

# STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) (FY2017-18)

## UT of Puducherry





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Checklist – Consolidated State Annual Action Plan of all ULBs to be sent for Assessment by MoUD (as per table 6.2)	4
Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHPS) Meeting	7
Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary	8
BACKGROUND	8
FOCUS AREAS	8
FUND ALLOCATION	9
Program Management Structure	9
Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs	16
Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)	29
1. Principles of Prioritization	30
2. Importance of O&M	31
3. Reform Implementation	32
4. Annual Capacity Building Plan	35
5. A&OE	41
6. Financing of Projects	42
Chapter 4: TABLES:	44

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

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Points of Consideration</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Give Details</b>
1.	Have all the Cities prepared SLIP as per the suggested approach?	Yes	As per MoUD guidelines of prioritization, the SLIP for all cities have been prepared. The Government of Puducherry has prioritized water supply & sewerage for the current financial year.
2.	Has the SAAP prioritized cities for investment as per priority sectors and gap assessment?	Yes	Prioritization has been done based on the guidelines of AMRUT.
3.	Is the indicator wise summary of improvements proposed (both investments and management improvements) by State in place?	Yes	Indicator wise summary of improvements (both investments and management improvements) are summarized and proposed.
4.	Have all the cities under Mission identified/done baseline assessments of service coverage indicators?	Yes	The service coverage indicators have been prepared for all the cities
5.	Is the SAAP derived from an approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks agreed by Ministry for each Sector?	Yes	SAAP has been prepared to meet out the Service Level benchmarks of MoUD
6.	Is the investment proposed commensurate to the level of improvement envisaged in the indicator?	Yes	The proposed investment in each sector are adequate to meet the level of each services envisaged.

7.	Are State Share and ULB share in line with proposed Mission approach?	Yes	As per Ministry of Finance Letter No.D.O.No.32/PSO/FS/2015 dated October 28th 2015, for Union Territories, the Centrally Sponsored Schemes will be funded 100 percent by the GoI.
8.	Is there a need for additional resources and have state considered raising additional resources (State programs, aided projects, additional devolution to cities, 14th Finance Commission, external sources)?	Yes	Yes. Government of Puducherry has proposed to avail additional sources through external borrowing like AFD (Agency for French Development), HUDCO and NABARD.
9.	Does State Annual Action Plan verify that the cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments?	Yes	The cities have identified the revenue sources required for managing the O&M cost and repayments of the additional funds for each service.
10.	Has the State Annual Action Plan considered the resource mobilization capacity of each ULB to ensure that ULB share can be mobilized?	Yes	As per Ministry of Finance Letter No.D.O.No.32/PSO/FS/2015 dated October 28th 2015, for Union Territories, the Centrally Sponsored Schemes will be funded 100 percent by the GOI.
11.	Has the process of establishment of PDMC been initiated and completed?	Yes	It has been proposed to plan, design and implement the projects departmentally.
12.	Has a roadmap been prepared to realize the resource potential of the ULB?	Yes	The CDPs prepared for the ULBs have identified the road map to realize the resource potential of respective ULBs

13.	Is the implementation plan for projects and reforms in place (Timelines and yearly milestones)?	Yes	It is considered in the SLIP and SAAP preparation
14.	Has the prioritization of projects in ULBs been done in accordance with para 7.2 of the guidelines?	Yes	The projects for each ULBs have been prioritized based on the priority given in the AMRUT guidelines.

State Mission Director

ENCLOSED

## Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary

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

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

### BACKGROUND

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

The aim of the mission is to provide basic services (e.g. water supply, sewerage, urban transport) to households and build amenities in cities which will improve the quality of life for all, especially the poor and the disadvantaged. Under this programme, Government of India has selected 500 AMRUT Cities in the Country based on the urban population of the State/ UT. In which 3 Cities / Towns, have been selected in Puducherry viz., Puducherry, Oulgaret and Karaikal.

### FOCUS AREAS

The Mission will focus on the following thrust areas. Viz.,

- water supply,
- Sewerage facilities and septage management,
- Storm water drains to reduce flooding,
- Pedestrian, non-motorized and public transport facilities, parking spaces, and
- Enhancing amenity value of cities by creating and upgrading green spaces, parks and recreation centers, especially for children.



## FUND ALLOCATION

The total outlay for AMRUT is Rs.50, 000 Crore for five years from FY 2015-16 to FY 2019-20 and the Mission will be operated as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The AMRUT may be continued thereafter in the light of an evaluation done by the MoUD and incorporating learning's in the Mission. The Mission funds will consist of the following four parts:

- Project fund - 80% of the annual budgetary allocation
- Incentive for Reforms - 10% of the annual budgetary allocation
- State funds for Administrative & Office Expenses (A&OE) - 8% of the annual budgetary allocation
- MoUD funds for Administrative & Office Expenses (A&OE) - 2% of the annual budgetary allocation

The project fund will be divided among States/UTs at the beginning of each year. An equitable formula will be used to distribute the annual budgetary allocation in which equal (50:50) weightage is given to the urban population of each State/UT (Census 2011) and the number of statutory towns in the State/UT. As the number of statutory towns are notified by States/UTs and will change during the Mission period, the formula will take into account changes in this number every year. The amount of project fund allocated will be informed to the States/UTs at the appropriate time. The Central Assistance (CA) for the projects will be in three instalments of 20:40:40 of the approved cost.

### Program Management Structure




Table 1.1 of the guideline

(Amount in Crores) – Year 2017-18					
Total Central Funds allocated to State	Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total given in column 1)	Allocation of Funds for AMRUT (Central Share)	Multiply col. 3 by x3) for AMRUT on col. 4 (project proposal to be three- times the annual allocation - CA)	Add equal (col. 4) State/ULB Share * **	Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>24.34</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>8.11</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>26.29</b>

\* As per the D.O.No. 32/PSO/FS/2015 from Ministry of Finance, GoI, U.T is entitled to avail 100% grant under AMRUT Mission.

**Table 0-1: Abstract – Sector Wise Proposed Total Project Fund (As per Existing Funding Pattern)**

Table 1.2.1 of the guideline

FY- 2017-18

S.No	Sector	No. of Project	GoI	State*	ULB**	Convergence	Others	Total
1	Water supply	2	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.50
2	Sewerage and Septage management	3	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23
3	Drainage	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Non-Motorised Transport	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green Space	3	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>24.34</b>

\* As per the D.O.No. 32/PSO/FS/2015 from Ministry of Finance, GoI, U.T is entitled to avail 100% grant under AMRUT Mission.

**Table 0-2: Abstract – Sector Wise Proposed Total Project Fund and Sharing Pattern***Table 1.2.2 of the guideline*

FY-2017-18

*(Amount in Crores)*

S.No.	Sector	Gol	State*			ULB**			Total
			14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total	
1	Water supply	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.50
2	Sewerage	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23
3	Drainage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	NMT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green space	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61
	<b>Total</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>24.34</b>

\* As per the D.O.No. 32/PSO/FS/2015 from Ministry of Finance, Gol, U.T is entitled to avail 100% grant under AMRUT Mission.

**Table 0-3: Abstract – Use of Funds on Projects: Ongoing and New**

Table 1.3 of the guideline

FY- 2017-18

(Amount in Crores)

S.No	Sector	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any ) from Previous Year						Proposed spending during current Financial year						Balance carry Forward for Next Financial Year									
			Gol	State			ULB			Gol	*State			ULB			Gol	State			ULB			
				14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total				
1	Water supply	54.01	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Sewerage	9.28	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Drainage	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	NMT	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green space	1.62	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>64.91</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

\* As per the D.O.No. 32/PSO/FS/2015 from Ministry of Finance, Gol, U.T is entitled to avail 100% grant under AMRUT Mission.

**Table 0-4: Abstract – Plan for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks**

Table 1.4 of the guideline

FY- 2017-18

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost in Crores	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets based on Master Plan					
				(Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY	FY	FY	FY
				H1	H2	2017	2018	2019	2020
WATER SUPPLY									
	54.01	1. Household coverage of water supply connections	93%	93%	93%	94%	95%	95%	95%
		2. Per capita quantum of water supplied	116	116	116	118	120	122	125
		3. Quality of water supplied	80%	80%	82%	83%	84%	84%	84%
SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT									
	9.28	4. Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	85.80%	87%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		5. Coverage of sewerage network services	28%	28%	55%	77%	80%	82%	85%
		6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewage	23%	28%	55%	77%	80%	82%	85%
		7. Efficiency in Treatment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
DRAINAGE									
	0.00	8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%

**Table 0-5: Sector Wise Breakup of Consolidated Investments for all ULBs in the State**

Table 3.2 of the guideline

FY- 2017-18

(Amount in Cr.)

S.No	Name of the ULB	Water supply	Sewerage	Drainage	NMT	Green space	Grand Total
1	Puducherry	7.00	0.365	0.00	0.00	0.21	<b>7.575</b>
2	Oulgaret	0.0	0.365	0.00	0.00	0.20	<b>0.565</b>
3	Karaikal	15.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.20	<b>16.20</b>
Total Project Investments		<b>22.50</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>24.34</b>
A & OE @ 8% of the project cost ( Restricted as per the allocation made by the MoUD)							<b>01.95</b>
Grand Total							<b>26.29</b>

**Table 0-6: SAAP – Year wise Share of Investments for all sectors (ULB Wise)**

Table 3.4 of the guideline

FY- 2017-18

			Committed Expenditure (if any ) from Previous Year						Proposed spending during current Financial year (2017-18)						Balance carry Forward for Next Financial Year								
S.No	Name of the City	**Total Project Investment	Gol	State			ULB			Gol	*State			ULB			Gol	State			ULB		
				14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total
1	Puducherry	39.811	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.575	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
2	Oulgaret	8.719	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.565	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
3	Karaikal*	16.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>64.91</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

\* As per the D.O.No. 32/PSO/FS/2015 from Ministry of Finance, Gol, U.T is entitled to avail 100% grant under AMRUT Mission.

\*\*The total project investment for SAAP 2015-16, 2016-17 & 2017-18.

**Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs**

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

**Project Progress**

In this section the physical and financial progress is reviewed. Please complete the following table and respond to the questions. FY2017-18

Sl.No	Name ULB	Approved SAAP		DPR (Y/N)	SLTC (Y/N)	Work Order (Y/N)	Implementation Progress		Amount disbursed till date
		Project name	Amount in Crores				Physical (%)	SLTC (Y/N)	
1	Puducherry Municipality	1. Energy & Water auditing, online water quality monitoring & control of non-revenue water in core areas of Puducherry Municipality.	7.00	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
2	Puducherry Municipality	Recycling & reuse of waste water for horticulture usages in Puducherry Municipality.	0.365	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
3	Puducherry Municipality	Strom Drainage	-	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
4	Puducherry Municipality	Green space & Park	0.21	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
5	Oulgaret Municipality	Water	0.00	N	N	N	[Nil	Nil	Nil
6	Oulgaret Municipality	Recycling & reuse of waste water for horticulture usages in Oulgaret Municipality.	0.365	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
7	Oulgaret Municipality	Strom Drainage	-	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
8	Oulgaret Municipality	Green space & Park	0.20	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil



9	Karaikal Municipality	1. Augmentation of Water Supply for north zone of Karaikal town including SCADA.	15.50	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
10	Karaikal Municipality	Sewerage and Septage Management for Karaikal town	0.50	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
11	Karaikal Municipality	Strom Drainage	0	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil
12	Karaikal Municipality	Green space & Park	0.20	N	N	N	Nil	Nil	Nil

*As per the approval of SAAP 2015-16, the GOI released 20% of the Committed Expenditure*

- Have DPRs been prepared for all projects approved earlier? If not then which are the projects for which DPR is pending and why? (500 words).

The preparation of DPRs for the SAAP 2017-18 for water supply, sewerage & Park development are in progress and the same would be placed before State Level Technical Committee for approval after the Apex Committee of MoUD approval.

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

The preparations of DPRs (SAAP 2017-18) are monitored closely and will be ready before the SLTC meeting after approval by the Apex Committee.

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

So far, 4 no. of SLTC meetings have been held and 6 DPRs are approved.

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

The DPRs for the FY2017-18 is under preparation and it will be implemented in the year 2017.

- Based on the identification of delayed projects and the reasons for slow physical progress, what is the plan of action to speed-up the projects? (300 words)

Not applicable.

- How much amount has been utilized and what is the percentage share of the funding agencies? Are there any deviations from the approved funding pattern approved by the Apex Committee? (tabular form and 500 words)

No fund has been utilized so far. As per Ministry of Finance Letter No.D.O.No.32/PSO/FS/2015 dated October 28th 2015, Union Territory of Puducherry is entitled to get 100% grant under AMRUT.

- List out the projects where release of funds to ULBs by the State was delayed?

The central release of Rs. 3.79 Crores has been released to the Local Administration Department and the same will be transferred to the PWD, Puducherry and Public Works Department being the implementing Agency for water supply, sewerage and two Municipalities being the implementing Agency for park development projects approved under SAAP 2015-16.

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

The implementation of water supply and sewerage projects will be done by Public Works Department, Government of Puducherry which is the nodal department for implementation and operation & maintenance of water supply and sewerage system in the UT of Puducherry. Therefore, no resolution is required from ULB.

- List out the projects where the assessed value approved by the Apex Committee was greater than the tendered value and there was a saving? Was this addressed by the HPSC in the present SAAP? (tabular and 200 words).

The projects for the SAAP 2017-18 are yet to be tendered.

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

No second and third installments have been claimed for any of the projects so far.

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

No project has been completed so far.

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

NIL

- List out and describe any out-of-the-box initiatives/Smart Solutions/resilience used/incorporated in the projects under implementation. What is the nature of the innovation in the projects? (tabular; 300 words)

PWD Puducherry has proposed to set up water treatment plant using Reverse Osmosis technology for treating the ground water having excess TDS. It is also proposed to install decentralized sewerage system in two locations .

### Service Levels

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

### Service Level Benchmark ( Puducherry Municipality)

Sector: Water Supply					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Puducherry	1. Household coverage of water supply connections.	95%	96%	96%	95%
	2.Per capita quantum of water supplied.	125	127	125	125
	3.Quality of water supplied	80%	82%	82%	80%

Sector: SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Puducherry	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	85.80%	100%	87%	87%
	5.Coverage of sewerage network services	53%	70%	65% (under ongoing JNNURM scheme)	53%
	6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewage	43%	53%	53% (under ongoing JNNURM scheme)	43%
	7.Efficiency in Treatment	100%	100%	100%	100%

Sector: DRAINAGE					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Puducherry	8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%	60%	60%

### Service Level Benchmark ( Oulgaret Municipality)

Sector: Water Supply					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Oulgaret	1. Household coverage of water supply connections.	90%	92%	92%	90%
	2.Per capita quantum of water supplied.	110	112	112	110
	3.Quality of water supplied	80%	82%	82%	80%

Sector: SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Oulgaret	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	85.50%	88%	88%	85.50%
	5.Coverage of sewerage network services	7%	80%	50% (under ongoing JNNURM Scheme)	7%
	6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewage	7%	80%	50% under ongoing JNNURM Scheme	7%
	7.Efficiency in Treatment	100%	100%	100%	100%

Sector: DRAINAGE					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Oulgaret	8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	55%	55%	55%	55%

**Service Level Benchmark (Karaikal Municipality)**

Sector: Water Supply					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Karaikal	1. Household coverage of water supply connections.	90%	92%	90%	90%
	2.Per capita quantum of water supplied.	125	127	125	125
	3.Quality of water supplied	85%	87%	85%	85%

Sector: SEWERAGE AND SEPTAGE MANAGEMENT					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Karaikal	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	90%	100%	90%	90%
	5.Coverage of sewerage network services	53%	53%	53%	53%
	6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewage	43%	43%	43%	43%
	7.Efficiency in Treatment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sector: DRAINAGE					
Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Karaikal	8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%	60%	60%

- In how many projects, city-wise, have targets not been achieved? What is the Plan for Action to achieve the targets? (tabular form; 500 words)

The projects approved under SAAP 2015-16 & 2016-17 are yet to be implemented. In addition to the projects proposed under AMRUT, Government of Puducherry has proposed to avail external funding from Agency for French Development (AFD) to

achieve 100% target for covering all households and improve drinking water quality and assured 24 x 7 water supply.

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

The DPRs included in SAAP 2017-18 are under process and it will be ready before meeting of SLTC .

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

Till date 4 SLTC meeting and 6 DPRs are approved

### Capacity Building

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

Sl No	Name of ULB	Name of Department	Total number to be trained in Mission period	Target to be trained during the previous Financial Year	Number fully trained during the previous Financial Year	Name training institute
1	Puducherry Municipality	• Finance Department	5	5	To be trained	ASCI,ESCI, Hyderabad
		• Engineering Department	20	10		
		• Town Planning	10	5		
		• Administration	10	10		
2	Oulgaret Municipality	• Finance Department	5	5	To be trained	ASCI,ESCI, Hyderabad.
		• Engineering Department	20	10		
		• Town Planning	10	5		
		• Administration	10	10		

3	Karaikal Municipality	• Finance Department	5	5	To be trained	ASCI,ESCI
		• Engineering Department	20	10		
		• Town Planning	10	5		
		• Administration	10	10		

- In how many departments was training completed as approved in the SAAP of the last Financial Year? In how many departments was training partially done and in how many departments training not done at all? Please give reasons (300 words)

The training in all the aforementioned ULBs and other concerned Departments such as PWD, Town and Country Planning Department is yet to be started.

- List out the training institutes that could not complete training of targeted functionaries. What were the reasons and how will this be avoided in future? (tabular; 300 words)

Govt. of Puducherry has identified ASCI and ESCI, Hyderabad as training institutes and MoU has been signed with ASCI for providing training programme.

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

The funds are not utilized yet, as the training is yet to start.

- Have the participants visited best practice sites? Give details (350 words).

Govt. of Puducherry will depute the officials for various training programmes and to visit the best practices in India.

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

The participants are regularly attending the national Workshops organized by the Ministry as well as other States/Agencies.



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

SI.NO	Pending Activities	Action Plan
1	DPRs Preparation for SAAP 2017-18	Under preparation
2	The SLTC approved the DPRs are included in the SAAP2015-16, SAAP 2016-17	Meeting was held and DPRs approved on 7 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2016 and 16 Nov 2016 for the SAAP2015-16 and SAAP 2016-17 respectively.
3	The meeting of SLTC & SHPSC for approval of DPRs for the SAAP2017-18	The meeting is proposed to be held in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of December 2016 after approval of Apex Committee.
4	Capacity Building ( training to be organized)	Will be organized from June 2017 on wards

### Reforms

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

SI.No	Reform Type	Milestones	Target for the last FY	Achievement for the last FY	Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent	Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent
1	Yet to be achieved	100%	70%	Nil	Nil	Nil

- Have the Reform formats prescribed by the TCPO furnished?

To be furnished.

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

No. Reform work is in progress.

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

Not yet claimed.

- What is the status of Reforms to be completed in the Mission period? Has advance action been taken and a Plan of Action prepared? (500 words)

Action is being taken to implement the Reforms.

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

Nil

### **Use of A&OE**

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

The A&OE fund will be used for the following items. Preparation of SLIP and SAAP, SMMU, CMMU, PDMC, Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency, Publications (e-Newsletter; guidelines, brochures etc.), Capacity Building and Training - CCBP, if Applicable – Others, Reform implementation and DPR Preparation.

- Are the items similar to the approved items in SAAP or there is any deviation? If yes, list the items with reasons (tabular; 300 words).

No deviation.

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

An amount of about Rs.5 lakhs has been committed for administrative expenses during 2017-18 and the same would be charged under the A&OE funds.

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

The IRMA is yet to be appointed.

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

It is expected that the IRMA will be appointed by the end of December, 2016 after award of work for implementation.

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

Action is being initiated.

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

The logo and tagline of AMRUT will be displayed on all the projects during implementation.

- Have you utilised the funds on any of the inadmissible components (para 4.4)? If yes, give list and reasons. (tabular; 350 words)

No.

### Funds flow

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

( FY 2015-16)

S. No	City name	Project name	Funds flow							
			Gol		State		ULB/Others		Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			*Approved amount	**Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
1	Puducherry	1. Installation of 3 nos of RO plants in Puducherry and Oulgaret Municipalities.	18.97 (Total)	3.79 (20% of total allocation as 1 <sup>st</sup> installment)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	3.79	Nil
2	Oulgaret	2. Sewerage system in Velrampet and Dr.Radhakrishnan Naagr in both Municipalities  3. Improvement of 2 parks in both the Municipalities.								

\* This approved amount is for the SAAP 2015-16.

\*\*The disbursed amount is against to the SAAP 2015-16.

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

SAAP for the year 2015-16 was approved by the Ministry for an amount of Rs. 18.97 crores in February 2016 and the installment of Rs. 3.79 crores (20% of SAAP amount) was released in March 2016. Action is being initiated to float RFPs.

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

No delay in release of funds. All the identified projects will be completed within the stipulated time period as envisaged in the SAAP.

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

Will be followed during implementation

### **Funds disbursements and Conditions**

- How many project fund request has been made to the GoI? (250 words).

First installment was released and the same is yet to be utilized and hence no request has been made.

- How many installments the GoI has released? (250 words).

First Installment of Rs 3.79 crores was released in March, 2016.

- Is there any observation from the GoI regarding the claims made? (350 words).

No.

- List out the conditions imposed by the Apex Committee, State HPSC and the SLTC. Have all the conditions been complied with? If no, identify the conditions not complied with and give reasons for non-compliance. (tabular; 500 words)

No condition has been imposed.

**Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)**

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

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

S.No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share				Change in service levels		
			GoI	State	ULB/Others	Total	Indicator	Existing	After project completion
1	Puducherry, Oulgaret & Karaikal	1. Energy & Water auditing, online water quality monitoring & control of non-revenue water in core areas of Puducherry Municipality. 2. Augmentation of Water Supply for north zone of Karaikal town including SCADA	22.50	0	0	22.50	1. House hold coverage of direct water supply connections. 2. Per capita quantum of water supplied. 3. Quality of water supplied	95% 125 80%	96% 126 82%
2	Puducherry, Oulgaret & Karaikal	1. Recycling & reuse of waste water for horticulture usages in Puducherry Municipality. 2. Recycling & reuse of waste water for horticulture usages in Oulgaret Municipality. 3. Sewerage and Septage Management for Karaikal town	1.23	0	0.00	1.23	4. Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community). 5. Coverage of sewerage network services. 6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewage. 7. Efficiency in Treatment	85.80% 28% 23% 100%	89% 55% 55% 100%
3	Puducherry, Oulgaret & Karaikal	Drainage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%
4	Puducherry, Oulgaret & Karaikal	NMT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Nil	0.00	
5	Puducherry, Oulgaret & Karaikal	Green space & Park	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.61	Nil	10%	12%
		<b>Total</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>24.34</b>			

1. Principles of Prioritization

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

- Has consultation with local MPs/ MLAs, Mayors and Commissioners of the concerned ULBs been carried out prior to allocation of funding? Give details of dates and number of participants (tabular; 250 words).

Yes. The consultations were held with MPs, MLAs of the respective Constituency and also consultation were held with various line departments and implementing agencies viz., Puducherry Public Works Department, Local Administration Department, Road Transport Department, Town & Country Planning Department etc on 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2016. The comments / suggestions received from various officials and elected representatives were considered during the preparation of Service Level Improvement Plan of the respective ULBs

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

Govt. of Puducherry has prioritized water supply sector in Puducherry Municipality keeping in view its financial condition.

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

The amount allocated under AMRUT has been evenly distributed to all the three municipalities .

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

In Puducherry State, Oulgaret Municipality was shortlisted under Smart Cities Mission, however Govt. of Puducherry has decided to nominate Puducherry city As per AMRUT guidelines, the city has given first preference because the Smart Cities Mission and the AMRUT are complementary. Based on this, Oulgaret Municipality has been prioritized under AMRUT Programme for the first year.

- What is the quantum of Central Assistance (CA) allocated to the State during 2017-18? (100 words)

Government of Puducherry has been allocated an amount of Rs. 24.34 crores as 100% Central Assistance the financial year 2015-16.

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

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

## 2. Importance of O&M

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

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

Yes, the project prioritized under SAAP has considered the Operation and Maintenance cost of the project for the period of 5 years. The Operation and Maintenance would be the responsibility of the contractor / agency, who will implement the project. The ULBs will also bear the O&M cost through user charges, if there is any gap.

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

The Operation and Maintenance cost of the infrastructure created under AMRUT Scheme will be borne by respective ULBs/ Public Works Department/State Govt. through collection of user charges, implementation of PPP models, etc.

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

The objective of ULBs is to recover the Operation and Maintenance cost through collection of user charges, implementation of action plan for reduction of Operation & Maintenance, metering system, SCADA system etc., However, if there are still gaps in the Operation and Maintenance expenditure, it will be meet out through the Government of Puducherry grant.

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

Yes, O&M cost has been excluded from project cost for the purpose of funding and shall be borne by ULB through user charges. If there will be any gap in recovery of user charges and same shall be borne by ULB/UT through its own resources.

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

At present, Public Works Department, Puducherry is responsible for operation and maintenance of water supply and sewerage system. The user charge of water is being collected on volumetric basis. However, most of the water meters are not functioning. Therefore, Govt. of Puducherry would plan to replace the existing meters as Smart Meters under the AFD Programme.

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

The PWD, Govt. of Puducherry has proposed appropriate cost recovery mechanism to meet the O&M Cost to make the system self sustainable.

### 3. Reform Implementation

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

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

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



State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S. No	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP					
				April to Sep, 2015	Oct, 2015 to Mar, 2016	April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017	April to Sep, 2017	Oct, 2017 to Mar, 2018
1	E-Governance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Personnel Staff management.</li> <li>2. Project management.</li> </ol>	36 months						
2	Urban Planning and City Development Plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish Urban Development Authorities.</li> </ol>	36 months						
3	Swachh Bharat Mission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elimination of open defecation.</li> <li>2. Waste Collection (100%),</li> <li>3. Transportation of Waste (100%).</li> <li>4. Scientific Disposal (100%).</li> <li>5. The State will prepare a Policy for Right-sizing the number of municipal functionaries depending on, say, population of the ULB, generation of internal resources and expenditure on salaries.</li> </ol>	36 months						

Table 0-1: ULB level Individual Capacity Development Plan to be sent by ULB to State Government

Form 7.1.1 (Physical) of the guideline

S.N	Name of the department/ Position	Total number of functionaries (officials/elected representatives) identified at start of Mission (2015)	Numbers trained during last FY(s)	Numbers to be trained during the current FY	Name(s) of Training Institute for training during the current FY	Cumulative numbers trained after completion of current FY.
1	Finance Department	50	-	-	-	10
2	Engineering Department	100	-	-	-	20
3	Town planning Department	50	-	-	-	10
4	Administration Department	100	-	-	-	20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	-	-	-	<b>60</b>

Table 0-2: Financial

Form 7.1.2(Financial) of the guideline

S.No	Name of the department/ Position	Cumulative funds released up to current FY	Total Expenditure up to current FY	Unspent funds available from earlier releases	Funds required for the current FY to train the number given in Form 3.20
1	Finance Department	0	0	0	0.05
2	Engineering Department	0	0	0	0.10
3	Town planning Department	0	0	0	0.05
4	Administration Department	0	0	0	0.10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.30</b>

- Fill out Table 5.5 (pg. 54) given in the AMRUT Guidelines. What is the outcome of the self-evaluation done for reporting progress on reform implementation in order to receive the 10% incentive? (tabular; 350 words)

Sl.No	Name of the ULBs	Maximum score possible during this year	Score obtained by ULB
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Puducherry	30	15
2	Oulgaret	30	15
Subtotal ULB		60	30
	State	60	30
Subtotal State		60	30
<b>Overall</b>		60	30

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

No issues have been identified.

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

Not Applicable

#### 4. Annual Capacity Building Plan

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

## Form 7.2.1 Fund requirement for Individual Capacity Building at ULB level

(Rs. in Cr.)									
S.No	Name of the City	Finance department	Engineering	Town Planning	Administration	Total	Name of the training institution (s) identified	Number of training programmes to be conducted	Funds required in current FY Rs. in Cr.)
1	Oulgaret	5	5	5	5	20	ASCI,ESCI	5	0.10
2	Puducherry	5	5	5	5	20		5	0.10
3	Karaikal	5	5	5	5	20		5	0.10
Total		15	15	15	15	60		15	0.30

## Form 7.2.2 Fund requirement for State level activities

FY2017-18

(Rs. in Cr.)					
S.No	State Level Activity	Cumulative Funds released upto current FY	Total Expenditure upto current FY	Unspent funds available from earlier releases	Funds required for the current FY
1	RPMC (CMMU & SMMU)	0	0	0	1.19
2	UMC	0	0	0	0
*3	Others (e.g., Workshops, Seminars etc), which are approved by NIUA	0	0	0	0.15
4	Institutional	0	0	0	0.00
Total		0	0	0	1.34

\* The program is for Individual

## Form 7.2.3 Total fund requirement for Capacity Building

Rs. in Cr.)						
Sl.No	Name of the department/ Position	Individual	Institutional	RPMC and UMC	Others	Total
1	Total release since start of Mission (2015)	0	0	0	0	0
2	Total Utilised - Central Share	0	0	0	0	0

## State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

Rs. in Cr.)						
Sl.No	Name of the department/ Position	Individual	Institutional	RPMC and UMC	Others	Total
3	Balance available - Centre Share	0	0	0	0	0
4	Amount required - Centre Share	0.15	0	0	0	0.15
5	Total funds required for Capacity building in current FY2017-18	0.15	0	0	0	0.15
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.15</b>

### Form 7.2.4 Details of Institutional Capacity Building

- a. Is the State willing to revise their town planning laws and rules to include land pooling ?  
Yes
- b. List of ULBs willing to have a credit rating done as the first step to issue bonds?  
Puducherry, Oulgarate Municipality & Karaikal Municipality.
- c. Is the State willing to integrate all work done in GIS in order to make GIS useful for decision-making in ULBs ?  
Yes
- d. Is the State willing to take assistance for using land as a fiscal tool in ULBs ?  
Yes.
- e. Does the State require assistance to professionalize the municipal cadre?  
Yes
- f. Does the State require assistance to reduce non-revenue water in ULBs?  
Yes
- g. Does the State require assistance to improve property tax assessment and collections in ULBs?  
Yes
- h. Does the State require assistance to establish a financial intermediary?  
Yes
- i. Any other capacity assistance to implement the AMRUT Reform Agenda as set out in these Guidelines?  
Not Applicable

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

Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Town & Country Planning Department and ASCI and the officials of the ULBs will be deputed for training by the end of December 2016.

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

No.

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

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

NIL

- What is the present institutional capacity in the ULBs of the state; have the RPMC, UMC, etc. been appointed? Are there other PMUs, PIUs, etc. which are still operational?

It is proposed to set up State Mission Management Unit at State level.

- What has been the progress during the previous year/s in institutional capacity building, especially but not only in the seven areas that are mentioned in the AMRUT Guidelines? (p. 67).

The official will be deputed to ASCI, Hyderabad for providing capacity training programme.

- Attach the Quarterly Score Cards on p. 73 of the Mission Guidelines.

**Table 7.3 Quarterly Score Cards for States****Financial & physical progress on Capacity Building ( ULB Level)**

Name of ULB	Name of the Department / Position	Physical		Financial		Balance funds available in current FY	Ahead (+) or behind proportionate target (-)
		Proportionate ULB Target	ULB achievement with respect to proportionate target	Proportionate funds allocated in current FY ( In Lakhs)	Funds utilized as compared to proportionate target ( In Lakhs)		
Pondicherry	Elected Representative	0	0	0	0	0	Not Started
	Finance Dept	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
	Engineering Dept	8	0	4	0	2	Not Started
	Town Planning Dept.	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
	Administration Dept	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
Oulgaret	Elected Representative	0	0	0	0	0	Not Started
	Finance Dept	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
	Engineering Dept	7	0	3.5	0	1.75	Not Started
	Town Planning Dept.	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
	Administration Dept	5	0	2.5	0	1.25	Not Started
Karaikal	Elected Representative	0	0	0	0	0	Not Started
	Finance Dept	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

	Engineering Dept	7	0	3.5	0	1.75	Not Started
	Town Planning Dept.	4	0	2	0	1	Not Started
	Administration Dept	5	0	2.5	0	1.25	Not Started

**Table 7.4 Quarterly Score Cards for States**

**Financial & physical progress on Capacity Building ( State Level)**

Quarter ending December 2016

Number of ULBs above / below proportionate target ( from table 7.3)	Name of the Department / Position	Physical		Financial		Total number trained if relevant upto quarter	Total funds utilized upto quarter
		Total Target in FY	Proportionate target upto quarter	Funds allocated in current FY ( In Lakhs)	Proportionate target upto Quarter		
Above NIL	Individual	60	40%	30	40%	NIL	NIL
	Institutional Capacity Building	0	0	0	0	0	0
Below NIL	PMC & UMC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other specify	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other specify	0	0	0	0	0	0



State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

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

Yes

5. A&OE

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

**Table 4: Plan of Action for Administrative & Other Expenses ( A&OE)  
(Amount in Rs. Crores)**

Name of State: Puducherry

FY 2017-18

Sr. No	Items proposed for A&OE	Total Allocation	Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any)	Proposed spending for Current Financial year	Balance to Carry Forward			
					FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
1	Preparation of SLIP and SAAP	0.00	0	0.0256	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	PDMC / SMMU	0.50	0	0.60	0.40	0.10	0.00	0.00
3.	Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency	0.16	0	0.20	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.00
5	Publications (e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures etc.)	0.05	0	0.12	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00
6	Capacity Building and Training - CCBP, if applicable - Others	0.15	0	0.60	0.12	0.03	0.00	0.00
7	Reform implementation	0.40	0	0.20	0.35	0.05	0.00	0.00
*8	Others	0.69	0	1.50	0.60	0.09	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>***1.95</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>**3.2456</b>	<b>1.61</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

\* Setting up SMMU and other expenses

\*\*Cumulative cost of A&OE for the FY 2015-16 & 2016-17

\*\*\* A&OE for the FY2017-18

## State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

---

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

NIL

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

No issues have been identified

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

Yet to be utilized

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

It is proposed to implement the project by appointing SMMU for UT of Puducherry or PWD Puducherry.

### 6. Financing of Projects

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

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

NIL

- Fill out Table 3.4 at pg.45 of AMRUT Guideline. How the residual financing (over and above Central Government share) is shared between the States, ULBs? (tabular; 200 words)

Please refer Table 0-3: SAAP – Year wise Share of Investments for all sectors (ULB Wise)

- Fill out Table 3.3 at pg 44 of AMRUT Guidelines. Has any other sources identified by the State/ULB (e.g. PPP, market borrowing)? Please discuss. (tabular; 250 words)

Please refer clause (h) in Form 7.2.4 Details of Institutional Capacity Building

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

Yes, the revenue sources has been worked out and furnished in the DPR

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

NIL, as the funding is 100%.

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

It is proposed to engage the PPP in O&M of the project to be set up under AMRUT especially for the RO plants.

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

Will be considered during implementation.

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

FY 2017-18

Name of State: Puducherry

Total Central funds allocated to State	Allocation of Central funds for A&OE(@ 8% of Total given in column1)	Allocation of funds for AMRUT (Central share)	Multiply col. 3 by x3) for AMRUT on col. 4 (project proposal to be three-times the annual allocation - CA)	Add equal (col. 4) State/UL B share	Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>24.34</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>8.11</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>26.29</b>

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

Amount in Crores

FY- 2017-18

Sl. No.	Sector	Centre	State			ULB			Convergence	Others	Total
		Mission	14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total			
1	Water Supply	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.50
2	Sewerage and Septage Management	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23
3	Drainage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Urban Transport	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Others	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61
	Grand Total	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>24.34</b>

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

(Amount in Rs.) FY 2017-18

Sl. No.	Sector	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any) from Previous year							Proposed Spending during Current Financial year							Balance Carry Forward for Next Financial Years							
			Centre	State			ULB			Centre	State			ULB			Centre	State			ULB			
				14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total	
1	Water Supply	54.01	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Sewerage and Septage Management	9.28	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Drainage	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Urban Transport	0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Others	1.62	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>64.91</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>24.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

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

FY-2017-18

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Baseline <sup>3</sup>	Annual Targets based on Master Plan (Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
				H1	H2				
<b>Water Supply</b>									
		1. Household level coverage of direct water supply connections	93%	93%	93%	94%	94%	94%	
		2. Per capita quantum of water supplied	116	116	116	118	120	122	
		3. Quality of water supplied	80%	80%	80%	82%	82%	84%	
<b>Sewerage and Septage Management</b>									
		4. Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	85.80%	87%	89%	100%	100%	100%	
		5. Coverage of sewerage network services	28%	28%	55%	77%	80%	82%	
		6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	23%	28%	55%	77%	80%	82%	
		7. Efficiency in treatment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
<b>Drainage</b>									
		8. Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	
<b>Urban Transport</b>									
		9. Service coverage of urban transport in the city	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	
		10. Availability of urban transport per 1000 population	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	
Others		11. Park	60%	60%	60%	65%	70%	85%	

<sup>4</sup>As per SLB framework for water supply, sewerage, solid waste management and drainage and proposed SLB indicator for urban transport

<sup>5</sup>Detailed information for arriving at % target against baseline shall be worked out from details provided by Cities so as to arrive at state indicators

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

FY- 2017-18

(Amount in Rs.)

Name of City	Water Supply	Sewerage and Septage Management	Drainage	Urban Transport	Others	Reforms	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Puducherry	7.00	0.365	0.0	0.0	0.21	0.0	<b>7.575</b>
Oulgaret	0.00	0.365	0.0	0.0	0.20	0.0	<b>0.565</b>
Karaikal	15.50	0.50	0.0	0.0	0.20	0.0	<b>16.20</b>
Total Project Investments							<b>24.34</b>
A&OE							<b>1.95</b>
Grand Total							<b>26.29</b>

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

Name of State : Puducherry

FY- 2017-18

(Amount in Crores.)

Name of City	*Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any) from Previous year							Proposed Spending during Current Financial year							Balance Carry Forward for Next Financial Years						
		Centre	State			ULB			Centre	State			ULB			Centre	State			ULB		
			14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total		14th FC	Others	Total			
Puducherry	39.811	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.575	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Oulgaret	8.719	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.565	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Karaikal	16.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>64.91</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>24.34</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0

\*Total Project investment for SAAP FY2015-16, 16-17 &amp; 17-18.



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

**Total number of ULBs: 3      Quarter ending 2016**

Number of ULBs above/below proportionate target (from table 7.3 of AMRUT guideline)	Name of the department/ position	Physical		Financial		Total number trained, if relevant, upto quarter	Total funds utilized upto quarter
		Total Target in FY	Proportionate target upto quarter	Funds allocated in current FY	Proportionate target upto quarter		
above	Individual training	60	40%	30	40%	NIL	NIL
	Institutional capacity building	0	0	0	0	0	0
Below	PMC and UMC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other - specify	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other -specify	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

**Current Mission period 2015-2020**

**Name of State: Puducherry**

Sr. No.	Name of ULB (water supply and sewerage)	Total number of projects to achieve universal coverage	Estimated Cost	Number of years to achieve universal coverage
1	2	3	4	5
	Puducherry	10	39.811	3
	Oulgaret	7	8.719	3
	Karaikal	4	16.38	2
			<b>64.91</b>	

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

Name of State – UT of Puducherry

Current Mission Period- 2017-18

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets based on Master Plan (Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
				H1	H2				
Water Supply									
	22.50	Household level coverage of direct water supply connections	95%	95%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Per capita quantum of water supplied	125	125	128	130	135	135	135
		Quality of water supplied	80%	80%	80%	85%	85%	95%	100%
Sewerage and Septage Management									
	1.23	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	85.80%	87%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Coverage of sewerage network services	53%	55%	65%	70%	70%	85%	100%
		Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	43%	53%	65%	70%	83%	95%	100%
		Efficiency in treatment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Drainage									
		Coverage of storm water drainage network	60%	60%	60%	65%	70%	85%	100%
Urban Transport									
		Service coverage of urban transport in the city	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
		Availability of urban transport per 1000 population	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
Others									
	0.61	Green Space	60%	60%	60%	60%	65%	70%	85%

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

Name of State: Puducherry

FY 2016-17

Sr. No	Items proposed for A&OE	Total Allocation	Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any)	Proposed spending for Current Financial year	Balance to Carry Forward			
					FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
1	Preparation of SLIP and SAAP	0.00	0	0.0256	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	PDMC / SMMU	0.50	0	0.60	0.40	0.10	0.00	0.00
3.	Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency	0.16	0	0.20	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.00
5	Publications (e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures etc.)	0.05	0	0.12	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00
6	Capacity Building and Training - CCBP, if applicable - Others	0.15	0	0.60	0.12	0.03	0.00	0.00
7	Reform Implementation	0.40	0	0.20	0.35	0.05	0.00	0.00
8	Others	0.69	0	1.50	0.60	0.09	0.00	0.00
Total		***1.95	0	**3.2456	1.61	0.34	0.00	0.00

\*Setting up SMMU and other expenses

\*\*A&amp;OE for the FY 2015-16 &amp; 2016-17

\*\*\* A&amp;OE for the FY2017-18

**Table 5.2: SAAP-Reforms Type, Steps and Target for AMRUT Cities FY-2017-2018**

S. No	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP					
				April to Sep, 2015	Oct, 2015 to Mar, 2016	April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017	April to Sep, 2017	Oct, 2017 to Mar, 2018
1	E-Governance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personnel Staff management.</li> <li>Project management.</li> </ol>	36 months						
2	Urban Planning and City Development Plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish Urban Development Authorities.</li> </ol>	36 months						
3	Swachh Bharat Mission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elimination of open defecation.</li> <li>Waste Collection (100%),</li> <li>Transportation of Waste (100%).</li> <li>Scientific Disposal (100%).</li> <li>The State will prepare a Policy for Right-sizing the number of municipal functionaries depending on, say, population of the ULB, generation of internal resources and expenditure on salaries.</li> </ol>	36 months						

**Table 5.5: SAAP- Self- Evaluation for Reporting Progression Reform Implementation For Financial Year 2016-17 (Last financial year)**

The reforms achievement will be measured every year after the end of financial year by

Allocating 10 marks for each reforms milestone achieved as against the targets set by the MoUD.

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

**Incentive based grant release calculation:**

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

S.No	Name of ULBs	Maximum Score possible during the year*	Score obtained ULB Wise*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Pondicherry	30	15
2	Oulgaret	30	15
Subtotal ULB		60	30
	State	60	30
1			
Sub total State		60	30
Overall		60	30

\*Note: Calculated for First Quarter until Dec 2016

Step 2: Calculate the overall score in percent age obtained by the state (States core plus ULB score).

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

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

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –

FY- 2016-17

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

Sl. No.	Name of ULB	Total numbers to be trained in the current financial year, department wise						Name of the Training Institution (s) identified	No. of Training Programmes to be conducted	Fund Reqd. in current FY (₹ in Crore)
		Elected Reprs.	Finance Dept.	Engineering Dept.	Town Planning Dept.	Admin. Dept.	Total			
1	Puducherry	0	5	10	5	10	30	ASCI, ESCI	5	0.15
2	Oulgaret	0	5	10	5	10	30	ASCI, ESCI	5	0.15

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State – Puducherry

FY- 2016-17

**Form 7.2.2 -Fund Requirement for State level activities****Amount in Crores**

Sl. No.	State Level activities	Total expenditure upto current FY	Unspent funds available from earlier releases	Funds required for the current FY (In Crores)
1	RPMC (SMMU)	NIL	0.00	1.19
2	UMC			0.00
3	Others (Workshops, Seminars, etc.) are approved by NIUA ( Individual)			0.15
4	Institutional/ Reform			0.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>1.34</b>

Name of State –UT of Puducherry

FY- 2016-17

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

Sl. No.	Fund requirement	Individual (Training & Workshop)	Institutional/ Reform	SMMU/RPM C/CMMU	Others	Total (In Crore)
1	Total release since start of Mission (2015)	-	-	--	-	-
2	Total utilisation-Central Share	-	-	-	-	-
3	Balance available-Central Share	-	-	-	-	-
4	Amount required-Central Share	0.15	-	-	-	0.15
5	Total fund required for capacity building in current FY 2015-16	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15

**Form 7.2.4 Details of Institutional Capacity Building**

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

Yes.

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

Puducherry and Oulgaret Municipalities are willing to do credit rating for their cities.

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

Name of State **PUDUCHERRY**

FY **2017-18**

Table 3.3: SAAP- ULB Wise Source of Funds for All Sectors										
(Amount in Rs.)										
Name of City	Centre	State			ULB			Convergence	Others (e.g. incentive)	Total
		14 <sup>th</sup> FC	Others	Total	14 <sup>th</sup> FC	Others	Total			
Puducherry Municipality	7.575	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.575
Oulgaret Municipality	0.565	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.565
Karaikal Municipality	16.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.20
<b>Total</b>	24.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.34
<b>Grand Total</b>	24.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.34