

# STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) (FY 2017-20)



## STATE- RAJASTHAN



*Atal Mission for Rejuvenation  
and Urban Transformation*

**Submitted by:**  
**GOVERNMENT OF RAJASTHAN**  
DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT



सत्यमेव जयते

डॉ. मनजीत सिंह, आई.ए.एस.  
Dr. Manjit Singh, I.A.S.

प्रमुख शासन सचिव  
स्वायत्त शासन विभाग, राजस्थान  
राज्य मिशन निदेशक, अमृत एवं स्मार्ट सिटीज

Principal Secretary to Government  
Department of Local Self Government, Rajasthan  
State Mission Director, AMRUT & Smart Cities

No. F16 (AMRUT-02 Part)RUDSICO/AMRUT/2016-17/ 10292  
Date: ~~10-2016~~ 9-11-2016

To,

Dr. Sameer Sharma  
Additional Secretary (AMRUT),  
Ministry of Urban Development, GoI  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110011

Sub:-State Annual Action Plan (SAAP) of Rajasthan under AMRUT for year  
2017-20.

Dear Sir,

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP) was prepared on the basis of Service Level Improvement Plan (SLIPs) submitted by all 29 ULBs of Mission Towns.

This SAAP was presented in the 3<sup>rd</sup> SHPSC held on 28.10.2016 and the same was approved for recommending it to MoUD. The SAAP including all formats duly filled along with a copy of minutes of meeting is enclosed for kind approval.

Encl:-As above

Yours sincerely,

  
(Dr. Manjit Singh)

No. F16 (AMRUT-02 Part)RUDSICO/AMRUT/2016-17/10293-94 Date: ~~10-2016~~  
Copy to:- 9-11-2016

1. Sh. Neeraj Mandloi, Joint Secretary, MoUD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.
2. Sh. Shiv Pal Singh, Director (AMRUT), MoUD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.

  
Executive Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHECKLIST - CONSOLIDATED STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN OF ALL ULBS TO BE SENT FOR ASSESSMENT BY MOUD (AS PER TABLE 6.2) .....	1
MINUTES OF STATE HIGH POWER STEERING COMMITTEE (SHpsc) MEETING .....	4
ABSTRACT OF PROJECT FUND .....	8
Chapter 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY .....	11
Thrust areas under mission: .....	11
URBAN SCENARIO IN RAJASTHAN.....	11
Coverage under Mission for Rajasthan:-.....	13
Program Management Structure.....	14
Funding Pattern .....	15
Table 4: Fund Sharing Pattern in Mission .....	16
Table 5: Sector wise Project Fund Allocation.....	17
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP).....	18
PROJECT PROGRESS (2015-16).....	18
PROJECT PROGRESS (2016-17).....	22
Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) .....	63

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1: Class wise distribution of towns in Rajasthan, 2011 .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Table 2: Decadal growth rate for Urban population India and Rajasthan .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 3: 29 Cities of Rajasthan .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 4: Fund Sharing Pattern in Mission .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 5: Sector wise Project Fund Allocation .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1: Population of Mission Cities .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Figure 2: Program Management Structure .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Figure 3: Mission Fund Allocation.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Figure 4: Sharing Pattern .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Figure 5: Sector wise Allocation .....</b>	<b>17</b>

**CHECKLIST - CONSOLIDATED STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN OF ALL ULBS TO BE SENT FOR ASSESSMENT BY MOUD (AS PER TABLE 6.2)**
**State: Rajasthan**

S. N.	Point of Consideration	Yes/No	Give/Details
1.	Have all Cities prepared SLIP as per the suggested approach?	Yes	Priority has been given to Water Supply and Sewerage/Septage sector.
2.	Has the SAAP prioritized proposed investments across cities?	Yes	Priority has been given to the cities having low service level in Water Supply & Sewerage sector.
3.	Is the indicator wise summary of improvement proposed (both investments and management improvements) by State in place?	Yes	Indicator wise improvement proposal both for investment and management has been proposed.
4.	Have all the cities under Mission identified/done baseline assessments of service coverage indicators?	Yes	The base line assessment of service coverage has been done for all mission cities.
5.	Are SAAPs addressing an approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks agreed by Ministry for each Sector?	Yes	SAAP has been prepared to approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks as agreed by Ministry for each Sector.
6.	Is the investment proposed commensurate to the level of improvement envisaged in the indicator?	Yes	Investment proposed commensurate with Service Level Improvement envisaged in the indicator.

7.	Are State Share and ULB share in line with proposed Mission approach?	Yes	State Share & ULB share line with proposed Mission approach.
8.	Is there a need for additional resources and have state considered raising additional resources (State programs, aided projects, additional devolution to cities, 14 <sup>th</sup> Financial Commission, external sources)?	Yes	State has considered additional financial resource through 14 <sup>th</sup> Finance Commission, ADB assistance, and State Program etc. and also convergence of various program funded by Gol/GoR/External financial funding from ADB/JICA etc.
9.	Does State Annual Action Plan verify that the cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O & M and repayments?	Yes	SAAP has been prepared considering O & M charges to be reimbursed by collecting user charges. Cost of O & M shall be borne by concerned ULB. Additional funds required for O & M and repayment shall be worked out while preparing the DPR.
10.	Has the State Annual Action Plan considered the resource mobilization capacity of each ULB to ensure that ULB share can be mobilized?	Yes	SAAP has been prepared considering Financial Positions of ULB & if required, funds shall be raised through financial institution & Municipal bonds.
11.	Has the process of establishment of PDMC been initiated?	Yes	PDMC work awarded to M/S Shah Technical Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in association with TUSPL & CEG and PDMC mobilized.

12.	Has a roadmap been prepared to realize the resource potential of the ULB?	Yes	The resource potential of each ULB has been considered while preparing the SAAP. Alternate fund sources for financially weak ULBs is being arranged.
13.	Is the implementation plan for projects and reforms in place (Time lines any yearly milestone)?	Yes	All departments concerning implementation of reform have been directed to implement reforms in given time lines.
14.	Has the prioritization of projects in ULBs been done in accordance with para 7.2 of the guidelines?	Yes	Prioritization of projects have been done in accordance with para 7.2 of guidelines. Priority has been given where service level gaps is more in order to achieve universal coverage. Financially weak ULBs have been given more fund.

**(Dr. Manjit Singh)**  
**Pr. Secretary, LSGD &**  
**State Mission Director,**  
**AMRUT, Rajasthan**



**MINUTES OF STATE HIGH POWER STEERING COMMITTEE (SHpsc) MEETING**

CIN:U74999RJ2004SGC-19961

**RAJASTHAN URBAN DRINKING WATER, SEWERAGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE CORPORATION LIMITED  
(RUDSICO)****{Erstwhile Rajasthan Urban Infrastructure Finance and Development Corporation Limited}  
(A Government of Rajasthan Undertaking)****Old Working Women's Hostel, Behind Nehru Place, Lal Kothi, Tonk Road, Jaipur  
Ph: 0141-2742240, 2742538, 2742263 Fax: 2740771 E-mail: ruifdco@gmail.com**No.F16(AMRUT-02 Part)RUIFDco/AMRUT/2016-17/10278 Dated : ~~01.07.2016~~  
9-11-2016**Minutes of 3rd Meeting of "State Level High Powered Steering  
Committee" (SHpsc) under Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban  
Transformation (AMRUT) held on 28.10.2016**

The 3rd meeting of State Level High Powered Steering Committee (SHpsc) under AMRUT was held on Friday, 28.10.2016 at 11.00 AM in Committee Room No.1 of Secretariat, Jaipur under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary, Rajasthan.

The following were present in the meeting: -

1. Shri Nihal Chand Goel, Additional Chief Secretary, Environment & Forest.
2. Shri Mukesh Sharma, Principal Secretary, UDH.
3. Shri P.S. Mehra, Principal Secretary, Finance.
4. Shri J.C. Mohanti, Principal Secretary, PHED.
5. Dr. Manjit Singh, Principal Secretary, LSGD cum State Mission Director.
6. Shri Purushottam Biyani, Director, Local Bodies, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

The following officials were present as special invitees: -

1. Dr. B.L. Jatawat, Executive Director, RUDSICO.
2. Shri Zakir Hussain, Joint Secretary, Finance Department.
3. Shri C.M. Chouhan, Chief Engineer (HQ), PHED.
4. Shri S.K. Goyal, Project Director (UI), RUDSICO.

At the outset, Principal Secretary, LSGD cum State Mission Director welcomed all members of SHpsc and informed the members that Rajasthan is leading State in implementing AMRUT Mission in India. Chief Secretary, Rajasthan cum Chairman SHpsc appreciated the efforts and good work done by the Department of LSG.

It was informed by Principal Secretary, LSGD, that, based on SLIPs and AMRUT guidelines, city wise projects were prioritized and these were aggregated into the State Annual Action Plan (SAAP) 2017-20. The estimated cost of projects proposed for years 2017-20 under SAAP amounts to Rs.1232.14 crores excluding O&M cost. The O&M cost on actual basis shall be borne by ULB/State through user charges or its own resources.



CIN:U74999RJ2004SGC-19961

**RAJASTHAN URBAN DRINKING WATER, SEWERAGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE CORPORATION LIMITED  
(RUDSICO)**

{Erstwhile Rajasthan Urban Infrastructure Finance and Development Corporation Limited}  
(A Government of Rajasthan Undertaking)

Old Working Women's Hostel, Behind Nehru Place, Lal Kothi, Tonk Road, Jaipur  
Ph: 0141-2742240, 2742538, 2742263 Fax: 2740771 E-mail: ruifdco@gmail.com

Principal Secretary, Finance informed that these proposals have huge financial implications. AD should have referred these proposals first to FD for examination and comments regarding availability of funds (State's share) in coming financial years. Principal Secretary, Finance also stated that AD should ensure availability of ULB share along with the sanction of projects pertaining to these ULBs otherwise later on these projects will remain incomplete for want to funds which will defeat the purpose of the entire Mission.

A brief presentation on action taken report, progress of projects approved under AMRUT, reforms to be undertaken under AMRUT, progress of GIS based mapping of AMRUT cities, use of funds received under the incentive scheme, SAAP 2017-20, matching share by PHED for water supply schemes under AMRUT, was made by PD (UI), RUDSICO.

After detailed deliberations on various issues, the following decisions were taken: -

1. State Annual Action Plan (SAAP) for years 2017-20 prepared on the basis of State Level Improvement Plans (SLIP) submitted by ULBs of all 29 mission towns may be recommended to MoUD, GoI for approval. Principal Secretary, LSGD cum State Mission Director was authorized to submit SAAP to MoUD, GoI for consideration and their approval.
2. The minutes of the meeting of SHPSC to be included as the first agenda of consecutive SHPSC meeting for confirmation.
3. Departments of LSG and PHED to coordinate implementation of water supply and waste water project under various schemes to synchronize and ensure that work orders for sewerage projects be taken only after assurance of adequate water supply in the city from PHED.
4. PHED was directed to implement water supply projects in time bound manner in order to ensure timely completion of AMRUT project.
5. Copy of AMRUT guidelines, Constitution of SHPSC and SLTC to be sent to FD for perusal.
6. Household sewerage connections to be ensured in towns where sewerage works have been executed or are under implementation.
7. Details of the matching share by ULBs under AMRUT Mission in the escrow account to be shared with Finance Department.
8. Water Audit to be undertaken by Water Supply & Sewerage Organization (WSSO) of PHED.

CIN:U74999RJ2004SGC-19961


**RAJASTHAN URBAN DRINKING WATER, SEWERAGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE CORPORATION LIMITED  
(RUDSICO)**

**{Erstwhile Rajasthan Urban Infrastructure Finance and Development Corporation Limited}  
(A Government of Rajasthan Undertaking)**

Old Working Women's Hostel, Behind Nehru Place, Lal Kothi, Tonk Road, Jaipur  
Ph: 0141-2742240, 2742538, 2742263 Fax: 2740771 E-mail: ruifdco@gmail.com

9. Energy efficiency/audit details to be submitted in the next meeting of SHPSC.
10. Municipal bonds for couple of ULBs with best credit rating, to be issued to raise money from the market by March, 2017.
11. For utilization of funds under the incentive scheme from MoUD, Gol amounting to Rs.20.80 crores, a detailed proposal with justification including procurement of buses for Ajmer, Udaipur and Jodhpur be prepared and put up to FD.
12. Principal Secretary, PHED requested to withhold the sanction of Water Supply Project of Kota. Fresh proposal shall be sent separately soon.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks.


  
(Dr. Manjit Singh)

Principal Secretary to the Govt,  
Local Self Government Department &  
State Mission Director, AMRUT/Smart Cities

No. 10279 - 89 Dt. 9-11-2016

Copy to the following for information and necessary action: -

1. Senior D.S. to Chief Secretary, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. PS to Additional Chief Secretary, Environment & Forest.
3. PS to Principal Secretary, UDH.
4. PS to Principal Secretary, Finance.
5. PS to Principal Secretary, PHED.
6. PS to Principal Secretary, LSGD cum State Mission Director.
7. Director (AMRUT), MoUD, Gol, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
8. Director, Local Bodies, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
9. PD (UI), RUDSICO.
10. CE (HQ), PHED, Jaipur.
11. Guard File.

  
Executive Director, RUDSICO





**ABSTRACT OF PROJECT FUND**

(Amount in Crore)

Sr. No.	Name of ULBs	Water Supply	Sewerage & Septage mgmt	Drainage	Urban Transport	Others (Green Space, Parks etc.)	Total	Reforms incentive @ 10%	Grand Total
1	Bhiwadi	20.00	110.00			2.50	132.50	13.25	145.75
2	Bewar	28.53	110.00			2.50	141.03	14.10	155.13
3	Hanumangarh	0	6.98			2.50	9.48	0.95	13.43
4	Gangapur City	59.81	99.42			2.50	161.73	16.17	177.90
5	Hindaun City	20.57	91.64			2.50	114.71	11.47	126.18
6	Sujangarh	25.00	100.00			2.50	127.50	12.75	140.25
7	Bikaner	34.95	113.58			2.50	151.03	15.10	166.13
8	Jodhpur	25.00	85.00			2.50	112.50	11.25	123.75
9	Alwar	90.62	80.00			2.50	173.12	17.31	190.43
10	Bharatpur	50.00	79.66			2.50	132.16	13.22	145.38

11	Sikar	30.50	110.00		2.50	143.00	14.30	157.30
12	Dhaulpur	41.67	24.00		2.50	68.17	6.82	74.99
13	Sawai Madhopur	50.00	24.00		4.00	78.00	7.80	85.80
14	Churu	20.79	98.37	6.33	2.50	127.99	12.80	140.79
15	Baran	78.31	85.00	1.00	2.50	166.81	16.81	183.49
16	Chittorgarh	55.00	87.89		2.50	145.39	14.54	159.93
17	Nagaur	50.00	60.00		2.50	112.50	11.25	123.75
18	Bundi	46.36	100.00		2.50	148.86	14.89	163.75
19	Bhilwara	25.00	10.00		2.50	37.50	3.75	41.25
20	Sriganganagar	0.00	10.00		2.50	12.50	1.25	13.75
21	Pali	0.00	10.00		2.50	12.50	1.25	13.75
22	Tonk	0.00	10.00		5.00	15.00	1.50	16.50
23	Jhunjhunu	0.00	0.00	11.00	2.50	13.50	1.35	14.85
24	Kishangarh	0.00	100.29		2.50	102.79	10.28	113.07
25	Jaipur	50.00	171.52		2.50	224.02	22.40	246.42
26	Kota	70.25	102.19		2.50	174.94	17.49	192.43



<b>27</b>	<b>Ajmer</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>68.21</b>			<b>2.50</b>	<b>100.71</b>	<b>10.07</b>	<b>110.78</b>
<b>28</b>	<b>Udaipur</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>160.00</b>	<b>11.50</b>		<b>5.00</b>	<b>206.50</b>	<b>20.65</b>	<b>227.15</b>
<b>29</b>	<b>Jhalawar</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>			<b>2.50</b>	<b>77.50</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>85.25</b>
	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>1007.36</b>	<b>2107.75</b>	<b>29.83</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>79.00</b>	<b>3223.94</b>	<b>322.39</b>	<b>3546.33</b>
								<b>A &amp; OE @ 8%</b>	<b>283.71</b>
								<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>3830.04</b>

## Chapter 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

AMRUT (Atal Mission of Rejuvenation & Urban Transformation) mission is initiated by Ministry of Urban Development, GoI on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2015 for next 5 Years i.e. upto March 2020. Five hundred (500) cities will be taken up having a population greater than one lakh (100,000). Under the mission MoUD, GoI will provide 50% of project fund while State & ULB will share rest 50%.

Earlier, the MoUD used to give project-by-project sanctions. In the AMRUT this has been replaced by approval of the State Annual Action Plan once a year by the MoUD and the States has to give project sanctions and approval at their end.

### Thrust areas under mission:

- ✚ Water supply
- ✚ Sewerage facilities and Septage management,
- ✚ Storm water drains to reduce flooding,
- ✚ Urban Transport - pedestrian, non-motorized and public transport facilities, parking spaces
- ✚ Creating and upgrading green spaces, parks and recreation centers, especially for children.

## URBAN SCENARIO IN RAJASTHAN

Rajasthan got its name as Rajputana (the land of the Rajputs) since the earliest Rajput dynasty emerged around 700 AD. Rajasthan in its present shape was formed in 1956. Rajasthan has been administratively divided into seven divisions with groups of districts that are in proximity to each other in each division. These are as follows:

1. **Ajmer Division** (Ajmer, Bhilwara, Tonk & Nagaur);
2. **Bharatpur Division** (Bharatpur, Karauli, Sawai Madhopur and Dhaulpur);
3. **Bikaner Division** (Bikaner, Churu, Hanumangarh and Ganganagar);
4. **Jaipur Division** (Alwar, Dausa, Jaipur, Sikar and Jhunjhunun);

5. **Jodhpur Division** (Jaisalmer, Jalor, Jodhpur, Pali, Barmer and Sirohi)

6. **Kota Division** (Baran, Bundi, Kota and Jhalawar)

7. **Udaipur Division** (Banswara, Chittaurgarh, Dungarpur, Rajsamand, Udaipur and Pratapgarh)

As per 2011 census, total population of Rajasthan was 68.54 million with about 25% of the population living in urban areas. Urban population growth in Rajasthan got an impetus after independence because of various economic development activities. The proportion of urban population from 1931 to 1961 was 14-16% of the total population and by 2011 it has increased to 24.9%.

**Table 1: Class wise distribution of towns in Rajasthan, 2011**

Towns	Population	No. of Towns - 2011		
		Statutory Towns	Census Towns	Total
Class I	1,00,000 and above	28	0	28
Class II	50,000 to 99,999	27	0	27
Class III	20,000 to 49,999	95	10	105
Class IV	10,000 to 19,999	33	47	80
Class V	5,000 to 9,999	2	45	47
Class VI	< 5,000	0	10	10
<b>Total</b>		<b>185</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>297</b>

*Source: Census of India, 2011*

As per 2011 census, there are no census towns in three districts only; these are Hanumangarh, Churu and Jaisalmer which are located in the western part of the state. It clearly shows that spatially, the growth of urban areas is skewed towards eastern Rajasthan.

**Table 2: Decadal growth rate for Urban population India and Rajasthan**

Year	India (Urban)	Rajasthan (Urban)
1971	38.28%	38.49 %
1981	46.28%	58.67 %
1991	35.29%	39.63 %
2001	32.57%	31.17 %
2011	31.80%	29.10


*Source: Census of India (various years)*

A comparison of the growth rates of the State with national data reveals that the trends at state level are no different from the trends at the national level.

#### Coverage under Mission for Rajasthan:-

**Table 3: 29 Cities of Rajasthan**

S.No.	City Name	S.No.	City Name	S.No.	City Name	S.No.	City Name
1	Hanumangarh	8	Bhilwara	15	Alwar	22	Hindaun City
2	S.Ganganagar	9	Kota	16	Chittorgarh	23	Sikar
3	Tonk	10	Pali	17	Beawar	24	Churu
4	Jhunjhunu	11	Ajmer	18	Gagnapur City	25	Baran
5	Dhaulpur	12	Nagaur	19	Bharatpur	26	Udaipur
6	Bikaner	13	Bundi	20	Kishangarh	27	Jodhpur
7	S.Madhopur	14	Sujangarh	21	Bhiwadi	28	Jaipur
						29	Jhalawar

**Figure 1: Population of Mission Cities**

### Program Management Structure

City level projects have been identified after due consultations with various stakeholders and SLIPs. The identified projects are then put up to SLTC for approval. The SLIPs are aggregated to form SAAP. This SAAP have been submitted to SHPSC for their consideration. After detailed deliberations in SHPSC meeting dated 28.10.2016 considered the SAAP and decided to recommend the same for approval from the Apex Committee. Projects will be executed by ULBs.




**Figure 2: Program Management Structure**



**Funding Pattern**

The fund sharing pattern as described in AMRUT guidelines have been followed:

**Figure 3: Mission Fund Allocation**



□ Fund will be released in three installments (20:40:40)

- 1<sup>st</sup> installment on approval of SAAP by the Apex Committee
- 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> installments on 75% utilization of previous released fund and meeting the ‘Service Level Benchmark’ as mentioned in the SAAP.

Table 4: Fund Sharing Pattern in Mission

Agency	Share Rs. In Cr.
Center	1526.73
State	984.23
ULB/Parastatal	712.98
Grand Total	3223.94

Figure 4: Sharing Pattern





Table 5: Sector wise Project Fund Allocation

Sector	Amount (Rs. In Cr.)
Water supply	1007.36
Sewerage and Septage management	2107.75
Drainage	29.83
Urban Transport	0.00
Open spaces	79.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3223.94</b>

Figure 5: Sector wise Allocation



**CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)****PROJECT PROGRESS (2015-16)**

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 Cr.)				Physical (%)	Financial (%)	
1.	Gangapur City		40.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	6.40
2.	Dholpur		30.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	4.80
3.	Chittorgarh		40.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	6.40
4.	Baran		50.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	8.00
5.	Alwar		50.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	8.00
6.	Ngaur	Water Supply	50.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	8.00
7.	Sujangarh		25.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	4.00
8.	Bhilwara		25.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	4.00
9.	Beawar		14.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	2.24
10.	Bhiwadi		20.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	3.20
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>344.00</b>						<b>55.04</b>

11.	Beawar		110.00	Y	Y	N			17.6
12.	Sikar		110.00	Y	Y	Y	-	-	17.6
13.	Jodhpur	Sewerage & Septage	85.00	Y	Y	Y	-	-	13.6
14.	Alwar		80.00	Y	Y	Y	-	-	12.8
15.	Nagaur		60.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	9.6
16.	Bhiwadi		110.00	Y	Y	Y	-	-	17.6
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>555.00</b>						<b>88.80</b>
17.	Bhiwadi		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
18.	Beawar		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
19.	Hanumangarh	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
20.	Gangapur City		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
21.	Hindaun City		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
22.	Sujangarh		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
23.	Bikaner		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
24.	Jodhpur		1.00	N	N	N	-	-	0.16



25.	Alwar		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
26.	Bharatpur		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
27.	Sikar		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
28.	Dhaulpur		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
29.	Sawai Madhopur		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.64
30.	Churu		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
31.	Baran		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
32.	Chittorgarh	<b>Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects &amp; Lake Conservation)</b>	0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
33.	Nagaur		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
34.	Bundi		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
35.	Bhilwara		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
36.	Sriganganagar		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
37.	Pali		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
38.	Tonk		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08

39.	Jhunjhunu		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
40.	Kishangarh		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
41.	Jaipur		1.00	N	N	N	-	-	0.16
42.	Kota	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	1.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.16
43.	Ajmer		1.00	N	N	N	-	-	0.16
44.	Udaipur		1.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.16
	Sub Total		20.00						
	Grand Total		919.00						147.04

## PROJECT PROGRESS (2016-17)

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 Cr.)				Physical (%)	Financial (%)	
1.	Beawer	Water Supply	14.53	Y	Y	N	-	-	2.32
2.	Gangapur City		19.81	Y	Y	N	-	-	3.17
3.	Alwar		40.62	Y	Y	N	-	-	6.50
4.	Dhaulpur		11.67	Y	Y	N	-	-	1.87
5.	Baran		28.31	Y	Y	N	-	-	4.53
6.	Sikar		30.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	4.88
7.	Kota		60.25	Y	Y	N	-	-	6.41
8.	Bundi		46.36	Y	Y	N	-	-	7.42
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>252.05</b>				-	-	<b>37.10</b>
9.	Gangapur City	Sewerage & Septage	99.42	Y	Y	N	-	-	15.91
10.	Sujangarh		100.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	16.00
11.	Baran		85.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	13.60

12.	Chittorgarh		87.89	Y	Y	N	-	-	14.06
13.	Hanumangarh		6.98	Y	Y	Y	-	-	1.12
14.	Bharatpur		79.66	Y	Y	N	-	-	12.75
15.	Udaipur		85.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	13.60
16.	Churu		98.37	Y	Y	N	-	-	15.74
17.	Bundi		52.29	Y	Y	N	-	-	8.37
18.	Hindaun City		91.64	Y	Y	N	-	-	14.66
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>786.25</b>						<b>125.81</b>
19.	Udaipur	<b>Drainage</b>	11.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	1.84
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>11.50</b>						<b>1.84</b>
20.	Bhiwadi	<b>Others (Green</b>	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
21.	Beawar	<b>Space, Parks, Innovative</b>	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
22.	Hanumangarh	<b>Projects &amp; Lake</b>	0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
23.	Gangapur City	<b>Conservation)</b>	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
24.	Hindaun City		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08

25.	Sujargarh		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
26.	Bikaner		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
27.	Jodhpur		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.05
28.	Alwar		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
29.	Bharatpur		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
30.	Sikar		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
31.	Dhaulpur	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
32.	Churu		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
33.	Baran		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
34.	Chittorgarh		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
35.	Nagaur		2.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.32
36.	Bundi		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
37.	Bhilwara		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
38.	Sriganganagar		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08

39.	Pali		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
40.	Tonk		4.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.72
41.	Jhunjhunu		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
42.	Kishangarh		0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.08
43.	Jaipur		0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.05
44.	Kota	Others	0.50	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.05
45.	Jhalawar	(Green	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
46.	Ajmer	Space, Parks,	0.50	N	N	N	-	-	0.08
47.	Udaipur	Innovative	4.00	Y	Y	N	-	-	0.64
		Projects &							
		Lake							
		Conservation)							
	<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>23.00</b>						<b>3.60</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>1072.80</b>						<b>168.35</b>



- 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)

All 18 DPRs of Water Supply and all 16 DPRs of Sewerage & Septage and 1 DPR of drainage sector have been approved by SLTC.

Green Space- DPRs of 27 out of 56 green space projects approved by SLTC and DPRs of remaining towns are under preparation, Delay of DPRs is on account of delay in mobilization of consultants.

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

The DPRs of remaining works are under preparation. DPRs of Green space of 29 towns shall be prepared by end of Jan, 2017.

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

Six SLTC meetings are held in the State till date, in which total Fifty Four DPRs of amounting Rs. 2671.51 Crs. have been approved.

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

The pending DPRs are likely to be approved by SLTC by the end of March, 2016. Implementation of AMRUT projects already started.

- 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)

The tenders for works are under process and the works shall be taken up soon. Regular review meetings are being held to speed up the projects and regular correspondence is being made with the ULBs to expedite the projects. Orders for constitution of PIUs at ULB level has already been issued

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

The amount received from Gol has already been distributed to ULBs as per the approved projects for SAAP 2015-16 & 2016-17, since the process of bidding has just been started actual utilization of fund will improve in next 2-3 months. There is no deviation in funding pattern approved by the Apex Committee. The funding pattern for towns with population less than 10 lacs is State share is 30% and ULB share is 20% and towns with population above 10 lacs is State share is 33.33% and ULB share is 33.33%.

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

Not applicable.

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

All works except water supply projects shall be executed by ULBs. ULBs do not have experts/manpower to execute water supply projects and as such all water supply projects shall be executed by PHED. The resolution of the ULBs Board to that affect shall be taken from ULBs for which necessary instruction has already been issued.

- 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)

Assessed value of DPRs for water supply projects at Bhiwadi, Sujangarh & Bhilwara and for sewerage Bhiwadi, Beawar, alwar & Jodhpur are less than approved by the Apex Committee and saving is expected in these projects. The saving have been included while considering other projects within approved and proposed SAAP.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

- 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)

### **Sewerage-**

- State Sewerage Policy-2015 promulgated with focus on treated waster water reuse, tariff recovery linked with water bills, incentive on PPP projects
- House sewer connections in convergence with Swach Bharat Mission to ensure full functionality of assets .
- GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar) survey before excavation to ensure minimum damage to underground utilities
- Construction in prioritized manner. Laterals to constructed only after 80% completion of civil work of STP and outfall.
- Payment linked with performance i.e 30% after material supply, 40% after road restoration & 30% after house sewer connections
- Provision of solar energy power generation at STP campus.
- Overhead reservoir to cover large command area for irrigation.
- Treatment of sullage through natural systems i.e Phytorid with reed bed.
- STPs on hybrid annuity model at Udaipur
- Alarm system for critical man holes
- Use of VFD (variable Frequency drive)

### **Water Supply-**

- Smart solutions with SCADA & smart metering- Install class B AMR meters for domestic connections & AMR meters for non domestic and industrial connections.
- Energy efficiency- Best efficiency pump in water supply schemes & LED bulbs for all types of light.
- Low cost solutions options- Non- metallic HDPE pipes for all non rocky strata. DI pipes only in rock strata.
- NRW reduction by using District Metering (DMA) approach & checking leakages & illegal connection
- Improvement in online Water quality monitoring system
- Setting up of Integrated Information Management System (IIMS) to integrate Asset data, operational data and consumer data.
- IEC activities to motivate people to discourage use of UG tanks, wastage of water, illegal connection. Installation of ferrules.
- 10 year O&M along with payment linked with performance

#### **Green Space/Parks-**

- Provision of sturdy play equipment & open gym with 10 years O&M by manufactures
- Almost 60% expenditure on improvement of green coverage & plantation
- Focus on use of natural materials rather than heavy concrete/building material
- Encouragement for one city level park with all necessary amenities
- Designing of contract with focus of 10 years O&M for non civil works
- Use of Solar Energy for illumination & pumping of water and sprinklers for irrigation.
- Water harvesting structures & reuse of treated sewage water.
- Security & Surveillance through CCTV etc.

**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 Levels

### Sector - Water Supply

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year (2015-16)	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Bhiwari	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	75%	100%	80%	-
Beawar	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	73.20%	100%	76.20%	-
Gangapur City	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	48%	100%	48%	-
Sujangarh	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	71%	100%	74%	-
Alwar	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	67.50%	100%	70%	-
Dhaulpur	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	53.80%	100%	58%	-



<b>Baran</b>	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	65%	100%	78%	-
<b>Nagaur</b>	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	28.50%	100%	35.50%	-
<b>Bhilwara</b>	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	72.80%	100%	76%	-
<b>Chittorgarh</b>	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	61.30%	80%	66%	-

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year (2016-17)	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Kota	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	78%	100%	89%	-
Beawar	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	73.20%	100%	87%	-
Gangapur City	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	48%	100%	71%	-
Bundi	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	71%	100%	88%	-
Alwar	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	67.50%	100%	83.50%	-
Dhaulpur	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	53.80%	100%	77%	-
Baran	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	65%	100%	88%	-

---

<b>Sikar</b>	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	80%	100%	90%	-
--------------	---	-----	------	-----	---

## Sector - Sewerage &amp; Septage

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year (2015-16)	
				Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Bhiwari	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	75.00%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	23.41%	100%	0%	-
Beawar	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	99%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	35%	0%	-
Sikar	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	91.64%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage	0%	33%	0%	-

	Network services				
<b>Alwar</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	68.52%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	14.73%	80%	14.73%	-
<b>Udaipur</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	59%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	20%	38%	0%	-
<b>Nagaur</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	85.22%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	19%	100%	0%	-

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline (as in 2015)	SAAP Mission Target	For the last Financial Year (2016-17) Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
<b>Gangapur City</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	93%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	80%	0%	-
<b>Sujangarh</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	92%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	95%	0%	-
<b>Baran</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	82%	100%	91%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	80%	0%	-
<b>Chittorgarh</b>	Coverage of latrines	86%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged



	(individual or community)				with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	100%	21%	-
<b>Hanumangarh</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	98%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	95%	89%	-
<b>Hindaun City</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	91%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	90%	0%	-
<b>Udaipur</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	95%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	20%	67%	45%	-
<b>Bharatpur</b>	Coverage of latrines	95%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged

	(individual or community)				with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	58%	18%	-
<b>Churu</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	72%	100%	100%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	95%	51%	-
					Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)
<b>Bundi</b>	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	97%	100%	100%	-
	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	0%	80%	10%	Nil (Already converged with SBM & TFC funds)

**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.

**Capacity Building (Training)**

Sl No	No. of ULBs	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	186	Elected Representative	5321	1451	139	CED IIHS ISPER
		Finance Department	237	65	56	CED
		Engineering department	851	560	385	CED IIHS
		Town Planning Department	40	40	Nil	ISPER
		Administrative Department	186	68	38	CED
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6635</b>	<b>2184</b>	<b>618</b>	

Under Individual Capacity Building Programme State has signed MoUs with following 3 training institutes empanelled by MoUD, GOI:

- i. Centre For Environment & Development (CED), Thiruvanthapuram
- ii. Indian Institute For Human Settlements (IIHS), Bangalore
- iii. Institute For Spatial Planning & Environment Research (ISPER), India, Panchkula.

Training shall be imparted in 3 phases. 1st and 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase training is under progress, 3rd Phase shall be taken up in Jan.-March 2017.

It is proposed to complete all 3 capsules of training and exposure visits initially for all 29 AMRUT cities during the financial year 2017-18.

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

Training programme has been conducted during the FY 2016-17 for 618 (Elected Representative- 139 and Officials- 475).

- 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)

Due to low participation of Elected Representatives for going out on training out of the state therefore, ISPER (training institute) could not complete training of targeted functionaries.

A model has been revised and trainings of ERs have been proposed at Divisional level to make active participation in the training programme.

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

Invoices for the cost of training received from training institute have been forwarded to MoUD, GoI for reimbursement.

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

Yes, the following sites visited by the Elected Representatives during the training programmes:

STP, Shimla, STP, 3BRD, Chandigarh, Solid waste Management, Tadumajra, Chandigarh

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

No.

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

All activities shall be taken up in FY 2016-17 as per details given below:

Rounds/Capsule	Schedule	Total Personnel's
Round I (Orientation Capsule)	Nov. 2016 to March 2017	Total 50 Officers (Engineers/Admin/ Fin & Revenue/TP) Total 300 Elected Representatives
Round II	Nov. 2016 to March 2017	Total 519 Officers (Engineers/Admin/ Fin & Revenue/TP)
Round III	Nov. 2016 to March 2017	Total 519 Officers (Engineers/Admin/ Fin & Revenue/TP)

## 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:

**Reforms**

Sr. no	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	<b>E-Governance</b>	Digital ULBs	Oct 2015 to March 2016	Department of Local Self Government website launched, website of all 29 ULB's to be made live.	29	-
		1. Creation of ULB website.				
		2. Publication of e newsletter, Digital India Initiatives.	Oct 2015 to March 2016	E- Newsletter for LSG issued, All 29 ULBs published their E-newsletter on their website	29	-
		3. Support Digital India (ducting to be done on PPP mode or by the ULB itself).	Oct 2015 to March 2016	Proposal to be initiated in association with IT Department. (Pending)	-	-
2	<b>Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre</b>	1. Policy for engagement of interns in ULBs and implementation.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Rajasthan Urban Sector Internship Program- 2016 Guidelines issued on 14.03.2016.	29	-

3	<b>Augmenting double entry accounting</b>	1. Complete migration to double entry accounting system and obtaining an audit certificate to the effect from FY 2012-13 onwards.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already under implementation, Double Entry Accounting system started in all 29 ULBs under JANAAGRAHA.	29	-
		2. Publication of annual financial statement on website.	Every Year	Budget uploaded on website of all ULBs.	29	-
4	<b>Urban Planning and City Development Plans</b>	1. Preparation of Service Level Improvement Plans (SLIP), State Annual Action Plans (SAAP).	Oct 2015 to March 2016	Already implemented (Updated for 2015-16).	29	-
		2. Make action plan to progressively increase Green cover in cities to 15% in 5 years.	Oct 2015 to March 2016	Provision already made in Master Plan, Township Policy and Building Bye Laws for Green Cover, Action Plan/directions issued to ULBs vide order dated 22.3.2016.	29	-
		3. Develop at least one Children Park every year in the AMRUT cities.	Every Year	Already implemented. Direction issued to ULBs vide order dated	29	-



		22.3.2016.				
<b>5</b>	<b>Devolution of funds and functions</b>	4. Establish a system for maintaining of parks, playground and recreational areas relying on People Public Private Partnership (PPPP) model.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Guidelines already in-force, direction issued to ULBs vide order dated 22.3.2016.	29	-
		1. Ensure transfer of 14th FC Devolution to ULBs.	Oct 2015 to March 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		2. Appointment of State Finance Commission (SFC) and making decisions.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		3. Transfer of all 18 function to ULBs.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
<b>6</b>	<b>Review of Building by-laws</b>	1. Revision of building bye laws periodically.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		2. Create single window clearance for all approvals to give building permissions.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Directions issued vide order dated 22.3.2016.	29	-
<b>7(a)</b>	<b>Municipal tax and fees improvement</b>	1. At least 90% coverage.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Under Process, Orders issued, Efforts being made	-	-

		by all ULBs				
	2. At least 90% collection.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Under Process, Orders issued, Efforts being made by all ULBs	-	-	
	3. Make a policy to, periodically revise property tax, levy charges and other fees.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented. It is based on DLC rate which is revised periodically.	29	-	
	4. Post Demand Collection Book (DCB) of tax details on the website.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already Under process.	Partially Implemented	-	
	5. Achieve full potential of advertisement revenue by making a policy for destination specific potential having dynamic pricing module.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented, Advertisement policy in - force, Advertisement sites are auctioned looking to site specific potential, pricing is dynamic.	29	-	
<b>7(b)</b>	<b>Improvement in levy and collection of user charges</b>	1. Adopt a policy on user charges for individual and institutional assessments in which a differential rate is charged for water use and adequate safeguards are included to	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented	29	-

		take care of the interests of the vulnerable.				
		2. Make action plan to reduce water losses to less than 20% and publish on the website.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		3. Separate accounts for user charges.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		4. At least 90% billing.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
		5. At least 90% collection.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented.	29	-
<b>8</b>	<b>Energy and Water audit</b>	1. Energy (Street lights) and Water Audit (including non-revenue water or losses audit).	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Partially implemented. Energy Audit (Street Lights) done for 12 ULBs, Rest in progress water audit in progress under AMRUT	Partially implemented	-
		2. Making STPs and WTPs energy efficient.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented, Variable Frequency Drive (VDF) & Sensors are being used, so as to make equipments energy	29	-

---

			efficient.		
3. Optimize energy consumption in street lights by using energy efficient lights and increasing reliance on renewable energy.	Oct 2015 to Sep 2016	Already implemented. Agreement with M/S EESL, a PSU of GOI for replacing all existing street lights to energy efficient LED lights, Total 12.5 lac points in 190 ULBs to be replaced by June, 2017. 5.28 lacs points already replaced.	29	-	

---

- Have the Reform formats prescribed by the TCPO furnished?

Yes, Reform formats prescribed by the TCPO furnished.

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

- Yes, report already submitted on 27.4.2016. It is worth to mention that Rajasthan amongst few state for chosen for achieving reform milestone and 1st installment of Rs. 20.80 Cr. received from Gol.

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

Amount claimed 10% of annual allocation to state under AMRUT. 1st installment received from MoUD will be utilized in transport sector (purchase of new buses in Jodhpur, Udaipur & Ajmer and NMT in (Cycle tracks, Bus Q shelters etc) Jhalawar & Sawaimadhopur.

- 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 has already taken to complete the Reforms in Mission period, advance action already taken and an Plan of Action prepared.

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

- I. Master Plans of all towns prepared- GIS based master plans of all AMRUT towns have been taken up and shall be completed in FY 2016-17.
- II. E-governance- "SmartRaj" project for complete online services in all ULBs of the state has been taken up and 1st phase shall be completed in FY 2016-17.
- III. Energy efficient street lighting (LED lighting)- The project is under implementation in all the ULBs. Rajasthan is the only state to implement state wide project through M/S EESL (a PSU of Gol) without any upfront/capital cost to state/ULB; under which 12.5 lacs

points will be replaced by LED light in June 2017. The cost of project to be recovered through saving on electricity bills.

- IV. Rs. 0.15/unit urban 'Cess' on all electricity bills is being charged and the fund is being used for street lightning in urban areas and surplus funds are available for ULBs.
- V. Dedicated transport infrastructure fund (RTIDF)- through 'Cess' on registration of property and new vehicles being levied.

### Use of A&OE

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

A sum of Rs. 7.00 Crores have been received during FY 2015-16 and the same have been transferred to ULBs for preparation of SLIPs and DPRs. A request was made to release balance amount for FY 2015-16 and funds for FY 2016-17 under A&OE which has yet to be been released.

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

Yes, the items are similar to the approved items in the SAAP and there is no any deviation.

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

A request was made to release funds for FY 2016-17 under A&OE which has yet to be been released.

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

IRMA Not appointed.

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

IRMA to be appointed by MoUD.

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

Yes, websites of 29 mission cities have been launched and all 29 ULBs published their E-newsletter on their website. State has already initiated implementation of Mobility of the services to the citizens, so that they will be able to access own device own places any time any where under the 'SmartRaj project'.

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

Yes, Instructions have been issued to display the logo and tagline of AMRUT prominently for compliance to adhere strictly and during the 1st anniversary function of AMRUT at State & city level, logo & tagline were displayed, participatory activities like competition etc. were also conducted .

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

No.

2015-16

## Funds flow

Sl. No	City Name	Project Name	Fund flow						Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			Gol		State		ULB/Others			
			Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
1.	Gangapur City	Water Supply	20.00	4.00	12.00	2.4	8.00	-	6.4	-
2.	Dholpur		15.00	3.00	9.00	1.8	6.00	-	4.8	-
3.	Chittorgarh		20.00	4.00	12.00	2.4	8.00	-	6.4	-
4.	Baran		25.00	5.00	15.00	3	10.00	-	8	-
5.	Alwar		25.00	5.00	15.00	3	10.00	-	8	-
6.	Ngaur		25.00	5.00	15.00	3	10.00	-	8	-
7.	Sujangarh		12.50	2.50	7.50	1.5	5.00	-	4	-
8.	Bhilwara		12.50	2.50	7.50	1.5	5.00	-	4	-
9.	Beawar		7.00	1.40	4.20	0.84	2.80	-	2.24	-



10.	Bhiwadi		10.00	2.00	6.00	1.2	4.00	-	3.2	-	
11.	Beawar		55.00	11.00	33.00	6.6	22.00		17.6		
12.	Sikar		55.00	11.00	33.00	6.6	22.00	-	17.6	-	
13.	Jodhpur	Sewerage & Septage	28.33	8.50	28.33	5.1	28.33	-	13.6	-	
14.	Alwar		40.00	8.00	24.00	4.8	16.00	-	12.8	-	
15.	Nagaur		30.00	6.00	18.00	3.6	12.00	-	9.6	-	
16.	Bhiwadi		55.00	11.00	33.00	6.6	22.00	-	17.6	-	
17.	Bhiwadi		Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
18.	Beawar			0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
19.	Hanumangarh			0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
20.	Gangapur City	0.25		0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-	
21.	Hindaun City	0.25		0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-	
22.	Sujangarh	0.25		0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-	
23.	Bikaner	0.25		0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-	

24.	Jodhpur		0.33	0.10	0.33	0.06	0.33	-	0.16	-
25.	Alwar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
26.	Bharatpur		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
27.	Sikar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
28.	Dhaulpur	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
29.	Sawai Madhopur		2.00	0.40	1.20	0.24	0.80	-	0.64	-
30.	Churu		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
31.	Baran		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
32.	Chittorgarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
33.	Nagaur		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
34.	Bundi		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
35.	Bhilwara		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
36.	Sriganganagar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-

37. Pali		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
38. Tonk		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
39. Jhunjhunu		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
40. Kishangarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
41. Jaipur		0.33	0.10	0.33	0.06	0.33	-	0.16	-
42. Kota	Others (Green	0.33	0.10	0.33	0.06	0.33	-	0.16	-
43. Ajmer	Space, Parks, Innovative	0.50	0.10	0.30	0.06	0.20	-	0.16	-
44. Udaipur	Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.50	0.10	0.30	0.06	0.20	-	0.16	-

**2016-17**

Amount in Cr.

Sl. No	City Name	Project Name	Fund flow							
			Gol		State		ULB/Others		Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
1	Beawer	Water Supply	7.27	1.45	4.36	0.87	2.91	-	2.32	-
2.	Gangapur City		9.91	1.98	5.94	1.19	3.96	-	3.17	-
3.	Alwar		20.31	4.06	12.19	2.44	8.12	-	6.50	-
4.	Dhaulpur		5.84	1.17	3.50	0.70	2.33	-	1.87	-
5.	Baran		14.16	2.83	8.49	1.70	5.66	-	4.53	-
6.	Sikar		15.25	3.05	9.15	1.83	6.10	-	4.88	-
7.	Kota		20.08	4.01	20.08	2.40	20.08	-	6.41	-
8.	Bundi		23.18	4.64	13.91	2.78	9.27	-	7.42	-
9.	Gangapur City	Sewerage &	49.71	9.94	29.83	5.97	19.88	-	15.91	-

10. Sujangarh	Septage	50.00	10.00	30.00	6.00	20.00	-	16.00	-
11. Baran		42.50	8.50	25.50	5.10	17.00	-	13.60	-
12. Chittorgarh		43.95	8.79	26.37	5.27	17.58	-	14.06	-
13. Hanumangarh		3.49	0.70	2.09	0.42	1.40	-	1.12	-
14. Hindaun City		45.82	9.16	27.49	5.50	18.33	-	14.66	-
15. Udaipur		42.50	8.50	25.50	5.10	17.00	-	13.60	-
16. Bharatpur		39.83	7.97	23.90	4.78	15.93	-	12.75	-
17. Churu		49.19	9.84	29.51	5.90	19.67	-	15.74	-
18. Bundi		26.15	5.23	15.69	3.14	10.46	-	8.37	-
19. Udaipur	Drainage	5.75	1.15	3.45	0.69	2.30	-	1.84	-
20. Bhiwadi	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
21. Beawar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
22. Hanumangarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
23. Gangapur City		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
24. Hindaun City		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-

25. Sujangarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
26. Bikaner		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
27. Jodhpur		0.17	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.16	-	0.05	-
28. Alwar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
29. Bharatpur		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
30. Sikar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
31. Dhaulpur	Others (Green Space, Parks, Innovative Projects & Lake Conservation)	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
32. Churu		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
33. Baran		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
34. Chittorgarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
35. Nagaur		1.00	0.20	0.60	0.12	0.40	-	0.32	-
36. Bundi		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
37. Bhilwara		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
38. Sriganganagar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-

39.	Pali		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
40.	Tonk		2.25	0.45	1.35	0.27	0.90	-	0.72	-
41.	Jhunjhunu		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
42.	Kishangarh		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
43.	Jaipur		0.17	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.16	-	0.05	-
44.	Kota	Others (Green	0.17	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.16	-	0.05	-
45.	Ajmer	Space, Parks, Innovative	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-
46.	Udaipur	Projects & Lake Conservation)	2.00	0.40	1.20	0.24	0.80	-	0.64	-
47.	Jhalawar		0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.10	-	0.08	-

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

All the funds sanctioned and received from MoUD and State have been disbursed in dedicate bank account opened in each ULB/parastatal. Details are given in above table.

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

Nil.

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

The works have not yet been taken up.

### **Funds disbursements and Conditions**

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

Nil.

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

First installment of works approved under SAAP 2015-16 & 2016-17 has been released by Gol.

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

Nil.

- 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)

Yes, all following conditions imposed by the Apex Committee have been complied:

- i. Slow progress on implementation of SAAP 2015-16 and steps for expditious implementation of SAAP 2016-17- Action have been taken up (PIU constituted, action plan to bid out all the projects by Jan, 2017
- ii. State should to ensure for no duplication of project in parking funds- this is being complied.



- iii. State may integrate water supply projects with construction of toilets and ensure that the water supply precedes toilets- being complied

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

Details of the projects sector wise that are being posed for approval to the Apex Committee.

Amount (Rs. In Cr.)

**2017-2020**

S.No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share				Change in service levels		
			Gol	State	ULB/ Others	Total*	Indicator	Existing	After project completion
1.	Hindaun City	Water Supply	10.29	6.17	4.11	20.57	Coverage of water supply connections	55%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	23%	100%
2.	Bikaner		17.48	10.48	6.99	34.95	Coverage of water supply connections	75.50%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	78%	100%
3.	Jodhpur		8.34	8.33	8.33	25.00	Coverage of water supply connections	77%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	75%	100%
4.	Bharatpur		25.00	15.00	10.00	50.00	Coverage of water supply connections	59.35%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	53%	100%
5.	Sawai		25.00	15.00	10.00	50.00	Coverage of water supply	66%	100%

	Madhopur						connections		
							Extent of metering of water connections	72%	100%
6.	Churu		10.40	6.23	4.16	20.79	Coverage of water supply connections	82.25%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	58%	100%
7.	Chttorgarh		7.50	4.50	3.00	15.00	Coverage of water supply connections	61.30%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	52%	100%
8.	Jaipur		16.67	16.67	16.66	50.00	Coverage of water supply connections	70.60%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	70%	100%
9.	Kota		3.34	3.33	3.33	10.00	Coverage of water supply connections	78%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	55%	100%
10.	Ajmer		15.00	9.00	6.00	30.00	Coverage of water supply connections	82.10%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	37.50%	99.50%
11.	Udaipur		15.00	9.00	6.00	30.00	Coverage of water supply connections	81.30%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	70%	100%

12.	Jhalawar		37.50	22.50	15.00	75.00	Coverage of water supply connections	65%	100%
							Extent of metering of water connections	90%	100%
<b>Sub Total</b>			<b>191.52</b>	<b>126.21</b>	<b>93.58</b>	<b>411.31</b>			
13.	Bikaner		56.79	34.07	22.72	113.58	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	93%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	75%	100%
14.	Dhaulpur		12.00	7.20	4.80	24.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	89%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	95%
15.	Sawai Madhopur		12.00	7.20	4.80	24.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	96%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	27%	56%
16.	Bundi	Sewerage & Septage	23.86	14.31	9.54	47.71	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	97%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	80%
17.	Bhilwara		5.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	85%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	8%
18.	Sri Ganganagr		5.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	99%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	12%
19.	Pali		5.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	Coverage of latrines (individual	89%	100%

							or community)		
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	67%
20.	Tonk		5.00	3.00	2.00	10.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	60%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	20%
21.	Kishangarh		50.15	30.09	20.06	100.29	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	92%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	95%
22.	Jaipur		57.18	57.17	57.17	171.52	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	77%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	74%	85%
23.	Kota		34.07	34.06	34.06	102.19	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	94%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	28%	75%
24.	Ajmer		34.11	20.46	13.64	68.21	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	95%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	3%	83%
25.	Udaipur		37.50	22.50	15.00	75.00	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	95%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	20%	67%
<b>Sub Total</b>			<b>337.66</b>	<b>239.05</b>	<b>189.79</b>	<b>766.50</b>			
26.	Churu	<b>Drainage</b>	3.16	1.90	1.27	6.33			
27.	Barn		0.50	0.30	0.20	1.00			

28.	Jhunjhunu		5.50	3.30	2.20	11.00			
<b>Sub Total</b>			9.16	5.50	3.67	18.33			
29.	Bhiwadi	<b>Green Space</b>	0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			Construction of at least 1 park & improvement in green coverage
30.	Beawar		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
31.	Hanumangarh		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
32.	Gangapur City		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
33.	Hindaun City		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
34.	Sujangarh		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
35.	Bikaner		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
36.	Jodhpur		0.34	0.33	0.33	1.00			
37.	Alwar		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
38.	Bharatpur		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
39.	Sikar		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
40.	Dhaulpur		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
41.	Churu		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
42.	Baran		0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50			
43.	Chittorgarh	0.75	0.45	0.30	1.50				

44.	<b>Bundi</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
45.	<b>Bhilwara</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
46.	<b>Sriganganagar</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
47.	<b>Pali</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
48.	<b>Jhunjhunu</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
49.	<b>Kishangarh</b>		0.75	0.45	0.30	<b>1.50</b>			
50.	<b>Jaipur</b>		0.34	0.33	0.33	<b>1.00</b>			
51.	<b>Kota</b>		0.34	0.33	0.33	<b>1.00</b>			
52.	<b>Ajmer</b>		0.50	0.30	0.20	<b>1.00</b>			
53.	<b>Jhalawar</b>		1.00	0.60	0.40	<b>2.00</b>			
<b>Sub Total</b>			<b>17.52</b>	<b>10.89</b>	<b>7.59</b>	<b>36.00</b>			
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>555.86</b>	<b>381.65</b>	<b>294.63</b>	<b>1232.14</b>			

Important steps followed for preparation of SAAP are mentioned below.

## 1. Principles of Prioritization

The State has identified project based on gap analysis and financial strength of ULBs and chose those ULBs in the FY 2016-17 that have higher gaps in water supply and sewerage sectors. While prioritizing projects, universal coverage of water supply and sewerage has been given top priority. In the towns, where water supply service level is sufficient, sewerage projects are considered. In the towns, where water supply level is low, there priority is given to water supply projects. In some towns, where water supply and sewer both service levels are low, in those towns, both water supply and sewerage projects are considered simultaneously. The analysis showing

“Principle of Prioritization”, which has been adopted during prioritization of projects for current financial year is also enclosed at Annexure - I. Information responding to the following questions, in words, has been 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, DLRMC and concerned ULBs were consulted prior to allocation of funds to different sectors. The allocation of funds given in the SAAP is based on discussions held with DLRMC and concerned ULBs. As mentioned before, lot of consultation was carried out with ULBs and Parastatal agencies. Apart from discussions at State level with Mission Directorate, discussion was done with stakeholders in presence of MoUD officials on 4.9.2015, 30.11.2015, 21.3.2016, 25.4.2016, 11.5.2016, 30.6.2016, 15.9.2016, 25.10.2016 & 28.10.2016.

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

Yes, ULBs having poor financial positions have been given priority for allocation of funds such as Gangapur City, Churu, Hindaun City).

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



Yes, ULBs having high proportion of urban poor have been given priority for fund allocation, such as Jaipur Rs. 224.02 Cr, Kota Rs. 174.94 Cr., Bikaner Rs. 151.03 Cr., Jodhpur Rs. 112.50 Cr., Baran Rs. 166.81 Cr. and Chittorgarh Rs. 145.39 Cr.

- **Has the potential Smart cities been given preference? Please give list. (150 words)**

Yes, 4 cities namely Jaipur, Kota, Udaipur & Ajmer have been selected in Smart Cities Mission for preparation of smart city proposal. While preparing SLIP, it has been kept in consideration and infrastructure gaps in Smart Cities have been taken on priority; provision for sewerage works has been taken in all 4 smart cities.

- **What is the quantum of Central Assistance (CA) allocated to the State during 2016-17? (100 words)**

Total sum of Rs. 121.584 Crores (Project funds Rs. 107.28 Cr. & A&OE Rs. 14.304 Cr.) have been allocated as Central Assistance to the State during 2016-17.

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

Yes. The amount under various GoI, GoR and externally finance schemes such as AMRUT is consistent with urban profile of the state.

## 2. Importance of O&M

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

Yes, Projects proposed in the SAAP includes O&M for 10 years for sewerage and water supply sector and 3 years for green spaces works. Provision of O&M is integral part of the original contract so that the agency/contractor who developed the assets shall be responsible for O&M. This concept shall also insist agency/contractor for good quality work. The O&M cost shall be borne by the State/ULB through user charges. If there will be any gap in recovery of user charges, same shall be borne by ULB.

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

O&M expenditures of the assets created are proposed to be funded through recovery of user charges, reduction in losses and other modes i.e. PPP, RWAs etc. If there will be any gap, the same shall be borne by ULB through its own resources/state support.

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

Though the focus of the state Govt. and ULB is to recover the O & M expenditure through user charges, however in some cases the gap of O & M expenditure will be borne by concerned ULB/State.

- **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, same shall be borne by ULB through its own resources.

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

State has proposed to recover O & M by ULBs through imposing user charges. However user charges may not be sufficient to recover entire O and M cost, for which innovative proposals like energy saving projects, reuse of treated waste,

reduction in NRW and other losses have been considered. One sewerage project has been designed on highbred annuity basis. The gap if still remains, shall be filled through ULBs fund/State support

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

State has proposed to recover O & M by ULBs through imposing user charges. However user charges may not be sufficient to recover entire O & M cost, for which innovative proposals like energy saving projects, reuse of treated waste, reduction in NRW and other losses have been considered. The gap if still remains, shall be filled through ULBs fund/State support

### 3. Financing of Projects

Financing is an important element of the SAAP. Each state has been given the maximum share which will be given by the Central Government. Information responding to the following questions regarding financing of the projects proposed under AMRUT has been, indicated against each question:

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

State has agreed to provide 30% matching share for cities having population less than 10 lacs & 33.33% for cities having population above 10 lacs.

- **How the residual financing (over and above Central Government share) is shared between the States, ULBs? (200 words)**

As per the mission guidelines Gol is providing 50% assistance for the mission cities having population upto 10 lacs and 1/3 assistance for mission cities having population above 10 lacs. State govt. will contribute 30% matching share from its own resources remaining share shall be arranged by respective ULBs through their own resources (SFC/TFC grants etc.) or through financing from financial institutions like HUDCO/ PMDO Fund managed by IL&FS / Municipal Bonds. ULB share can

be contributed through MLA/MP led funds also.

- **Has any other sources identified by the State/ULB (e.g. PPP, market borrowing)? Please discuss. (250 words)**

Yes. Alternate sources shall definitely be identified. At this stage exact details have not been worked out but looking to poor financial position of ULBs and lack of internal resources, it is imperative that ULBs will arrange finance from financial institutions like BRICS Bank/HUDCO/ PMDO Fund managed by IL&FS / Municipal Bonds. ULB share can be contributed through MLA/MP led funds also.

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

It has been attempted but if there will be VGF, the same shall be arranged by the ULBs through their own resources or funding/loan through financial institutions.

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

Yes, all possible dovetailing/convergence of ongoing/sanctioned projects under JnNURM, UIDSSMT, Smart City, ADB funded have been given due consideration during preparation of the SLIPs of the ULBs.

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

PPP is seriously under consideration. All the assets created will be under Operation and maintenance of 10 years period for which provision will be kept in the bidding document. The work shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who will have to be maintain and operate the created asset, for which O& M charges shall be borne by the ULB. State has prepared sewerage and waste water policy which is very soon expected to be promulgated after necessary approval at the component level. After the approval of policy, Treated sewerage effluent, which is the property of ULB would be auctioned/sold for agriculture/industrial/any other use as per the local demand according to the guidelines of policy. Proposal for reuse of treated effluent shall be prepared at

the time of DPR preparation. The policy has a provision to attract PPP investors for sewerage projects and suitable incentives have been included for prospective PPP entrepreneur.

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

PPP is seriously under consideration and has been detailed out during DPR & bid document preparation. The focus is not only on asset creation but on actual service delivery which shall be ensured by linking payment the performance and by linking to the service delivery at the door step level of citizen.

Table 1.1: Breakup of Total MoUD Allocation in AMRUT (Amount in Cr.)

Name of State: Rajasthan

FY 2017-20

Total Central funds allocated to State	Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total Given in column1 X 2)	Allocation of funds for AMRUT (Central share)	Multiply col. 3 by *3 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
55.79	44.46	555.79	-	616.07	1232.14

Note:- \*\* This is not applicable as no Central fund is declared for 2017-20.

**Table 1.2.1: Abstract-Sector Wise Proposed Total Project Fund and Sharing Pattern****(Amount in Cr.)**

Sl. No	Sector	Centre	State	ULB	Convergence	Others	Total
1	Water Supply	479.47	307.05	220.84	0	0	1007.36
2	Sewerage and Septage Management	994.09	644.28	469.38	0	0	2107.75
3	Drainage	14.92	8.95	5.96	0	0	29.83
4	Urban Transport	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
5	Green Space	38.25	23.95	16.80	0	0	79.00
6	<b>Grand Total</b>	1526.73	984.23	712.98	0	0	3223.94

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

(Amount in Cr.) FY 2017-20

Sl. No.	Sector	Centre	State			ULB			Convergence	Others	Total
		Mission	14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total			
1	Water Supply	191.48	-	126.23	126.23	-	93.60	93.60	-	-	411.31
2	Sewerage and Septage Management	337.64	-	239.07	239.07	-	189.79	189.79	-	-	766.50
3	Drainage	9.16	-	5.50	5.50	-	3.67	3.67	-	-	18.33
4	Urban Transport	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	-	-	0.00
5	Green Space	17.50	-	10.90	10.90	-	7.60	7.60	-	-	36.00
	<b>Grand Total</b>	555.79	-	381.70	381.70	-	294.66	294.66	-	-	1232.14



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

(Amount in Cr.) FY 2017-20

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	1007.36	-	-	-	-	-	-	105.55	-	66.87	66.87	-	47.53	47.53	373.93	-	240.18	240.18	-	173.30	173.30	
2	Sewerage and Septage Management	2107.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	230.71	-	145.47	145.47	-	102.85	102.85	763.41	-	498.80	498.80	-	366.52	366.52	
3	Drainage	29.83	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.64	-	1.59	1.59	-	1.06	1.06	12.27	-	7.37	7.37	-	4.91	4.91	
4	Urban Transport	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5	Green Spaces	79.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.97	-	5.01	5.01	-	3.52	3.52	30.27	-	18.95	18.95	-	13.28	13.28	
	Grand Total	3223.94	-	-	-	-	-	-	346.87	-	218.93	218.93	-	154.96	154.96	1179.87	-	765.29	765.29	-	558.02	558.02	

**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 Crs.)**

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
1	Bhiwadi	2	130.00	4
2	Beawar	2	138.53	4
3	Hanumangarh	1	6.98	4
4	Gangapur City	2	159.23	4
5	Hindaun City	2	112.21	4
6	Sujangarh	2	125.00	4
7	Bikaner	2	148.53	4
8	Jodhpur	2	110.00	4
9	Alwar	2	170.62	4
10	Bharatpur	2	129.66	4
11	Sikar	2	140.50	4
12	Dhaulpur	2	65.67	4
13	Sawai Madhopur	2	74.00	4
14	Churu	2	119.16	4
15	Baran	2	163.31	4

16	Chittorgarh	2	142.89	4
17	Nagaur	2	110.00	4
18	Bundi	2	146.36	4
19	Bhilwara	2	35.00	4
20	Sriganganagar	1	10.00	4
21	Pali	1	10.00	4
22	Tonk	1	10.00	4
23	Kishangarh	1	100.29	4
24	Jaipur	3	221.51	4
25	Kota	2	172.44	4
26	Ajmer	2	98.21	4
27	Udaipur	2	190.00	4
28	Jhalawar	1	75.00	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>3115.11</b>	

**Table 3.2: Sector Wise Breakup of Consolidated Investments for all ULBs in the State  
(FY 2015-16 to 2019-20)**

(Amount in Crore)

Sr. No.	Name of ULBs	Water Supply	Sewerage & Septage mgmt	Drainage	Urban Transport	Others (Green Space, Parks etc.)	Total	Reforms incentive @ 10%	Grand Total
1	Bhiwadi	20.00	110.00			2.50	132.50	13.25	145.75
2	Beawar	28.53	110.00			2.50	141.03	14.10	155.13
3	Hanumangarh	0	6.98			2.50	9.48	0.95	13.43
4	Gangapur City	59.81	99.42			2.50	161.73	16.17	177.90
5	Hindaun City	20.57	91.64			2.50	114.71	11.47	126.18
6	Sujangarh	25.00	100.00			2.50	127.50	12.75	140.25
7	Bikaner	34.95	113.58			2.50	151.03	15.10	166.13
8	Jodhpur	25.00	85.00			2.50	112.50	11.25	123.75
9	Alwar	90.62	80.00			2.50	173.12	17.31	190.43

10	Bharatpur	50.00	79.66		2.50	132.16	13.22	145.38
11	Sikar	30.50	110.00		2.50	143.00	14.30	157.30
12	Dhaulpur	41.67	24.00		2.50	68.17	6.82	74.99
13	Sawai Madhopur	50.00	24.00		4.00	78.00	7.80	85.80
14	Churu	20.79	98.37	6.33	2.50	127.99	12.80	140.79
15	Baran	78.31	85.00	1.00	2.50	166.81	16.81	183.49
16	Chittorgarh	55.00	87.89		2.50	145.39	14.54	159.93
17	Nagaur	50.00	60.00		2.50	112.50	11.25	123.75
18	Bundi	46.36	100.00		2.50	148.86	14.89	163.75
19	Bhilwara	25.00	10.00		2.50	37.50	3.75	41.25
20	Sriganganagar	0.00	10.00		2.50	12.50	1.25	13.75
21	Pali	0.00	10.00		2.50	12.50	1.25	13.75
22	Tonk	0.00	10.00		5.00	15.00	1.50	16.50
23	Jhunjhunu	0.00	0.00	11.00	2.50	13.50	1.35	14.85
24	Kishangarh	0.00	100.29		2.50	102.79	10.28	113.07
25	Jaipur	50.00	171.52		2.50	224.02	22.40	246.42

26	Kota	70.25	102.19			2.50	174.94	17.49	192.43
27	Ajmer	30.00	68.21			2.50	100.71	10.07	110.78
28	Udaipur	30.00	160.00	11.50		5.00	206.50	20.65	227.15
29	Jhalawar	75.00	0.00			2.50	77.50	7.75	85.25
	Total Project Cost	1007.36	2107.75	29.83	0.00	79.00	3223.94	322.39	3546.33
								A & OE @ 8%	283.71
								GRAND TOTAL	3830.04

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

(Amount in Cr.)

Name of City	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any) from							Proposed Spending during Current						Balance Carry Forward for Next							
		Previous year							Financial year						Financial Years							
		Centr e	State			ULB			Cen	State			ULB			Centr e	State			ULB		
			14th	Oth	Tot	14th	her	Tot		14th	her s	Tot al	1	he rs	Total		1	hers	Total	14th	hers	Total
Bhiwadi	132.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.73	-	11.84	11.84	-	7.89	7.89	46.53	-	27.92	27.92	-	18.61	18.61	
Bewar	141.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.00	-	12.60	12.60	-	8.40	8.40	49.51	-	29.71	29.71	-	19.80	19.80	
Hanumangar	9.48	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.27	-	0.76	0.76	-	0.51	0.51	3.47	-	2.08	2.08	-	1.39	1.39	
Gangapur	161.73	-	-	-	-	-	-	24.11	-	14.47	14.47	-	9.64	9.64	56.76	-	34.05	34.05	-	22.70	22.70	
Hindaun City	114.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.00	-	9.00	9.00	-	6.00	6.00	42.36	-	25.41	25.41	-	16.94	16.94	
Sujargarh	127.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.98	-	11.39	11.39	-	7.59	7.59	44.78	-	26.87	26.87	-	17.91	17.91	
Bikaner	151.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.65	-	4.59	4.59	-	3.06	3.06	67.86	-	40.72	40.72	-	27.15	27.15	
Jodhpur	112.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.52	-	9.52	9.52	-	9.52	9.52	27.98	-	27.98	27.98	-	27.98	27.98	
Alwar	173.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.82	-	15.49	15.49	-	10.33	10.33	60.74	-	36.45	36.45	-	24.30	24.30	
Bharatpur	132.16	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.67	-	8.80	8.80	-	5.87	5.87	51.41	-	30.84	30.84	-	20.56	20.56	
Sikar	143	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.30	-	12.78	12.78	-	8.52	8.52	50.20	-	30.12	30.12	-	20.08	20.08	
Dhaulpur	68.17	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.68	-	4.61	4.61	-	3.07	3.07	26.41	-	15.85	15.85	-	10.56	10.56	
Sawai Madhopur	78	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.30	-	2.58	2.58	-	1.72	1.72	34.70	-	20.82	20.82	-	13.88	13.88	

<b>Churu</b>	127.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.34	-	9.80	9.80	-	6.53	6.53	47.66	-	28.60	28.60	-	19.06	19.06
<b>Baran</b>	166.81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24.77	-	14.86	14.86	-	9.91	9.91	58.63	-	35.18	35.18	-	23.45	23.45
<b>Chittorgarh</b>	145.39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.16	-	12.10	12.10	-	8.06	8.06	52.54	-	31.52	31.52	-	21.01	21.01
<b>Nagaur</b>	112.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.88	-	10.13	10.13	-	6.75	6.75	39.38	-	23.63	23.63	-	15.75	15.75
<b>Bundi</b>	148.86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.41	-	10.44	10.44	-	6.96	6.96	57.02	-	34.21	34.21	-	22.81	22.81
<b>Bhilwara</b>	37.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.48	-	2.69	2.69	-	1.79	1.79	14.28	-	8.57	8.57	-	5.71	5.71
<b>Sriganganaga</b>	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.73	-	0.44	0.44	-	0.29	0.29	5.53	-	3.32	3.32	-	2.21	2.21
<b>Pali</b>	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.73	-	0.44	0.44	-	0.29	0.29	5.53	-	3.32	3.32	-	2.21	2.21
<b>Tonk</b>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.25	-	0.75	0.75	-	0.50	0.50	6.25	-	3.75	3.75	-	2.50	2.50
<b>Jhunjhunu</b>	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.78	-	0.47	0.47	-	0.31	0.31	5.98	-	3.59	3.59	-	2.39	2.39
<b>Kishangarh</b>	102.79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.24	-	3.14	3.14	-	2.10	2.10	46.16	-	27.69	27.69	-	18.46	18.46
<b>Jaipur</b>	224.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.57	-	7.57	7.57	-	7.57	7.57	67.11	-	67.11	67.11	-	67.11	67.11
<b>Kota</b>	174.94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.95	-	9.95	9.95	-	9.95	9.95	48.37	-	48.37	48.37	-	48.37	48.37
<b>Ajmer</b>	100.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.19	-	3.11	3.11	-	2.07	2.07	45.17	-	27.10	27.10	-	18.07	18.07
<b>Udaipur</b>	206.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.48	-	12.29	12.29	-	8.19	8.19	82.78	-	49.67	49.67	-	33.11	33.11
<b>Jhalawar</b>	77.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.93	-	2.36	2.36	-	1.57	1.57	34.83	-	20.90	20.90	-	13.93	13.93
<b>Total</b>	3223.94								<b>346.86</b>		218.93	218.93		154.96	154.96	1179.87		765.30	765.30		558.02	558.02



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

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets (Increment from the Baseline value)					
				FY 2016		FY - 2017	FY - 2018	FY - 2019	FY - 2020
				H1	H2				
<b>Water Supply</b>									
i	1007.36	House hold level coverage of water supply connections	69.20	3.00	5.00	10.00	9.00	4.00	
ii		Per capita quantum of water supplied in lpcd	92.40			7.00	23.00	13.00	
iii		Quality of water supplied	84.40			4.00	6.00	6.00	
<b>Sewerage and Septage management</b>									
i	2107.5	Coverage of latrines (individual or community)	88.10	3.00	6.00	3.00			
ii		Coverage of Sewerage Network services	10.40		5.00	20.00	35.00	25.00	
iii		Efficiency of collection of sewage	8.90		5.00	20.00	35.00	25.00	
iv		Efficiency in treatment	10.10		5.00	25.00	35.00	25.00	
<b>Drainage</b>									

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets (Increment from the Baseline value)					
				FY 2016		FY - 2017	FY - 2018	FY - 2019	FY - 2020
				H1	H2				
1	29.83	Coverage of storm drainage network	29.10	7.00	15.00	17.00	17.00	15.00	

### Urban Transportation

1	20.80	Service coverage of urban transport in the city	These indicators are proposed for motorized transportation. Whereas mission emphasize on Non motorized transportation.
2		Availability of Urban transport per 1000 population	

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

State: Rajasthan

FY: 2016-17 to 2019-20

Sr. No	Items proposed for A&OE	Total Allocation	Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any) (2015-16)	Proposed spending for Current Financial year (2016-17)	Balance to Carry Forward		
					FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
1	Preparation of SLIP and SAAP	27.87	6.65	2.79	7.63	5.72	5.07
2	PDMC and Urban Transport DPR	50.76	-	5.08	15.22	15.23	15.23
3	Procuring Third Party Independent Review and Monitoring Agency	10.45	-	0.52	3.13	3.66	3.13
5	Publications (e-Newsletter, guidelines, brochures, IEC activities etc.)	20.90	-	1.04	7.31	6.27	6.27

<b>6</b>	Capacity Building and Training	53.64	-	4.29	17.16	16.09	16.09
	CCBP, if applicable	27.52	-	2.29	9.63	8.26	7.34
	Others (workshops & seminars)	11.25	-	1.13	3.38	3.94	2.81
<b>7</b>	Reform implementation	67.14	-	3.42	23.50	23.06	17.16
<b>8</b>	Others (SLNA charges)	14.19	0.35	0.99	4.26	4.26	4.34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>283.71</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>21.56</b>	<b>91.22</b>	<b>86.48</b>	<b>77.45</b>

Table 5.2: SAAP - Reforms, Type, Steps and Target for AMRUT Cities (FY 2016-17)

S. No.	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP	
				April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017
1.	E-Governance	<p>1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registration of Birth, Death &amp; Marriage,</li> <li>• Water &amp; Sewerage Charges</li> <li>• Grievance Redressal,</li> <li>• Property Tax,</li> <li>• Advertisement tax,</li> <li>• Issuance of Licenses,</li> <li>• Building Permissions,</li> <li>• Mutations,</li> <li>• Payroll,</li> </ul>	24 Months		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pension and e-procurement.</li> </ul>			
2.	Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of municipal cadre.</li> <li>Cadre linked training.</li> </ol>	24 Months		
3.	Augmenting double entry accounting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appointment of internal auditor.</li> </ol>	24 Months		
4.	Urban Planning and City Development Plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make a State Level policy for implementing the parameters given in the National Mission for Sustainable Habitat.</li> </ol>	24 Months		

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

**For Financial Year 2015-16 (Last financial year)**

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

S. No	Year	No of milestones	Maximum Score
1	1st year	28/24	240
2	2nd year	13	130
3	3rd year	8	80
4	4th year	3	30

**Incentive based grant release calculation:**

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

S. No	Name of ULBs	Maximum Score possible during the year	Score obtained ULB Wise
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Bhiwadi	280	240
2	Beawar	280	240
3	Hanumangarh	280	240
4	Gangapur City	280	240

5	Hindaun City	280	240
6	Sujargarh	280	240
7	Bikaner	280	240
8	Jodhpur	280	240
9	Alwar	280	240
10	Bharatpur	280	240
11	Sikar	280	240
12	Dhaulpur	280	240
13	Sawai Madhopur	280	240
14	Churu	280	240
15	Baran	280	240
16	Chittorgarh	280	240
17	Nagaur	280	240
18	Bundi	280	240
19	Bhilwara	280	240
20	Sriganganagar	280	240
21	Pali	280	240
22	Tonk	280	240
23	Jhunjhunu	280	240
24	Kishangarh	280	240
25	Jaipur	280	240
26	Kota	280	240
27	Ajmer	280	240
28	Udaipur	280	240
29	Jhalawar	280	240
Subtotal ULB			280



	State		
1	Rajasthan	280	240
Subtotal State		280	240
Overall		<b>280</b>	<b>240</b>

Step2: Calculate the overall score in percentage obtained by the state(State score plus ULB score).

Step3: Only those States achieving 70 percent and above over all reform score will be considered for incentive.

Step4: 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

State: Rajasthan

FY: 2016-17

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

S. No	Name of the ULB	Total numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise					Name of the training institution (s) identified	Number of training programmes to be conducted	Funds required in current FY (in lacs)	
		Elected Representative	Finance Dept.	Engineering Dept.	Town planning Dept.	Administration Dept.				Total
1	Ajmer	60	4	31		4	99	CED	8	34.00
2	Kishangarh	45	2	7		2	56	IIHS	5	22.00
3	Beawar	45	1	4		1	51	ISPER	2	10.00
4	Alwar	50	2	10		1	63		5	16.00
5	Bhiwari	45	1	5		1	52		2	10.00
6	Bharatpur	45	2	12		1	60		5	22.00
7	Bhilwara	55	1	24		1	81		5	22.00
8	Bikaner	60	4	18		3	85		5	22.00

S. No	Name of the ULB	Total numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise					Name of the training institution (s) identified	Number of training programmes to be conducted	Funds required in current FY (in lacs)
		Elected Representative	Finance Dept.	Engineering Dept.	Town planning Dept.	Administration Dept.			
9	Bundi	45	2	7		1	55	5	22.00
10	Chittorgarh	45	1	14		1	61	5	22.00
11	Churu	45	1	5		1	52	2	10.00
12	Sujargarh	45	1	2		1	49	2	10.00
13	Dholpur	23	1	6		1	53	1	5.00
14	Baran	45	1	6		1	53	2	10.00
15	Ganganagar	50	2	10		1	63	5	22.00
16	Hanumangarh	45	2	12		3	62	5	22.00
17	Jaipur	91	13	155		21	280	22	91.00
18	Jhunjhunu	45	3	6		1	55	5	22.00

S. No	Name of the ULB	Total numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise					Name of the training institution (s) identified	Number of training programmes to be conducted	Funds required in current FY (in lacs)
		Elected Representative	Finance Dept.	Engineering Dept.	Town planning Dept.	Administration Dept.			
19	Jodhpur	65	5	68		5	143	11	47.00
20	Hindaun	45	1	3		1	50	2	10.00
21	Kota	65	2	62		6	135	9	38.00
22	Nagaur	45	3	5		1	54	2	10.00
23	Pali	50	2	19		2	73	5	22.00
24	Gangapur City	23	1	3		1	50	1	5.00
25	S.Madhapur	45	1	5		1	52	2	10.00
26	Sikar	50	2	11		1	64	5	22.00
27	Tonk	45	2	6		1	54	5	22.00
28	Udaipur	55	1	38		2	96	8	34.00

S. No	Name of the ULB	Total numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise					Name of the training institution (s) identified	Number of training programmes to be conducted	Funds required in current FY (in lacs)
		Elected Representative	Finance Dept.	Engineering Dept.	Town planning Dept.	Administration Dept.			
29	Jhalawar	35	1	6		1	43	4	18.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1451</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>2184</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>632</b>

## Form 7.2.2 Fund requirement for State level activities

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 (2017-18)
1	RPMC (SMMU)	-	-	-	9.63
2	UMC				
3	Others (e.g. workshops, seminars, etc), which are approved by NIUA				3.38
4	Institutional/Reform				23.50
<b>Total</b>					<b>36.51</b>

## Form 7.2.3 Total fund requirement for Capacity Building

S.No	Funds requirements	Individual	Institutional & SMMU & CMMU	Others	Total
1	Total release since start of Mission (2015)	-	-	-	-
2	Total utilized - Centre share	-	-	-	-
3	Balance available- Centre share	-	-	-	-
4	Amount required - Centre share	-	-	-	-
5	<b>Total funds required for capacity building in current FY (2017-18)</b>	<b>17.16</b>	<b>9.63</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>30.17</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?

Provisional credit rating of all the following 29 Mission towns have been done, details given as under:

SN	ULB	Credit Rating Assigned	SN	ULB	Credit Rating Assigned	SN	ULB	Credit Rating Assigned
1	Bharatpur	BBB-	11	Alwar	BBB+	21	Jaipur	A-
2	Bikaner	BBB-	12	Beawar	BBB+	22	Kota	BBB+
3	Sriganganagar	BBB-	13	Bhiwadi	A-	23	Udaipur	BBB+
4	Hanumangarh	BBB-	14	Jodhpur	BB	24	Ajmer	BBB+
5	Dholpur	BB+	15	Jhunjhunu	A	25	Bhilwara	BBB-
6	Gangapur City	BB+	16	Kishangarh	A+	26	Bundi	BB
7	Swai-Madhupur	BB+	17	Nagaur	BBB+	27	Chittaurgarh	BB
8	Churu	BB	18	Pali	BB+	28	Jhalawar	BB-
9	Sujargarh	BB	19	Sikar	BB+	29	Baran	BB-
10	Hindaun City	BB	20	Tonk	BBB			

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**

Table 7.4: Quarterly Score Cards for States Financial and physical Progress on Capacity Building (State Level)

Total number of ULBs: 29

Quarter ending- June 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	Proportionate target upto quarter _____		
	Individual training	2184	350	-	-	114	-
<b>Above</b> _____	Institutional Capacity Building	29	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Below</b> _____	RPMC and UMC	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other - specify	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other - specify	-	-	-	-	-	-

## PRINCIPLE OF PRIORITIZATION

## Water Supply Projects

FY 2017-20

S.No	Name of the City	House hold level coverage of water supply connections in %	Per capita quantum of water supplied in lpcd	Project cost demanded by cities under AMRUT (In Crs.)	Priority No of the project
1.	Hindaun City	55	49	20.57	1
2.	Bikaner	75.5	135	34.95	1
3.	Jodhpur	77	135	25.00	1
4.	Bharatpur	59.35	90	50.00	1
5.	Sawai Madhopur	66	70	50.00	1
6.	Churu	82.25	108	20.79	1
7.	Chittorgarh	61.3	85	15.00	1

8.	Jaipur	70.60	130	50.00	1
9.	Kota	78	150	10.00	1
10.	Ajmer	82.10	110	30.00	1
11.	Udaipur	81.30	110	30.00	1
12.	Jhalawar	65	100	75.00	1

\* Per capita water supply is more than 100 lpcd and household coverage is above 75%. The universal coverage in these will be managed by internal sources or other schemes going in these towns. Else these cities may be priotize under AMRUT in subsequent years

\*\*The quality of available water is poor having high TDS. Potable water availability is only 24lpcd.

**Sewerage and Septage  
Management**

**FY 2017-20**

S. No.	Name of City	Per capita quantum of water supplied in lpcd	Sewerage and Septage Management			
			Coverage of latrines	Coverage of Sewerage Network services	Project cost demanded by cities under AMRUT	Priority of the project
			Existing	Existing	in Cr.	
1	Bikaner	135	93	75	113.58	1
2	Dhaulpur	70	89	0	24.00	1
3	Sawai Madhopur	70	96	0	24.00	1
4	Bundi	100	97.32	0	47.71	1
5	Bhilwara	68	84.61	0	10.00	1
6	Sriganganagar	130	96.80	0	10.00	1
7	Pali	95	89.10	0	10.00	1
8	Tonk	80	60	0	10.00	1
9	Kishangarh	70	92	0	100.29	1

10	Jaipur	130	77	74	171.52	1
11	Kota	150	94	28	102.19	1
12	Ajmer	110	95	3	68.21	1
13	Udaipur	110	95.35	20.30	75.00	1

\* The project will be taken up after property connection of sewerage network existing/ongoing



Submitted by:  
**Department of Local Self Government, GoR**  
State Level Nodal Agency:  
**RUDSICO**  
Old Working Women Hostel, Near Police Head Quarter,  
Lal Kothi, **Jaipur, Rajasthan**  
PH: 0141- 2742240/ 2742538  
Fax: 0141 – 2740771  
Email: [ruifdco@gmail.com](mailto:ruifdco@gmail.com)  
Web: [www.ruifdco.rajasthan.gov.in](http://www.ruifdco.rajasthan.gov.in)