this section</p> <p>Section 2.5 has focused on the core area of the city whereas the population and area details of the core city have not been provided in the CDP. Moreover this section has not adequately analyzed the existing situation in the core area of the city. The situation in the periphery areas with respect to coverage and level of services needs to be given in details.</p> <p>An estimate of one million populations for the year 2005 seems to be very high as it has resulted in a lower per capita availability of water in 2005 (table 2.9). Since the estimated demand in the core sectors depends crucially on the estimated population therefore population projections must be estimated carefully. More discussions on these analytical issues will need to be incorporated in the CDP.</p>	<p>Typological error regretted, the details modified in Chapter -II and IV of Final CDP</p> <p>The details have been modified and the same can be referred from Chapter-II of Final CDP</p>
2.3	<p>Financial profile of the city: Section 2.3 on “financial profile of RMC” needs more details to be presented, as it does not provide the sources of tax, non-tax incomes, tax rates and especially the break-up of state transfers. State transfers represents 65 percent of revenue income compared to 28 percent and 7 percent of revenue receipts from tax and non-tax sources respectively. This indicates a very high dependency on state government.</p>	<p>Necessary details have been incorporated and the same can be referred from Chapter-VII and Annexure2 from final CDP</p>
	<p>The conclusions drawn on page 6 under section 2.3.1 highlight that there is a reduction in the proportion of grants and indicates it as “a good financial health of local body”. This conclusion does not seem to be correct because there is no reduction in grants as it continued to contribute 65 percent of revenue receipts for 2001-02 to 2004-05 except for the year 2003-04, when there was a decline on all the heads. Huge grants are received on capital account also whereas the capital expenditure pattern is not provided in the CDP.</p>	<p>Typological error regretted, the details have been incorporated in Chapter-VII and Annexure 2</p>
	<p>Interestingly, assuming their population actual/estimates for the year 2001 and 2005 to be correct, i.e., 6.7 lakhs and 10.0 lakhs respectively; RMC generates merely Rs.237.40 on per capita basis from its own resources. Secondly the capacity to generate revenue from own resources on per capita basis is on decline even on the current prices for same period (see the above table).</p>	<p>Typological error regretted, the details have been incorporated in Chapter-VII and Annexure 2</p>
	<p>Further, the CDP highlights that 67 percent of the revenue expenditure goes on wages & salaries and merely 28 percent is allocated to operation and maintenance works. With these kinds of financial results RMC will continue to be dependent on state transfers, as there are no proposals for increasing RMC’s own sources of revenue.</p>	<p>Necessary details have been incorporated and the same can be referred from Chapter- VII from final CDP</p>
	<p>Quotation made in section 2.4.1.1 “the above table shows the efforts of MC to collect capital from market and introduce PPP in developmental projects” is very puzzling and not evident from the table. The repaying capability of loans by RMC is also not discussed in the CDP. The fiscal health of RMC as emerges from the CDP, is not very good.</p>	<p>Necessary details have been incorporated and the same can be referred from Chapter- VII and Annexure2 from final CDP</p>
2.4	<p>Water Supply and Sewerage: Water supply does not come in the functional domain of the RMC. The responsibility of provision of water supply comes under PHE department of state government and there is a water supply and sewerage board for this purpose for RMC area. However the finances of city-level water supply and sewerage board (table 2.8 page 8), shows that the cost recovery is more than 100 percent for the year of 2004-05, which does not seem to be feasible as there are a few parastatal agencies in the country who can recover more than ninety percent of the cost incurred. A break-up of the income and expenditure of the water board should be provided in the CDP for a clear understanding of financial issues of the water sector.</p>	<p>A new chapter on Municipal Infrastructure (Chapter-IV) which sufficiently address the queries/ observations of the Proof Consultant</p>
	<p>The present analysis on Infrastructure of water supply (page 7&8) could have been presented in a more refined manner. There is no explanation on the difference between the present water supply and the original capacity. Distribution and</p>	<p>Necessary details have been included. The same can be referred from Chapter-IV of final CDP</p>

	transmission losses are not provided in the CDP. Zone-wise demand and supply gap should have been provided in this section to bring out the real deficiencies in water supply sector and the reasons for these deficiencies should have been analyzed.	
	<p>The PHE department of the state government is looking after the capital and O&M works of water sector in the entire state of Chhattisgarh including urban and rural areas. Therefore working out of strategies for RMC area should have been presented separately.</p> <p>The section on sewerage and drainage systems has not highlighted the agency responsible for this service. The coverage and the level of this service are not provided in the CDP, i.e., what percentage of population and what percentage of road length is covered at present etc. The past financial performances together with the financial constraints of this sector are not provided in the CDP. Similar details need to be provided for storm water drainage sector also.</p>	Necessary details have been included. The same can be referred from Chapter-IV of final CDP
	<p>Solid Waste Management:</p> <p>Section 2.4.4 of the CDP has not dealt adequately the issues related to solid waste management. Subsections 2.4.4.1, 2.4.4.4 and 2.4.4.5 are quite reluctant. The existing situation with respect to this service sector is not clear. This section should indicate how the SWM service is being provided. The details of collection, transportation and disposal should also be provided in the CDP. Performance indicators for this sector need to be provided and discussed in the CDP.</p>	A new chapter on Municipal Infrastructure (Chapter-IV) which sufficiently address the quarries/ observations of the Proof Consultant
2.5	<p>Urban Poor:</p> <p>The section on urban poor in Raipur City (Section 2.7.3) provides only the list of slums and squatter settlements. No specific details and estimates are provided in this section on the coverage and level of services in these slum areas. The financial planning for addressing the problems of slum dwellers has not been provided in the CDP.</p>	A separate section (Chapter-V) has been introduced in final CDP incorporating the necessary suggestions/ observations.
3	Future Perspective and Vision, Strategies for Development and City Investment Plan	
3.1	<p>Future Perspective and Vision:</p> <p>Section 3.1 of Chapter 3 on vision and goals has been presented in a generalized manner. The chapter merely provides the vision such as water lines for the length of 176 kms without giving the background of existing coverage in kilometers. The vision for other sectors has also not been presented well. The details linking the present situation to future goals should have been presented clearly.</p>	The 4 section on Future Perspective and Vision has been revised in-light of the said observations/ comments. Necessary details can be referred from Chapter-VI of final CDP.
3.2	<p>Strategies for Development:</p> <p>Chapter 4 is on "Strategies for Development". The main focus of these strategies seems to be on the core of the city and strategies for the periphery areas has not been explained. Further these strategies are on behalf of RMC or on the behalf of all the multiple agencies together are not clear from the CDP. Although table 4.9 under the section 4.4 gives some idea about the total amount required for its different components but detailed break-up for these projects would have been provided. The column 2 and 3 are of nodal agency and implementing agency whereas distinction between the two has not been explained.</p>	Necessary details have been incorporated in the section on Vision, Key Priorities and sectoral Strategy Framework (Chapter-VI) of final CDP.
3.3	<p>Sector-wise Funding:</p>	A new Section on Capital Improvement Programme (Chapter-VIII) has been included in the final CDP addressing the necessary observations/ Comments.