

STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) (FY2016-17)

State- Tamil Nadu



TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHpsc) Meeting _____ 6

Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary _____ 7

1.1 BACKGROUND _____ 7

1.2 THRUST AREAS _____ 7

1.3 COVERAGE OF CITIES UNDER MISSION _____ 7

1.4 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND FUNDING ALLOCATION _____ 8

Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs _____ 1

2.1 Project Progress _____ 1

2.2 Service Levels _____ 4

2.3 Capacity Building _____ 7

2.4 Reforms _____ 9

2.5 Use of A&OE _____ 12

2.6 Funds flow _____ 13

2.7 Funds disbursements and Conditions _____ 15

Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP) _____ 16

3.1 Principles of Prioritization _____ 23

3.2 Importance of O&M _____ 23

3.3 Reform Implementation _____ 24

3.4 Annual Capacity Building Plan _____ 26

3.5 A&OE _____ 28

3.6 Financing of Projects _____ 29

Chapter 4: TABLES: _____ 31

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

S.No.	Points of Consideration	Yes/No	Give Details
1.	Have all the Cities prepared SLIP as per the suggested approach?	Yes	As per MoUD Principles of prioritization, the SLIPs for all cities have been prepared. First Priority has been given to universal coverage of water supply and second has been given to sewerage system.
2.	Has the SAAP prioritized cities for investment as per priority sectors and gap assessment?	Yes	Prioritization has been done based on the Principles of MoUD for priority sectors and based on gap assessment
3.	Is the indicator wise summary of improvements proposed (both investments and management improvements) by State in place?	Yes	Indicator wise summary of improvements (both investments and management improvements) are summarized in the State Annual Action Plan.
4.	Have all the cities under Mission identified/done baseline assessments of service coverage indicators?	Yes	All the cities have identified service coverage indicators and incorporated in the Service Level Improvement Plan.
5.	Is the SAAP derived from an approach towards meeting Service Level Benchmarks agreed by Ministry for each Sector?	Yes	SAAP has been prepared to meet out the Service Level benchmarks agreed by MoUD for each sector.
6.	Is the investment proposed commensurate to the level of improvement envisaged in the indicator?	Yes	The investment proposed will improve the service level indicators to desired levels as envisaged in SLIP and SAAP.
7.	Are State Share and ULB share in line with proposed Mission approach?	Yes	As per AMRUT Guidelines, depending upon the size of the city the State Share and ULBs Share has been considered. At least 20% of fund contribution by

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

			the State.
8.	Is there a need for additional resources and have state considered raising additional resources (State programs, aided projects, additional devolution to cities, 14th Finance Commission, external sources)?	Yes	Action has been taken to converge the additional funds through State Programmes, 14 th Finance commission, TNSUDP, JICA and KFW.
9.	Does State Annual Action Plan verify that the cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments?	Yes	Cities have undertaken financial projections to identify revenue requirements for O&M and repayments for each project considered in the State Annual Action Plan.
10.	Has the State Annual Action Plan considered the resource mobilization capacity of each ULB to ensure that ULB share can be mobilized?	Yes	The State Annual Action Plan has considered the financial capacity of each ULB and if required, ULB share can be mobilized through other financial institutions.
11.	Has the process of establishment of PDMC been initiated and completed?	Yes	It is under tendering process
12.	Has a roadmap been prepared to realize the resource potential of the ULB?	Yes	The CDP/CCBP prepared for the ULBs has identified the road map to realize the resource potential of respective ULBs
13.	Is the implementation plan for projects and reforms in place (Timelines and yearly milestones)?	Yes	Timelines and yearly milestones are proposed in SLIP and SAAP.
14.	Has the prioritization of projects in ULBs been done in accordance with para 7.2 of the guidelines?	Yes	The projects for each ULBs has been prioritized based on the principles of AMRUT guidelines viz., gap analysis and financial strength of ULBs, consultation with local MPs, Mayors and Commissioners etc.,

Minutes of State High Powered Steering Committee (SHPS) Meeting

Chapter 1: Project Background and Summary

1.1 BACKGROUND

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

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

1.2 THRUST AREAS

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

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

1.3 COVERAGE OF CITIES UNDER MISSION

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

List of Urban Local Bodies

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

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

5	Cuddalore Municipality	18	Salem Municipal Corporation
6	Dindigul Municipal Corporation	19	Tambaram Municipality
7	Erode Municipal Corporation	20	Thanjavur Municipal Corporation
8	Hosur Municipality	21	Thiruvannamalai Municipality
9	Kancheepuram Municipality	22	Thoothukkudi Municipal Corporation
10	Karaikudi Municipality	23	Tiruchirappalli Municipal Corporation
11	Kumbakonam Municipality	24	Tirunelveli Municipal Corporation
12	Madurai Municipal Corporation	25	Tiruppur Municipal Corporation
13	Nagapattinam Municipality	26	Velankanni Town Panchayat
14	Nagercoil Municipality	27	Vellore Corporation
15	Pallavaram Municipality	28	Rameswaram Municipality

1.4 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND FUNDING ALLOCATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROJECT FUND -MoUD, GoI, vide OM No. K16012/04/2015/SC-IV dated January 20th 2016 has allocated an amount of Rs. 1582.80 Crores to Projects and A&OE of Rs. 42.208 Cr for Tamil Nadu.

Table 1.1 Breakup of Total MoUD Allocation in AMRUT

(Amount in Crores) – Year 2016-17					
Total Central Funds allocated to State (2016-17)	Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total given in column 1)	Allocation of Funds for AMRUT (Central Share)	Project proposal Submitted - CA	*State /ULB share	Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
1582.80	42.21	1582.80	1582.80	2251.60	3876.61

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

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

(Amount in Crores) – Year 2016-17							
S.No	Sector	No.of Project	Gol	State	ULB	Convergence	Total
1	Water supply	7	693.05	356.19	731.69	0.00	1780.93
2	Sewerage and Septage management	7	850.27	394.88	729.27	0.00	1974.42
3	Storm Water Drainage	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Non-Motorized transport	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green Space	25	39.57	15.83	23.74	0.00	79.14
Grand Total		39	1582.89	766.90	1484.70	0	3834.49

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

(Amount in Crores) – Year 2016-17									
S.No	Sector	Gol	State			ULB			Total
			14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total	
1	Water supply	693.05	0	356.19	356.19	0	731.69	731.69	1780.93
2	Sewerage	850.27	0	394.88	394.88	0	729.27	729.27	1974.42
3	Drainage	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	NMT	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green space	39.57	0	15.83	15.83	0	23.74	23.74	79.14
	Total	1582.89	0.00	766.90	766.90	0.00	1484.70	1484.70	3834.49

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

Sanctioned 2015-16 and proposed 2016-17funds

S.N.	Sector	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)							Proposed Spending during current financial year						Balance Carry Forward for the next Year							
			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB		
				14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total
1	Water supply	4927.97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402.88	0	276.59	276.59	0.00	306.13	306.13	1611.50	0	1106.34	1106.34	0	1224.53	1224.53
2	Sewerage	2008.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173.43	0	80.32	80.32	0.00	147.88	147.88	693.70	0	321.30	321.30	0	591.50	591.50
3	Drainage	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
4	NMT	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
5	Green space	147.62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.76	0	5.91	5.91	0.00	8.86	8.86	59.05	0	23.62	23.62	0	35.43	35.43
	Total	7083.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591.06	0	362.82	362.82	0	462.86	462.86	2364.25	0	1451.26	1451.26	0	1851.46	1851.46

Table 1.4 Abstract-Plans for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets					
				(Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY	FY	FY	FY
				H1	H2	2017	2018	2019	2020
Water Supply	1780.93	1.Household coverage of direct water supply connections	37.86%	43.16%	47.81%	49.89%	60.00%	71.78%	100.00%
		2.Per capita quantum of water supplied	73	73	78	88	99	116	135
		3.Quality of water supplied	76.44%	81%	84%	89%	93%	97%	100%
Sewerage	1974.42	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	72.22%	74.00%	77.50%	81.90%	88.40%	95.20%	100.00%
		5.Coverage of sewerage network services	30.22%	35.80%	42.60%	56.50%	70.00%	84.50%	100.00%
		6.Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	34.53%	40.39%	46.90%	60.90%	74.50%	86.80%	100.00%
		7.Efficiency in treatment	63.56%	65.62%	70.00%	79.67%	87.30%	94.40%	100.00%

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

S.no	Name of the City	Water supply	Sewerage	Drainage	NMT	Green space	Grand Total
1	Ambur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Avadi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
3	Chennai	723.96	482.72	0.00	0.00	13.19	1219.87
4	Coimbatore	0.00	322.83	0.00	0.00	5.28	328.11
5	Cuddalore	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
6	Dindigul	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
7	Erode	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
8	Hosur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
9	Kancheepuram	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
10	Karaikudi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
11	Kumbakonam	25.67	39.64	0.00	0.00	2.64	67.95
12	Madurai	437.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	439.94
13	Nagapattinam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
14	Nagercoil	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
15	Pallavaram	274.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	276.64
16	Pudukottai	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
17	Rajapalayam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
18	Salem	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
19	Tamparam	320.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	322.64
20	Thanjavur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
21	Thiruvannamalai	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
22	Thoothukkudi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
23	Tiruchirappalli	0.00	439.21	0.00	0.00	2.64	441.85
24	Tirunelveli	0.00	297.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	299.64
25	Tiruppur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
26	Velankanni	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	Vellore	0.00	348.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	350.64
28	Rameswaram	0.00	45.02	0.00	0.00	2.64	47.66
Total Project Investments		1780.93	1974.42	0.00	0.00	79.14	3834.49
A &OE						42.208	42.21
Grand Total						3876.70	3876.70

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

S.No	Name of the Cities	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)						Proposed Spending during current financial year						Balance Carry Forward for the next Year								
			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB		
				14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total
1	Ambur	110.04	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.00	0.00	4.40	4.40	0.00	6.60	6.60	44.02	0.00	17.61	17.61	0.00	26.41	26.41
2	Avadi	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
3	Chennai	1971.71	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	131.44	0.00	148.04	148.04	0.00	114.86	114.86	525.76	0.00	592.17	592.17	0.00	459.45	459.45
4	Coimbatore	784.39	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	52.40	0.00	37.40	37.40	0.00	67.08	67.08	209.58	0.00	149.61	149.61	0.00	268.32	268.32
5	Cuddalore	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
6	Dindigul	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
7	Erode	246.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.68	0.00	9.87	9.87	0.00	14.81	14.81	98.71	0.00	39.48	39.48	0.00	59.23	59.23
8	Hosur	148.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.88	0.00	5.95	5.95	0.00	8.93	8.93	59.51	0.00	23.80	23.80	0.00	35.71	35.71
9	Kancheepuram	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
10	Karaikudi	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
11	Kumbakonam	70.09	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.01	0.00	2.80	2.80	0.00	4.21	4.21	28.04	0.00	11.21	11.21	0.00	16.82	16.82
12	Madurai	762.08	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.67	0.00	34.75	34.75	0.00	66.99	66.99	202.69	0.00	139.00	139.00	0.00	267.97	267.97
13	Nagapattinam	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
14	Nagercoil	244.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.48	0.00	9.79	9.79	0.00	14.69	14.69	97.91	0.00	39.16	39.16	0.00	58.75	58.75
15	Pallavaram	278.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.88	0.00	11.15	11.15	0.00	16.73	16.73	111.51	0.00	44.60	44.60	0.00	66.91	66.91
16	Pudukottai	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
17	Rajapalayam	247.14	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.71	0.00	9.89	9.89	0.00	14.83	14.83	98.86	0.00	39.54	39.54	0.00	59.31	59.31
18	Salem	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
19	Tambaram	324.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.48	0.00	12.99	12.99	0.00	19.49	19.49	129.91	0.00	51.96	51.96	0.00	77.95	77.95
20	Thanjavur	179.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.98	0.00	7.19	7.19	0.00	10.79	10.79	71.91	0.00	28.76	28.76	0.00	43.15	43.15
21	Thiruvannamalai	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
22	Thoothukkudi	4.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.29	0.29	1.91	0.00	0.76	0.76	0.00	1.15	1.15
23	Tiruchirappalli	443.99	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.40	0.00	17.76	17.76	0.00	26.64	26.64	177.60	0.00	71.04	71.04	0.00	106.56	106.56
24	Tirunelveli	301.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.18	0.00	12.07	12.07	0.00	18.11	18.11	120.71	0.00	48.28	48.28	0.00	72.43	72.43
25	Tiruppur	234.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.48	0.00	9.39	9.39	0.00	14.09	14.09	93.91	0.00	37.56	37.56	0.00	56.35	56.35
26	Velankanni	35.85	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.59	0.00	1.43	1.43	0.00	2.15	2.15	14.34	0.00	5.74	5.74	0.00	8.60	8.60
27	Vellore	602.78	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.28	0.00	24.11	24.11	0.00	36.17	36.17	241.11	0.00	96.44	96.44	0.00	144.67	144.67
28	Rameswaram	47.66	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.77	0.00	1.91	1.91	0.00	2.86	2.86	19.06	0.00	7.63	7.63	0.00	11.44	11.44
		7083.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	591.06	0.00	362.82	362.82	0.00	462.87	462.87	2364.25	0.00	1451.26	1451.26	0.00	1851.47	1851.47

Chapter 2: Review of SAAPs

In Tamil Nadu, the SAAP 2015-16 has been prepared at a cost of Rs. 1372.42 and it has been approved by APEX committee. The implementation progresses are summarized below;

- Service Level Improvement Plan has been prepared at a cost of Rs. 49918.02 Cr.
- State Annual Action Plan has been prepared at a cost of Rs. 1372.42 Cr
- SAAP 2015-16 approved by State Level High Powered Steering Committee on 30.10.2015
- SAAP 2015-16 approved by APEX Committee – GoI on 26.11.2015
- Identified project components approved by State Level Technical Committee and SLHPSC on 29.01.2016

2.1 PROJECT PROGRESS

The physical and financial progress is reviewed. Please complete the following table and respond to the questions.

S.N.	Name of ULB	Approved SAAP		DPR	SLTC	Work Order	Implementation in Progress		Amount Disbursement Till Date
		Project Name	Amount Rs..Cr	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Physical (%)	Financial (%)	
1	Ambur	Water Supply	50.90	Yes	Yes	No	0%	20%	11.71
2	Chennai		954.00						205.31
3	Coimbatore		395.41						97.67
4	Erode		484.45						111.42
5	Hosur		87.91						20.22
6	Madurai		320.00						79.04
7	Nagercoil		223.44						51.39
8	Rajapalayam		180.05						41.41
9	Thanjavur		48.14						11.07
10	Tiruppur		250.00						57.50
11	Vellore		234.93						54.04
	TOTAL (A)		3229.23						740.78
B	SEWERAGE								
1	Velankanni		23.32	Yes	Yes	No			5.36
B	TOTAL (B)		23.32						5.36
C	GREEN SPACE								
1	Ambur		1.33	Yes	Yes	No			0.30
2	Avadi		2.06						0.47
3	Chennai		11.01						2.53
4	Coimbatore		4.28						0.98
5	Cuddalore		2.13						0.49
6	Dindigul		2.14						0.49
7	Erode		2.27						0.52

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

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

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

DPR has already been prepared for all the projects and approved by SLHPSC.

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

NA

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

State Level Technical Committee conducted on January 29th 2016, in which 11 Water Supply DPRs, 1 Sewerage DPR and 27 Green Parks DPRs were reviewed and approved.

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

NA

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

Due to the State Assembly Election, Election Code of Conduct was in force. The Urban Local Bodies were not in a position to proceed with the tenders for the sanctioned projects. The projects are expected to be tendered before end of June 2016. The proposed plan of action is summarized below:

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

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

Fund has not been utilized so far. There is no change in the funding pattern approved by the Apex Committee. Apart from the Gol share for the projects, the State Government is contributing 20% of project cost and remaining fund will be met by respective ULBs

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

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

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

Only one. It is proposed to execute Underground Sewerage project at Vellankanni Town Panchayat through Tamil Nadu water Supply and Drainage Board (TWAD). The ULB council has already resolved in this aspect.

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

As tenders for all the projects are yet to be received (except Thanjavur), the excess/ savings could not be assessed at present.

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

Nil. It has been planned to claim the second installment during September 2016 after the implementation of the projects.

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

Nil. Due to the State Assembly Election, Election Code of Conduct was in force and the projects could not be commenced till May -2016.

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

There are no projects taken up under PPP Model so far

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

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

2.2 SERVICE LEVELS

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

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline	SAAP Mission	For the last Financial Year	
		(as in 2015)	Target	Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Sector: Water Supply					
Coimbatore	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	44%	100%	44%	45%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	39	135	40	45
	Quality of water supplied	75%	100%	75%	77%
Rajapalayam	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	49%	100%	53%	54%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	58	135	61	61
	Quality of water supplied	60%	100%	70%	80%
Chennai	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	54.71%	100%	54.71%	60%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	75	135	75	77
	Quality of water supplied	92.38%	100%	94%	95%

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline	SAAP Mission	For the last Financial Year	
		(as in 2015)	Target	Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
Vellore	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	41%	100%	45%	50%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	60	135	60	65
	Quality of water supplied	60%	100%	60%	65%
Erode	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	38.62%	100%	45%	46%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	64	135	64	67
	Quality of water supplied	62.0%	100%	62%	65%
Hosur	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	38%	100%	39%	39%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	65	135	65	68
	Quality of water supplied	80%	100%	80%	83%
Madurai	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	53%	100%	53%	55%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	76	135	76	77
	Quality of water supplied	75%	100%	75%	80%
Ambur	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	53%	100%	53%	55%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	77	135	77	77
	Quality of water supplied	95%	100%	95%	95%
Thanjavur	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	54%	100%	54%	55%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	88	135	88	90

Name of City	Service Level Benchmark	SAAP Baseline	SAAP Mission	For the last Financial Year	
		(as in 2015)	Target	Target upto beginning of current FY	Achievement upto beginning of current FY
	Quality of water supplied	99%	100%	99%	100%
Nagercoil	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	57%	100%	57%	57%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	93	135	93	93
	Quality of water supplied	95%	100%	95%	95%
Tiruppur	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	76.46%	100%	78%	80%
	Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	110	135	110	112
	Quality of water supplied	95%	100%	95%	96%
Sector: Sewerage					
Velankanni Town Panchayat	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	12.60%	100%	13%	13%
	Coverage of sewerage network services	34%	80%	34%	35%
	Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	12%	100%	12%	13%
	Efficiency in treatment	18%	100%	18%	18%

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

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

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

DPRs have already been prepared and approved by the State Level High Powered Steering Committee. There is no DPR pending to be approved.

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

State Level Technical Committee conducted on January 29th 2016, in which 11 Water Supply DPRs, 1 Sewerage DPR and 27 Green Parks DPRs were approved.

2.3 CAPACITY BUILDING

There are two types of capacity building – individual and institutional. The Apex Committee had approved the annual capacity building plan and the SAAP of the current year has to review the progress of the capacity plan.

S.No	Name of ULB	Name of Department	Total number to be trained in Mission period	Target to be trained during the previous Financial Year	Number fully trained during the previous Financial Year	Name training institute
1	Ambur	Finance / Engineering/ Town Planning Administration	750	20	18	Engineering Staff College of India, Hyderabad and Tamil Nadu Institute of Urban Studies
2	Avadi		750	20	19	
3	Chennai		4750	100	121	
4	Coimbatore		2500	50	60	
5	Cuddalore		1450	50	20	
6	Dindigul		1500	50	57	
7	Erode		1500	50	64	
8	Hosur		750	50	20	
9	Kancheepuram		750	50	16	
10	Karaikudi		750	50	16	
11	Kumbakonam		750	50	18	
12	Madurai		1250	50	66	
13	Nagapattinam		750	50	17	
14	Nagercoil		750	50	19	
15	Pallavaram		750	50	18	
16	Pudukottai		750	50	19	
17	Rajapalayam		750	50	17	
18	Salem		1250	50	58	
19	Tambaram		750	50	18	
20	Thanjavur		1500	50	50	
21	Thiruvannamalai		750	50	19	
22	Thoothukudi		1500	50	52	
23	Tiruchirapalli		1500	50	61	
24	Tirunelveli		1500	50	49	
25	Tiruppur		1500	50	53	
26	Velankanni TP		250	10	13	
27	Vellore		1500	50	49	
	Total		33200	1300	1007	

17) 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)

Out of 1300 participants proposed, 1007 participants from the Departments viz Finance, Engineering, Town Planning and Administration have been covered under various capacity building programmes. The target was not fully achieved since implementation of the training programmes was kept on hold over pending finalization of Capacity Building Programmes under AMRUT. In addition to that, due to unprecedented rainfall in Tamil Nadu and the State Election, the officials of ULBs were deployed. Hence, there is a gap in capacity building component.

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

Nil

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

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

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

Yes, the participants were exposed to successful project sites on Solid Waste management and UGSS as follows:

Solid Waste Management

- 1) Jawahar Nagar Hyderabad: Segregation, Composting, RDF preparation, Secured land fill & disposal, Leachate collection and treatment.
- 2) Toopran, Hyderabad: Demo on Biogas generation using Cow Dung, Vegetable waste, Poultry & elephant grass - 1 Ton plant- Production of 15 kWh power -
- 3) Suryapet Municipality: Door to Door Collection, Source Segregation, Composting, Dump free, Litter Free, Dust free Municipality.

Underground Sewerage System

- 1) 39 MLD – UASB Technology , Hyderabad
- 2) 51 MLD SBR Technology, Attapur, Hyderabad,
- 3) 0.5 MLD – Gated Community waste water treatment for reuse on site. Hyderabad

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

A workshop at International level on “Smart Solutions for Urban Infrastructure Services” was organized on October 8th 2015. During the workshop National/ International experts were facilitated the sessions and showcased various smart solutions to be incorporated in Smart City Proposal. Around 200 participants have attended from various ULBs / parastatal agencies.

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

There are no pending activities.

2.4 REFORMS

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

S.No	Reform Type	Milestones	Target for the Last FY	Achievement for the last FY	Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent	Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent
1	E-Governance	1. Creation of ULB website.			27	
		2. Publication of e-newsletter, Digital India			27	
		3. Support Digital India(ducting to be done on PPP mode or by the ULB itself).			27	
2	Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre	1. Policy for engagement of interns in ULBs and implementation.			27	
3	Augmenting double entry accounting	1. Complete migration to double entry accounting system and obtaining an audit certificate to the effect from FY 2012-13 onwards.			27	
		2. Publication of annual financial statement of website			27	

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Reform Type	Milestones	Target for the Last FY	Achievement for the last FY	Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent	Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent
4	Urban Planning and City level Plans	1. Preparation of Service Level Improvement Plans (SLIP), State Annual Action Plans (SAAP)			27	
		2. Make action plan to progressively increase Green cover in cities to 15% in 5 years			27	
		3. Establish a system for maintaining of parks, playground and recreational areas relying on People Public Private Partnership (PPPP) model.			27	
		4. Develop at least one Children Park every year in AMRUT cities.			27	
5	Devolution of funds and functions	1. Ensure transfer of 14th FC devolution to ULBs.			27	
		2. Appointment of State Finance Commission (SFC) and making decisions.			27	
		3. Transfer of all 18 functions to ULBs.			27	
6	Review of Building by-laws	1. Revision of building bye laws periodically.			27	
7 (a)	Municipal tax and fees improvement	1. Atleast 90% coverage			27	
		90% collection			5	22
		2. Make a policy to periodically revise property tax, levy charges and other fees			27	

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Reform Type	Milestones	Target for the Last FY	Achievement for the last FY	Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent	Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent
		3. Post Demand Collection Book (DCB) of tax details on the website			27	
		4. Achieve full potential of advertisement revenue by making a policy for destination specific potential having dynamic pricing module			27	
7 (b)	Improvement in levy and collection of user charges	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 take care of the interests of the vulnerable			27	
		2. Make action plan to reduce water losses to less than 20% and publish on the website			27	
		3. Separate accounts for user charges			27	
		4. At least 90% billing			27	
		90% collection			5	22
8	Energy and Water audit	1. Energy (Street Lights) and Water Audit (including non-revenue water or losses audit)			27	
		2. Making STPs and WTPs more energy efficient			27	

S.No	Reform Type	Milestones	Target for the Last FY	Achievement for the last FY	Number of ULBs achieved 70 percent	Number of ULBs not achieved 70 percent
		3. Optimize energy consumption in street lights by using energy efficient lights and increasing reliance on renewable energy			27	

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

Yes

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

Yes. The claim for reform incentive has already been sent to Gol

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

Annual Budgetary Allocation on incentive for reforms to be communicated by Gol. It will be distributed to ULBs, as per the direction of State Level High Powered Sanctioning Committee.

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

Yes. The Plan of Action has already been prepared and RFP for Water Audit and Energy Audit to be floated end of June 2016.

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

NA

2.5 USE OF A&OE

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

A&OE funds have been utilized viz.

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

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

Yes.

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

S.No	Particulars	Expenditure Amount Rs. In Cr.
1	2	3
1	State Mission Management	0.43
2	Conduct National Level Workshop on Smart Solutions	0.49
3	Conduct Residential Training Programme and visit to projects / utilities which are having best practices	0.24

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

Appointment of IRMA is in Tender stage

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

The likely date of appointment of IRMA will be July 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

No

2.6 FUNDS FLOW

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

S.N.	City name	Project name	Funds flow						Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			Gol		State		ULB/Others			
			Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
1	Ambur	Water Supply Projects	25.45	5.09	10.18	2.036	15.27	4.581	50.90	11.71
2	Chennai		314.82	62.96	494.10	98.82	145.08	43.52	954.00	205.31
3	Coimbatore		130.48	26.09	79.08	15.81	185.85	55.75	395.41	97.67
4	Erode		242.23	48.44	96.89	19.37	145.33	43.59	484.45	111.42

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.N.	City name	Project name	Funds flow							
			Gol		State		ULB/Others		Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
5	Hosur		43.95	8.79	17.58	3.516	26.38	7.914	87.91	20.22
6	Madurai		105.60	21.12	64.00	12.8	150.40	45.12	320.00	79.04
7	Nagercoil		111.72	22.34	44.68	8.93	67.04	20.11	223.44	51.39
8	Rajapalayam		90.03	18.00	36.01	7.20	54.01	16.20	180.05	41.41
9	Thanjavur		24.07	4.81	9.62	1.92	14.45	4.33	48.14	11.07
10	Tiruppur		125.00	25	50.00	10	75.00	22.5	250.00	57.50
11	Vellore		117.46	23.49	46.98	9.39	70.49	21.14	234.93	54.04
0	TOTAL (A)		1330.81	266.16	949.12	189.82	949.30	284.79	3229.23	740.78
B	SEWERAGE									
1	Velankanni	UGSS projects	11.66	2.33	4.66	0.93	7.00	2.1	23.32	5.36
B	TOTAL (B)		11.66	2.33	4.66	0.93	7.00	2.10	23.32	5.36
C	GREEN SPACE									
1	Ambur	Development of Green parks	0.66	0.13	0.27	0.053	0.40	0.11	1.33	0.30
2	Avadi		1.03	0.20	0.41	0.08	0.62	0.18	2.06	0.47
3	Chennai		5.50	1.10	2.20	0.44	3.30	0.99	11.01	2.53
4	Coimbatore		2.14	0.428	0.86	0.17	1.28	0.38	4.28	0.98
5	Cuddalore		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.13	0.49
6	Dindigul		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
7	Erode		1.13	0.22	0.45	0.09	0.68	0.20	2.27	0.52
8	Hosur		1.04	0.20	0.41	0.08	0.62	0.18	2.07	0.48
9	Kancheepuram		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
10	Karaikudi		1.08	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.65	0.19	2.16	0.50
11	Kumbakonam		1.09	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.65	0.19	2.17	0.50
12	Madurai		1.11	0.22	0.44	0.08	0.67	0.19	2.22	0.51
13	Nagercoil		0.99	0.19	0.40	0.07	0.59	0.17	1.98	0.46
14	Pallavaram		1.01	0.20	0.40	0.08	0.61	0.18	2.02	0.46
15	Pudukottai		1.03	0.20	0.41	0.08	0.62	0.18	2.07	0.47
16	Rajapalayam		1.13	0.22	0.45	0.09	0.68	0.20	2.26	0.52
17	Salem		0.97	0.19	0.39	0.07	0.58	0.17	1.93	0.44
18	Tambaram		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
19	Thanjavur		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
20	Thiruvannamalai		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
21	Thoothukkudi		1.00	0.19	0.40	0.07	0.60	0.17	1.99	0.46
22	Tiruchirappalli		1.07	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.64	0.19	2.14	0.49
23	Tirunelveli		1.36	0.27	0.54	0.10	0.82	0.24	2.72	0.63
24	Tiruppur		1.08	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.65	0.19	2.16	0.50
25	Vellore		1.01	0.20	0.40	0.08	0.60	0.18	2.01	0.46

S.N.	City name	Project name	Funds flow						Total funds flow to project	Total spent on project
			Gol		State		ULB/Others			
			Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed	Approved amount	Disbursed		
	Total		31.84	6.37	12.73	2.55	19.10	5.73	63.67	14.64
	Grand Total		1374.31	274.86	966.51	193.30	975.40	292.62	3316.22	760.78

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

Nil. The projects are only in Tender stage. First installment has been released to all ULBs.

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

NA.

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

Projects are in tender stage.

2.7 FUNDS DISBURSEMENTS AND CONDITIONS

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

There is no request made to Gol so far.

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

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

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

No.

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

There are no specific conditions suggested by the committees viz., Apex Committee, State HPSC and the SLTC.

Chapter 3: STATE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN (SAAP)

The SAAPs are aggregated from the SLIPs. Please fill out the Master Plan of projects (Table 3.1; pg.43) and the state level plan for achieving service levels (Table 3.5; pg.46 of AMRUT Guidelines). Also, in the table below please give the details of the projects sector wise that are being posed for approval to the Apex Committee.

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

S.No	Name of the AMRUT Cities (water Supply)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost Rs, in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
1	Chennai	3	723.96	4
2	Pallavaram	1	274.00	4
3	Tambaram	1	320.00	4
4	Kumbakonam	1	25.67	4
5	Madurai	1	437.30	4
	Total	7	1780.93	

S.No	Name of the AMRUT Cities (Sewerage)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost Rs. in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
1	Chennai	1	482.72	4
2	Coimbatore	1	322.83	4
3	Kumbakonam	1	39.64	4
4	Tiruchirappalli	1	439.21	4
5	Tirunelveli	1	297.00	4
6	Vellore	1	348.00	4
7	Rameswaram	1	45.02	4
	Total	7	1974.42	

S.No	Name of the AMRUT Cities (Green Space)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
1	Ambur	0	0.00	0
2	Avadi	1	2.64	4
3	Chennai	1	13.19	4
4	Coimbatore	1	5.28	4
5	Cuddalore	1	2.64	4
6	Dindigul	1	2.64	4
7	Erode	1	2.64	4
8	Hosur	1	2.64	4

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Name of the AMRUT Cities (Green Space)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
9	Kancheepuram	1	2.64	4
10	Karaikudi	1	2.64	4
11	Kumbakonam	1	2.64	4
12	Madurai	1	2.64	4
13	Nagapattinam	1	2.64	4
14	Nagercoil	1	2.64	4
15	Pallavaram	1	2.64	4
16	Pudukottai	1	2.64	4
17	Rajapalayam	0	0.00	0
18	Salem	1	2.64	4
19	Tambaram	1	2.64	4
20	Thanjavur	1	2.64	4
21	Thiruvannamalai	1	2.64	4
22	Thoothukkudi	1	2.64	4
23	Tiruchirappalli	1	2.64	4
24	Tirunelveli	1	2.64	4
25	Tiruppur	1	2.64	4
26	Velankanni	0	0.00	0
27	Vellore	1	2.64	4
28	Rameswaram	1	2.64	4
	Total Project Cost	25	79.14	

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets					
				(Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY	FY	FY	FY
				H1	H2	2017	2018	2019	2020
Water Supply	1780.93	1.Household coverage of direct water supply connections	37%	43%	47%	49%	60%	71%	100%
		2.Per capita quantum of water supplied	73	73	78	88	99	116	135
		3.Quality of water supplied	76%	81%	84%	89%	93%	97%	100%
Sewerage	1974.42	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	72%	74%	77%	81%	88%	98%	100%
		5.Coverage of sewerage network services	30%	35%	42%	56%	70%	84%	100%
		6.Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	34%	40%	46%	60%	74%	86%	100%
		7.Efficiency in treatment	63%	65%	70%	79%	87%	94%	100%

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S. No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share				Change in service levels		
			Govt	State	ULB/Others	Total	Existing	After project completion	
Water Supply									
1	Chennai	Source Augmentation / Distribution improvement	238.91	144.79	340.26	723.96	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	55%	100%
							Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	75	135
							Quality of water supplied	94%	100%
2	Pallavaram	source Improvement	137.00	54.80	82.20	274.00	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	45%	100%
							Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	30	135
							Quality of water supplied	99%	100%
3	Tambaram	Source improvement	160.00	64.00	96.00	320.00	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	42%	100%
							Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	72.00	135
							Quality of water supplied	55%	100%

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S. No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share					Change in service levels	
			Govt	State	ULB/Others	Total		Existing	After project completion
4	Kumbakonam	Distribution System Improvement	12.84	5.13	7.70	25.67	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	45%	100%
							Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	113	135
							Quality of water supplied	100%	100%
5	Madurai	Distribution System Improvement	144.31	87.46	205.53	437.30	Household coverage of direct water supply connections	53%	100%
							Per capita quantum of water supplied LPCD	76	135
							Quality of water supplied	75%	100%
Sewerage									
5	Chennai	Provision of UGSS for 8 added areas	159.30	96.54	226.88	482.72	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	80%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	75%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	95%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	65%	100%

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S. No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share					Change in service levels	
			Govt	State	ULB/Others	Total		Existing	After project completion
6	Coimbatore	UGSS to added area	106.5339	64.566	151.7301	322.83	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	87%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	30%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	50%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	75%	100%
7	Kumbakonam	Provision of UGSS	19.82	7.928	11.892	39.64	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	79%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	40%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	69%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	86%	100%
8	Tiruchirappalli	UGSS – Phase II area	219.61	87.84	131.76	439.21	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	80%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	25%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	26%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	69%	100%
9	Tirunelveli	UGSS – Phase I area	148.5	59.4	89.1	297.00	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	86%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage	25%	100%

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S. No	City name	Project name	Estimated cost and share					Change in service levels	
			Govt	State	ULB/Others	Total		Existing	After project completion
							network services		
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	25%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	100%	100%
10	Vellore	UGSS – Phase II area	174.00	69.60	104.40	348.00	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	73%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	25%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	7%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	100%	100%
11	Rameswaram	UGSS to entire city	22.51	9.00	13.51	45.02	Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	44%	100%
							Coverage of sewerage network services	0%	100%
							Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	0%	100%
							Efficiency in treatment	0%	100%

3.1 PRINCIPLES OF PRIORITIZATION

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

Yes. The Service Level Improvement Plan has been presented before the elected representatives and Commissioners of respective Cities. A detailed consultation for prioritization of projects has been taken place for the year 2016-17. In addition to that, the State has analyzed the inter-ULB allocation based on gap analysis, financial strength of ULBs, priority to Smart Cities, and choose those ULBs which are having higher gaps in provision of drinking water supply and sewerage.

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

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

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

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

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

Yes. Out of shortlisted 12 Smart Cities, Six cities has been considered under this programme viz., Chennai, Vellore, Madurai, Coimbatore, Tirunelveli and Trichy

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

MoUD, GoI, vide OM No. K16012/04/2015/SC-IV dated January 20th 2016 has allocated an amount of Rs. 1582.80 Crores to Projects and for A&OE is Rs. 42.208 Cr for Tamil Nadu.

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

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

3.2 IMPORTANCE OF O&M

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The entire O&M cost has been proposed to meet out from the user charges and one time connection charges to be levied to the citizens.

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

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

3.3 REFORM IMPLEMENTATION

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

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

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

S.n	Milestones	Activities to be achieved	Implementation Time Line				
			April -Sept - 2015	Oct -2015 to March- 2016	April to Sept 2016	Oct 2016 to Mar 2017	
1	E-Governance	1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software	24 Months	E-Governance Modules under Preparation			
		Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage					
		Water & Sewerage Charges					
		Grievance redressal					
		Property Tax			Rolling out of software & testing		
		Advertisement Tax					
		Issuance of Licenses					
		Building permissions				Commissioning and Training	
		Mutations					
		Payroll					
		Pension and e-procurement					
2	Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre	Establishment of Municipal cadre	24 Months	Already in Place			
3	Augmenting double entry accounting	Appointment of internal auditor	24 Months	Local Fund Auditor already available			
4	Urban Planning and City level Plans	Make a State Level Policy for implementing the parameters given in the National mission for Sustainable Habitat	24 Months				
5	Devolution of Funds and Functions	Implementation of SFC recommendations within timeline	24 Months	Already in Place			
6	Review of Building Bye Laws	State to formulate a policy and action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than 500 square meters and all public buildings	24 Months	Already in place			
		State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rain water harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300 sq. meters and above.	24 Months	Already in Place			

8	Set-up financial intermediary at state level	Establish and Operationalize Financial intermediary-pool, finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds	24 Months	Already in Place			
9	Credit Rating	Complete the credit ratings of the ULBs	24 Months				
10	Energy and Water audit	Give incentives for green buildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges).					

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

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

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

No issues have been identified by HPSC.

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

Not Applicable

3.4 ANNUAL CAPACITY BUILDING PLAN

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

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

The following capacity building programmes were implemented under the scheme

- 1) Two days Training on 'Municipal Finance and Financial Affairs' was conducted through the Tamil Nadu Institute of Urban Studies, Coimbatore covering 363 participants in 12 batches.
- 2) A Five days Residential Training Programme on Sustainable Solid Waste Management Practices & its effective implementation for the officials of ULBs conducted covering 62 participants in 2 batches. Visits to the following successful project sites were arranged to the participants during the course of the training.

- Jawahar Nagar Hyderabad: Segregation, Composting, RDF preparation, Secured land fill & disposal, Leachate collection and treatment.
 - Toopran, Hyderabad: Demo on Biogas generation using Cow Dung, Vegetable waste, Poultry & elephant grass - 1 Ton plant- Production of 15 kWh power -
 - Suryapet Municipality: Door to Door Collection, Source Segregation, Composting, Dump free, Litter Free, Dust free Municipality.
- 3) Five days Residential Training Programme on Underground Sewerage Systems - Design, Operation & Maintenance for the officials of ULBs through the ESCI, Hyderabad covering 63 participants in 2 batches. Visits to the following successful project sites were arranged to the participants during the course of the training.
- 9 MLD – UASB Technology , Hyderabad
 - 51 MLD SBR Technology, Attapur, Hyderabad,
 - 0.5 MLD – Gated Community waste water treatment for reuse on site
- 4) A Two days' Hand-holding Workshop on the Preparation of Service Level Improvement Plan [SLIP] conducted at Hotel Rain Tree, Chennai in coordination with MoUD, New Delhi covering 196 participants.
- 5) One day International Level work shop on Smart Solutions for Service Delivery in Urban Local Bodies conducted at Hotel Fortune, Chennai covering about 300 participants.

A total of 1007 officials and staff of the ULBs have been benefited through these programmes at an expenditure of Rs.0.49 Crore.

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

No

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

There are no issues.

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

The training plan being sent to NIUA for vetting and approval

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

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

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

- ASCI, Hyderabad has been appointed as handholding agency for preparation of Smart City Proposal for the Smart Cities selection competition.
- Assisting in implementing the reform agenda focusing on outcomes, as given in AMRUT Reforms and identified indicators in the CCBP toolkit15.
- Providing all kind of support to the Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to be established under the Smart City Mission.
- Develop multi-layer GIS maps connected to data (attribute tables) in order to enable ULBs to use GIS for decision-making – Tender Process Initiated

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

Nil

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

There are no issues.

3.5 A&OE

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

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

(Rs. in Cr.)							
S.N	Items proposed for A&OE	Total Allocation	Committed Expenditure from previous year (if any)	Proposed spending for Current Financial year	Balance to Carry Forward		
					FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
	Building and Training - CCBP, if Applicable - Others						
6	Reform implementation	37.80	0	7.56	7.56	7.56	7.56
7	DPR Preparation	78.65	15.73	15.73	15.73	15.73	15.73
Total		210.37	15.73	41.97	41.97	41.97	44.06

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

Nil

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

There are no issues

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

Yes

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

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

3.6 FINANCING OF PROJECTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes. The SAAP has been prepared accordingly.

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

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

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

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

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

Yes.

Table 1.1 Breakup of total MoUD allocation for AMRUT

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

FY_2016-17

Total Central Funds allocated to State	Allocation of Central funds for A&OE (@8% of Total given in coloumn 1)	Allocation of Funds for AMRUT (Central Share)	Project proposal Submitted	State/ULB share	Total AMRUT annual size (cols.2+4+5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
1582.80	42.208	1582.80	1582.80	2251.60	3876.61

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

(Amount in Rs.) FY2016-17

S.No	Sector	No.of Project	GoI	State	ULB	Convergence	Others	Total
1	Water supply	7	693.05	356.19	731.69	0.00	0.00	1780.93
2	Sewerage and Septage management	7	850.27	394.88	729.27	0.00	0.00	1974.42
3	Storm Water Drainage	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Non-Motorized transport	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Green Space	25	39.57	15.83	23.74	0.00	0.00	79.14
Grand Total		39	1582.89	766.90	1484.70	0	0	3834.49

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

(Amount in Rs.) FY-2016-17

S.N	Sector	Total Project Investment	Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)							Proposed Spending during current financial year									Balance Carry Forward for the next Year					
			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			
				14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total		14th FC	Other	Total	14th FC	Other	Total	
1	Water supply	4927.97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402.88	0	276.59	276.59	0.00	306.13	306.13	1611.50	0	1106.34	1106.34	0	1224.53	1224.53	
2	Sewerage	2008.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173.43	0	80.32	80.32	0.00	147.88	147.88	693.70	0	321.30	321.30	0	591.50	591.50	
3	Drainage	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
4	NMT	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
5	Green space	147.62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.76	0	5.91	5.91	0.00	8.86	8.86	59.05	0	23.62	23.62	0	35.43	35.43	
	Total	7083.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591.06	0	362.82	362.82	0	462.86	462.86	2364.25	0	1451.26	1451.26	0	1851.46	1851.46	

Table 1.4: Abstract-Plan for Achieving Service Level Benchmarks

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets					
				(Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY	FY	FY	FY
				H1	H2	2017	2018	2019	2020
Water Supply	1780.93	1. Household coverage of direct water supply connections	37.86%	43.16%	47.81%	49.89%	60.00%	71.78%	100.00%
		2. Per capita quantum of water supplied	73	73	78	88	99	116	135
		3. Quality of water supplied	76.44%	81%	84%	89%	93%	97%	100%
Sewerage and Septage Management	1974.42	4. Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	72.22%	74.00%	77.50%	81.90%	88.40%	95.20%	100.00%
		5. Coverage of sewerage network services	30.22%	35.80%	42.60%	56.50%	70.00%	84.50%	100.00%
		6. Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	34.53%	40.39%	46.90%	60.90%	74.50%	86.80%	100.00%
		7. Efficiency in treatment	63.56%	65.62%	70.00%	79.67%	87.30%	94.40%	100.00%

2 As per SLB framework for water supply, sewerage, solid waste management and drainage and proposed SLB indicator for urban transport

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

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

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

FY 2016-17

(Amount in Rs.Cr)

S.no	Name of the City	Water supply	Sewerage	Drainage	NMT	Green space	Grand Total
1	Ambur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Avadi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
3	Chennai	723.96	482.72	0.00	0.00	13.19	1219.87
4	Coimbatore	0.00	322.83	0.00	0.00	5.28	328.11
5	Cuddalore	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
6	Dindigul	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
7	Erode	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
8	Hosur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
9	Kancheepuram	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
10	Karaikudi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
11	Kumbakonam	25.67	39.64	0.00	0.00	2.64	67.95
12	Madurai	437.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	439.94
13	Nagapattinam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
14	Nagercoil	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
15	Pallavaram	274.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	276.64
16	Pudukottai	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
17	Rajapalayam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
18	Salem	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
19	Tambaram	320.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	322.64
20	Thanjavur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
21	Thiruvannamalai	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
22	Thoothukkudi	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
23	Tiruchirappalli	0.00	439.21	0.00	0.00	2.64	441.85
24	Tirunelveli	0.00	297.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	299.64
25	Tiruppur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	2.64
26	Velankanni	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	Vellore	0.00	348.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	350.64
28	Rameswaram	0.00	45.02	0.00	0.00	2.64	47.66
Total Project Investments		1780.93	1974.42	0.00	0.00	79.14	3834.49
A &OE							42.21
Grand Total							3876.70

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

FY 2016-17

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

(Amount in Rs.)

S.No	Name of the Cities	Total Project Cost	Gol	State	ULB	Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)						Proposed Spending during current financial year						Balance Carry Forward for the next Year								
						Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB		
							14FC	Other	Total	14FC	Other	Total		14FC	Other	Total	14FC	Other	Total		14FC	Other	Total			
1	Ambur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
2	Avadi	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
3	Chennai	1219.87	402.56	243.97	573.34	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	80.51	0.00	48.79	48.79	0.00	114.67	114.67	322.05	0	195.18	195.18	0	0	458.67
4	Coimbatore	328.11	108.27	65.62	154.21	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	21.65	0.00	13.12	13.12	0.00	30.84	30.84	86.62	0	52.50	52.50	0	0	123.37
5	Cuddalore	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
6	Dindigul	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
7	Erode	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
8	Hosur	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
9	Kancheepuram	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
10	Karaikudi	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
11	Kumbakonam	67.95	33.97	13.59	20.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	6.79	0.00	2.72	2.72	0.00	4.08	4.08	27.18	0	10.87	10.87	0	0	16.31
12	Madurai	439.94	145.18	87.99	206.77	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	29.04	0.00	17.60	17.60	0.00	41.35	41.35	116.14	0	70.39	70.39	0	0	165.42
13	Nagapattinam	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
14	Nagercoil	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
15	Pallavaram	276.64	138.32	55.33	82.99	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	27.66	0.00	11.07	11.07	0.00	16.60	16.60	110.66	0	44.26	44.26	0	0	66.39
16	Pudukottai	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
17	Rajapalayam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
18	Salem	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63
19	Tamaram	322.64	161.32	64.53	96.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	32.26	0.00	12.91	12.91	0.00	19.36	19.36	129.06	0	51.62	51.62	0	0	77.43
20	Thanjavur	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0	0.63

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Name of the Cities	Total Project Cost	Gol	State	ULB	Committed Expenditure (if any from Previous Year)						Proposed Spending during current financial year						Balance Carry Forward for the next Year								
						Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB			Center	State			ULB		
							14FC	Other	Total	14FC	Other	Total		14FC	Other	Total	14FC	Other	Total		14FC	Other	Total			
21	Thiruvannamalai	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0.63	0.63
22	Thoothukku	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0.63	0.63
23	Tiruchirappalli	441.85	220.92	88.37	132.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	44.18	0.00	17.67	17.67	0.00	26.51	26.51	176.74	0	70.70	70.70	0	106.04	106.04
24	Tirunelveli	299.64	149.82	59.93	89.89	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	29.96	0.00	11.99	11.99	0.00	17.98	17.98	119.86	0	47.94	47.94	0	71.91	71.91
25	Tiruppur	2.64	1.32	0.53	0.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.16	0.16	1.06	0	0.42	0.42	0	0.63	0.63
26	Velankanni	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
27	Vellore	350.64	175.32	70.13	105.19	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	35.06	0.00	14.03	14.03	0.00	21.04	21.04	140.26	0	56.10	56.10	0	84.15	84.15
28	Rameswaram	47.66	23.83	9.53	14.30	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	4.77	0.00	1.91	1.91	0.00	2.86	2.86	19.06	0	7.63	7.63	0	11.44	11.44
	Total	3834.49	1579.30	766.90	1488.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	315.86	0.00	153.38	153.38	0.00	297.66	297.66	1263.44	0.00	613.52	613.52	0.00	1190.63	1190.63

Table 7.4: Quarterly Score Cards for States

Financial and physical progress on capacity building (State level)

Quarter ending-March 2016

Total number of ULBs:28

Number of ULBs above/below proportionate target (from table 7.3 of AMRUT guideline)	Name of the department/position	Physical		Financial		Total number trained, if relevant, upto quarter	Total funds utilized upto quarter
		Total target in FY	Proportionate target upto quarter	Funds allocated in current FY	Proportionate target upto quarter		
above	Individual training	14180	530	15.20 Cr	2.36	1537	2.79 Cr
	Institutional capacity building						
Below	RPMC and UMC				0.14		
	Other- specify						
	Other-specify						

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

S.No	Name of the ULB (water Supply)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
1	Chennai	3	723.96	4
2	Pallavaram	1	274.00	4
3	Tambaram	1	320.00	4
4	Kumbakonam	1	25.67	4
5	Madurai	1	437.30	4
6	Total	7	1780.93	

S.No	Name of the ULB (Sewerage)	Total Number of Projects to Achieve universal Coverage	Estimated Cost in Crores	Number of Years to Achieve Universal Coverage
1	Chennai	1	482.72	4
2	Coimbatore	1	322.83	4
3	Kumbakonam	1	39.64	4
4	Tiruchirappalli	1	439.21	4
5	Tirunelveli	1	297.00	4
6	Vellore	1	348.00	4
	Rameswaram	1	45.02	4
	Total	7	1974.42	

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

Name of State – Tamil Nadu

Current

Mission Period- 2016-17

Proposed Priority Projects	Total Project Cost	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Targets					
				(Increment from the Baseline Value)					
				FY 2016		FY	FY	FY	FY
				H1	H2	2017	2018	2019	2020
Water Supply	1780.93	1.Household coverage of direct water supply connections	37.86%	43.16%	47.81%	49.89%	60.00%	71.78%	100.00%
		2.Per capita quantum of water supplied	73	73	78	88	99	116	135
		3.Quality of water supplied	76%	81%	84%	89%	93%	97%	100%
Sewerage	1974.42	4.Coverage of Latrines (Individual or community)	72.22%	74.00%	77.50%	81.90%	88.40%	95.20%	100.00%
		5.Coverage of sewerage network services	30.22%	35.80%	42.60%	56.50%	70.00%	84.50%	100.00%
		6.Efficiency of Collection of Sewerage	34.53%	40.39%	46.90%	60.90%	74.50%	86.80%	100.00%
		7.Efficiency in treatment	63.56%	65.62%	70.00%	79.67%	87.30%	94.40%	100.00%

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

FY:2016-17

Name of State: Tamil Nadu

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

Table 5.2: SAAP-Reforms Type, Steps and Target for AMRUT Cities FY-2016-2017

S.No	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP			
				April to Sep, 2015	Oct, 2015 to Mar, 2016	April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017
1	E-Governance	1. Coverage with E-MAAS (from the date of hosting the software) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration of Birth, Death and Marriage, • Water & Sewerage • Charges, • Grievance Redressal, • Property Tax, • Advertisement tax, • Issuance of Licenses, • Building Permissions, • Mutations, • Payroll, • Pension and e-procurement. 	24 months	E-Governance Modules are under preparation	Rolling out of Software and Testing	Commissioning and Training	
2	Constitution and professionalization of municipal cadre	1. Establishment of municipal cadre. 2. Cadre linked training.	24 months	Already in Place			
3	Augmenting Double entry accounting	1. Appointment of internal auditor.	24 months	Local Fund Auditor already available			

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP			
				April to Sep, 2015	Oct, 2015 to Mar, 2016	April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017
4	Urban Planning and City Development	1. Make a State Level policy for implementing the parameters given in the National Mission for Sustainable Habitat.	24 months				
5	Devolution of Funds and functions	1. Implementation of SFC Recommendations within timeline.	24 months	Already in Place			
6	Review of Building by-laws	1. State to formulate a policy And action plan for having a solar roof top in all buildings having an area greater than 500 square meters and all public buildings.	24 months	Already in Place			
		2. State to formulate a policy and action plan for having Rainwater harvesting structures in all commercial, public buildings and new buildings on plots of 300sq. meters and above.	24 months	Already in Place			
7	Set-up financial Intermediary at state level	1. Establish and operationalize financial intermediary- pool finance, access external funds, float municipal bonds.	24 months	Already in Place			
8	Credit Rating	1. Complete the credit ratings of The ULBs.	24 months				

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Type	Steps	Implementation Timeline	Target to be set by states in SAAP			
				April to Sep, 2015	Oct, 2015 to Mar, 2016	April to Sep, 2016	Oct, 2016 to Mar, 2017
	Energy and Water audit	1. Give incentives for green buildings (e.g. rebate in property tax or charges connected to building permission/development charges).	24 months				

Table 5.5: SAAP- Self- Evaluation for Reporting Progress on Reform Implementation For Financial Year 2015-16 (Last financial year)

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

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

Incentive based grant release calculation:

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

S.No	Name of ULBs	Maximum Score possible during the year	Score obtained ULB Wise
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Ambur	280	260
2	Avadi	280	260
	Chennai	280	260
	Coimbatore	280	260
	Cuddalore	280	260
	Dindigul	280	260
	Erode	280	280
	Hosur	280	260
	Kancheepuram	280	260
	Karaikudi	280	280
	Kumbakonam	280	260
	Madurai	280	260

State Annual Action Plan (SAAP)

S.No	Name of ULBs	Maximum Score possible during the year	Score obtained ULB Wise
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Nagapattinam	280	260
	Nagercoil	280	260
	Pallavaram	280	260
	Pudukottai	280	260
	Rajapalayam	280	280
	Salem	280	260
	Tambaram	280	260
	Thanjavur	280	260
	Thiruvannamalai	280	260
	Thoothukkudi	280	260
	Tiruchirappalli	280	260
	Tirunelveli	280	260
	Tiruppur	280	280
	Velankanni	280	270
	Vellore	280	260
	Subtotal ULB	280	263.33
1	Average of State	280	263.33
	Sub total State	280	263.33
	Overall	280	263.33

Step 2: Calculate the overall score in percentage obtained by the state (State score plus ULB score). 94.05%

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

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

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –Tamil Nadu

FY- 2015-16

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

S.No	Name of ULB	Total Numbers to be trained in the current FY department wise						Name of the Training Institution Identified	No. of Training programmes to be conducted	Funds Required in Current FY
		Ele.Reps	Finance	Engineering	Town Planning	Admin	Total			
1	Ambur	30	30	180	30	30	300	1. ESCI, Hyderabad, 2. RCEUS, Lucknow 3. AILSG, Mumbai 4. ATI, WB 5. YASHADA, Pune 6. IMG, Trivandrum 7.IIHS, Bangalore 8.Dr.MCR HRD, Hyd 9.IIT, Roorkee 10. TNIUS, Coimbatore 11.IITM, Chennai 12. IRT, Chennai	19 training 278 batches	15.20 Crore
2	Avadi	30	30	180	30	30	300			
3	Chennai	30	30	1810	30	30	1930			
4	Coimbatore	30	30	580	30	30	700			
5	Cuddalore	30	30	180	30	30	300			
6	Dindigul	30	30	580	30	30	700			
7	Erode	30	30	580	30	30	700			
8	Hosur	30	30	180	30	30	300			
9	Kancheepuram	30	30	180	30	30	300			
10	Karaikudi	30	30	180	30	30	300			
11	Kumbakonam	30	30	180	30	30	300			
12	Madurai	30	30	580	30	30	700			
13	Nagapattinam	30	30	180	30	30	300			
14	Nagercoil	30	30	180	30	30	300			
15	Pallavaram	30	30	180	30	30	300			
16	Pudukottai	30	30	180	30	30	300			
17	Rajapalayam	30	30	180	30	30	300			
18	Salem	30	30	580	30	30	700			
19	Tambaram	30	30	180	30	30	300			
20	Thanjavur	30	30	580	30	30	700			
21	Thiruvannamalai	30	30	180	30	30	300			
22	Thoothukudi	30	30	580	30	30	700			
23	Tiruchirapalli	30	30	580	30	30	700			
24	Tirunelveli	30	30	580	30	30	700			
25	Tiruppur	30	30	580	30	30	700			
26	Velankanni TP	30	30	230	30	30	350			
27	Vellore	30	30	580	30	30	700			
	TOTAL	810	810	10940	810	810	14180			

Table 7.2: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State –Tamil Nadu

FY- 2015-16

Form 7.2.2 -Fund Requirement for State level activities

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

Table 7.2.3: Annual Action Plan for Capacity Building

Name of State – Tamil Nadu

FY- 2015-16

Form 7.2.3 -Total Fund Requirement for Capacity Building

Sl. No.	Fund requirement	Individual (Training & Workshop)	Institutional/ Reform	SMMU/RPMC/CMMU	Others	Total (In Crore)
1	Total release since start of Mission (2015)	-	-	-	-	-
2	Total utilisation-Central Share	-	-	-	-	-
3	Balance available-Central Share	-	-	-	-	-
4	Amount required-Central Share	15.20	5.25	-	-	-
5	Total fund required for capacity building in current FY 2015-16	15.20	5.25	2.14		22.59

Form 7.2.4 Details of Institutional Capacity Building

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

Already in place.

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

All the AMRUT Cities are willing to have a credit rating done. Based on the credit rating, the ULBs will decide to issue bonds.

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

Yes the state is willing to integrate all work done in GIS in order to make GIS based master planning. RFP has already been prepared and the State has planned to invite the bids during first week of July 2016.

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

Yes.

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

No

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table3.3:SAAP- ULB Wise Source of Funds for All Sectors (Amount in Rs.) GY-2016-17

S.No.	Name of the City	Center	State			ULB			Convergence	Others	Total
			14th FC	Others	Total	14th FC	Others	Total			
1	Ambur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
2	Avadi	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
3	Chennai	404.80	0.00	243.97	243.97	0.00	571.10	571.10	0.00	0	1219.87
4	Coimbatore	109.17	0.00	65.62	65.62	0.00	153.31	153.31	0.00	0	328.11
5	Cuddalore	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
6	Dindigul	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
7	Erode	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
8	Hosur	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
9	Kancheepuram	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
10	Karaikudi	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
11	Kumbakonam	33.97	0.00	13.59	13.59	0.00	20.38	20.38	0.00	0	67.95
12	Madurai	145.63	0.00	87.99	87.99	0.00	206.32	206.32	0.00	0	439.94
13	Nagapattinam	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
14	Nagercoil	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
15	Pallavaram	138.32	0.00	55.33	55.33	0.00	82.99	82.99	0.00	0	276.64
16	Pudukottai	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
17	Rajapalayam	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
18	Salem	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
19	Tambaram	161.32	0.00	64.53	64.53	0.00	96.79	96.79	0.00	0	322.64
20	Thanjavur	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
21	Thiruvannamalai	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
22	Thoothukkudi	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
23	Tiruchirappalli	220.92	0.00	88.37	88.37	0.00	132.55	132.55	0.00	0	441.85
24	Tirunelveli	149.82	0.00	59.93	59.93	0.00	89.89	89.89	0.00	0	299.64
25	Tiruppur	1.32	0.00	0.53	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.00	0	2.64
26	Velankanni	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
27	Vellore	175.32	0.00	70.13	70.13	0.00	105.19	105.19	0.00	0	350.64
28	Rameswaram	23.83	0.00	9.53	9.53	0.00	14.30	14.30	0.00	0	47.66
	Total	1582.89	0.00	766.90	766.90	0.00	1484.70	1484.70	0.00	0.00	3834.49

