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Background to the assignment

• Preparation of a Vision for the Karnataka in light of its current status
• **Study to facilitate objective sectoral allocations in the eleventh plan keeping in view the change in GoI priorities and priorities of the state**
• Project commenced in September 2007
• Analysis of the following sectors
  1. Healthcare
  2. Education – a) School & b) Higher
  3. Social Sector – a) Woman & Child; b) SC/ ST/ OBC/ Minorities etc.
  4. Agriculture and Allied Services
  5. Rural Development
  6. Irrigation & Flood Control
  7. Industry – Minerals, Construction & Manufacturing
  **8. Urban Development**
  9. Transport and Infrastructure
  10. Energy
Assignment deliverables

KD 1: Inception Presentation

KD 2: Perspectives, Dimensions and Strategies Paper

KD 3: Macroeconomic Profile & Comparative Analysis

KD 4: Position Papers for various sectors

KD 5 & 6: Enabling Strategy Papers

KD 7: Draft Vision

Cross-Cutting Themes; Development Models and Case Studies

Sectors

Assignment deliverables
Methodology & consultations

- Both primary and secondary sources
- Primary: Interviews and informal discussions
- Secondary: Primarily GoK publications & documents, KDR, KHDR, Task Force Report,
- National/international comparisons

We are grateful to the following people
- Mr. Jothiramalingam, Principal Secretary, UDD
- Mrs. Lakshmi Venkatachalam, Principal Secretary, Planning Dept.
- Mr. Subhash Chandra, Secretary, UDD
- Mr. Jawaid Akhtar, MD, KUIDFC
- Mr. Anjum Perwez, Director, DMA
- Mr. Lakshmipathy, Joint Director, UDD
- Mr. NRN Simha, DGM, KUIDFC
- Ms. Shambhavi Kamath, AGM, Environment, KUIDFC
- Dr. A. Ravindra, Chairman, Centre for Sustainable Development
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**Status Report on Urban Sector in Karnataka**

Role of Government

Key issues and challenges
Urbanisation in Karnataka

- Urban sector estimated to contribute 62% of GDP in India today (27% urban pop.). Contribution expected to be 75% by 2021.
- Karnataka - 4th most urbanised among major states (34% urban pop.); 219 ULBs

Largest Urban Agglomerations in Karnataka

Source: Provisional Pop. Totals, Census 2001, Series 30

Demographic Comparison of Urban and Rural Karnataka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2001 in lakhs)</td>
<td>179.19</td>
<td>348.14</td>
<td>527.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population share (2001)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decadal growth rate (1991-2001)</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
<td>12.05%</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Ratio (2001)</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sex ratio 0-6 yrs (2001)</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate in age: 7+ (2001)</td>
<td>81.05%</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
<td>67.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001

- Bangalore Urban has 32% of states urban population
- Unique aspect is presence of Urban corridors along the national highways
- Urban growth rate comparatively much higher than rural; points to significant rural-urban migration
- Sex ratio and CSR much lower than in rural areas
Rapid Urban Growth

- Urban growth rate Karnataka reduced slightly from 29.6% in the decade of 1981-91 to 28.85% in the decade 1991-2001
- Highest growth in Haveri, Bidar & Gulbarga.
- Negative growth in Udupi and Kodagu

Sources:
- Provisional Pop. Totals, Census 2001, Series 30

Spread of Census towns by Size

Comparison of rural-urban pop. Growth rate

- Growth concentrated in larger towns and cities. Both population and the number of Class I, II and III towns have increased.
- Urban pop. constituted only 12.6% (1901), has increased to 30.9% (1991) and to 34% (2001) to 36% (2007). Projections show this may touch 42.3% in 2026 (with 2.84 cr people)
Employment, Education and Wages

- Figure below depicts per 1000 distribution of usually working persons (principal + subsidiary) by broad industry division
- Employment structure in urban areas of state marginally differs from country average.
- **Marked difference in gender preference exists:** Males in state prefer employment in trade, hotels & restaurants, manufacturing, construction and transport industry; Urban females distinctly prefer employment in public administration, education and services, manufacturing and agriculture.

### Education specific WPR – Karnataka and India

- **Gender gap in employment:** the WPR of urban females (average = 181) is much lower than Urban males (average = 576), and also lower than rural females (average = 459)
- WPR increases with attainment of diploma and graduation, proving benefit of higher education
- State fares well on wage comparisons with other states

### Comparison of wages – Regular and Casual workers

Source: NSSO Employment Survey, 61st Round

Urban Development in Karnataka
PricewaterhouseCoopers
Poverty, Slums and Housing

- Urban poverty ratio of 32.6% in Karnataka is much higher than that of all the other states as well as the all India average.
  
  **Urban Poverty Levels across states: 2004-05**

- NSSO 58th round (2002) survey on condition of urban slums estimates 1983 slums with 4,83,828 households in class I cities in Karnataka. **This is around 20.5% of population of these 24 cities.**
- However, census 2001 reports 35 towns having slums with 7.8% of urban slum pop. Karnataka fares comparatively better than comparable states (except Kerala)

- **MDG no 7, Indicator no 32** is “Proportion of households with access to secure tenure”. In terms of households by tenure, only 54.6% of the houses in urban areas in state are owned while 42% are rented. (Rural: 91.2% owned)

- Around 1,50,170 houses (4.2%) in urban areas are temporary structures.

**Comparison of select states – Slum Population**

- **Urban Poverty Levels across states: 2004-05**
- **MDG no 7, Indicator no 32** is “Proportion of households with access to secure tenure”. In terms of households by tenure, only 54.6% of the houses in urban areas in state are owned while 42% are rented. (Rural: 91.2% owned)

- Around 1,50,170 houses (4.2%) in urban areas are temporary structures.
Water Supply

- **MDG no 7 indicator no. 30 specifically deals with water supply** – “Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source”.
- As per the census 2001, 92.2% of urban households in Karnataka have access to safe drinking water, compared to 80.9% households in rural Karnataka.
- Access to safe drinking water is still a major issue in four districts – Udupi (31.6% HH), Uttara Kannada (48.7%), Dakshina Kannada (61.1%) and Bidar (70.5%)
- State Water Policy 2002 identified drinking water as the highest priority for water usage, and in 2000, it got around 4.4% of total water demand in the state (with agriculture getting around 84%)
- Karnataka has **highest proportion (13.8%) of urban HH where the drinking water source is away from premises.**
- Strong regional disparity in access as all districts with >20% away location in NK
- **Taps constitute the dominant sources of drinking water in urban areas in the state.** However, **2,66,985 (nearly 7.5% - highest)** urban HH in Karnataka depend on tube well for drinking water – stress on resource

The municipal water supply in 75 out of 205 towns supplied by KUWSDB in 2002 already depends on ground water as a primary source
Sanitation

Type of drainage for wastewater in urban households

- Around 19% of the urban HH in the state lack any drainage facility; State is behind MAH and AP in this aspect
- MDG no 7 indicator no. 31 specifically deals with sanitation – “Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation”.

Urban households having sanitation facility within house

- As per census 2001, 75.2% of urban HH in Karnataka have access to toilets, compared to 17.4% HH in rural Karnataka. Significant improvement from 62.5% in 1991.
- Regional Disparity - Coverage of toilets still < 50% in 5 adjoining districts of Gadag (33.5%), Bagalkot (33.7%), Koppal (39.4%), Raichur (43%) & Bijapur (43.2%)

Source: Census 2001
Source: KHDR 2005
Solid Waste Management

- Most ULBs of Karnataka lack the physical and human capital to efficiently and effectively deal with solid waste.
- As shown in the figure, there exist huge gaps between MSW generated, collected, and treated scientifically.
- Only around 77% of the total waste generated is collected.
- The gap between the requirement and provision of composting in the state is wide, with a cumulative installed capacity of just 291 TPD across the state against a waste generation of 4312 TPD.

Other Major issues with MSW

- Door-to-door collection of MSW is carried out only in a few cities including Bangalore. Waste segregation is not practiced.
- There are no transfer stations; Transfer of waste into transport vehicles is manual.
- There are no prescribed standards for processing of compost due to heterogeneous nature of waste composition.
- Disposal of waste is carried out unscientifically.
- Expenditure in SWM is mostly in collection and salaries. Meagre amount left for treatment.
- Conservancy staff/rag pickers at high risk of infection.
- Shortage of staff has also led to poor service delivery levels.

Source: Status of Urban Infrastructure in Karnataka, KUIDFC
Domestic Energy

Cooking

- In 1991, about 73% of urban HH in Karnataka used fuels such as wood, dung, kerosene and coal for cooking.
- There has been a **marked reduction in firewood usage** from 55.5% in 1990 to 27.6% in 2001.
- Usage of firewood is least among southern states, but higher than 12.5% and 9.9% urban households in GUJ and MAH resp.
- Kerosene consumption has decreased from 26.5% in 1993 to 23.8% in 2001.
- LPG sales have almost doubled from 247656 metric tons in 1998-1999 to 413358 metric tons in 2001-2002.

Lighting

- Almost **90.5% urban HH in state use electricity** as primary source of lighting; State fares best among southern states, but trails MAH and GUJ.
- Traces of **regional disparity** in access as 8/10 districts with <85% access in N. Kar.
Urban Roads

a) Traffic Congestion
- Poor conditions of roads and inadequate road capacity are significant contributors to traffic congestion and vehicular pollution.
- Study for Bangalore Metro indicated that avg. speed in city is 10-12 kmph.
- Road density in most towns/cities is poor, resulting in a high ratio of vehicles to road length; Indicative in high number of accidents.

b) Obstruction/impediments on the road
- Potholes, depressions, waves etc cause hindrance. In addition, household waste and construction debris encroach roads.

c) Adjunct Infrastructure
- Safety enhancing features such as footpaths, signposts, medians, street lights, storm water drains and speed breakers need to be properly maintained which are form the lifeline of the roads.

d) Type of Roads
- Quality of road is critical.
- 35.7% of the roads in CMCs, TMCs and TPs are kutcha roads, whereas it is only 13.4% in CCs.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>9131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>4905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>3525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>2411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiastat

Motor Vehicle accidents in Urban Karnataka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Roads</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>TMC</th>
<th>CMC*</th>
<th>CC*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tar Road</td>
<td>1095.3</td>
<td>1408.8</td>
<td>3210.9</td>
<td>1977.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Road</td>
<td>711.6</td>
<td>1179.3</td>
<td>2811</td>
<td>388.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Road</td>
<td>1080.1</td>
<td>1524.3</td>
<td>3461.6</td>
<td>382.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CC except Bangalore & Belgaum; CMC except Shimga & Kolar

Source: Status of Urban Infrastructure in Karnataka, KUIDFC
Urban Road Infrastructure and Transport

Storm Water Drains
- Figure below compares length of storm water drains along the road, to length of the roads in urban towns/cities of the state
- It shows that length of SWD is less than 20% when compared to roads in corporations and slightly more than 1/3rd in case of CMCs, TMCs and TPs.

Status of SWDs in ULBs (2003)

Street Lighting
- Shortage of street lights in CMCs
- Ad Hoc committee set up by DMA in 2002 indicated that 10-12% streetlights were not working, 10-30% were malfunctioning and 35% exceeded burning hours

Urban Transport
- Lack of adequate public transport services has led to increase in the number of private vehicles in cities of the state
- 71.6% of vehicles are 2 wheelers followed by cars (10.5%), Goods vehicles (3.56%) and Autorickshaws (6%) .
- Bangalore Urban (39.8%), Belgaum (6.2%) and Mysore (6%) have highest no. of vehicles among districts.
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Policies and Legislations

Major Policies
• State urban sector policy (1984)
• National Housing Policy (1998)
• GoK policy on Urban Drinking water and sanitation (2002)
• GoK Water policy (2002)
• National Urban Transport Policy (2006)
• Integrated Solid Waste Management policy
• Draft National Urban Housing and Habitat policy

Key Legislations
• Karnataka Town and Country Planning Act (1961)
• Karnataka Municipalities Act (1964)
• Karnataka Slum Clearance Act (1974)
• Bangalore Development Authority Act (1976)
• Karnataka Municipal Corporations Act (1976)
• BMRDA Act (1985)
• Karnataka Urban Development Authority Act (1987)
• The Constitution 74th Amendment Act (1992)
The share of UD in the total state plan outlay increased from Rs 750 crores (3.2% of ninth plan outlay) to Rs 3,229 crores (7.4% of tenth plan outlay) between the 9th and 10th Plan.

However, the actual expenditure in the sector was Rs 798 crores (2.5% of ninth plan expenditure) and Rs 2,934 crores (4.9% of tenth plan expenditure) during these plans.

The share of Urban Housing and Water Supply and Sanitation in the total state plan outlay increased from Rs 624 cr (2.67% of ninth plan outlay) to Rs 2,000 cr (4.6% of tenth plan outlay) between 9th and 10th Plan.

However, the actual expenditure in the sector was Rs 928 crores (3.5% of ninth plan expenditure) and Rs 2078 crores (3.6% of tenth plan expenditure) during these plans.
Key Accomplishments

- In the area of Urban Development, **Karnataka has been a pioneer across many areas**
- State has benefited from involvement of external agencies such as ADB, World Bank & JBIC
- The state has introduced Self Assessment of Property Tax for all ULBs. BBMP has initiated several such schemes, (property tax, Building Plan Sanction and Trade license renewal)
- Karnataka is one of the first states to institute an urban water policy and has been in the forefront of structured institutional and financial reforms specific to the urban sector
- State Directorate of Urban Land Transport and Bangalore Metropolitan Land Transport Authority (for Bangalore Metropolitan Region) have been set up to enable integrated transport, develop proper strategic transport plans and implementation of transport infrastructure
- Double Entry / accrual system of accounting implemented in 63 ULBs, computerisation of 57 ULBs nearing completion on GIS supported property tax; Cadre and Recruitment rules were amended in 2004. 90 cadres rationalised to 40
- Out of 219 ULBs in the State 71 ULBs have been covered for provision of Urban Infrastructure under the various EAPs. City Level Investment Plans are available for 71 ULBs and they are being prepared for all the balance 146 ULBs with facilitation of KUIDFC.
- Novel institutional mechanisms are being experimented by the State as well as the ULBs involving NGOs, community and private sector in the provision of basic services. Launching of individual web sites of 57 cities under the Nirmal Nagar scheme with NGOs mediating the public grievance redressal system
- A Comprehensive Traffic and Transportation Plan (CTTP) has been made for Bangalore city in 2007 that has identified a host of measures and several projects to ease mobility within the City.
- GoK has created district urban development cells (DUDC) in 2003 that oversees the following activities with regard to urban areas in the district – poverty alleviation, SWM, Water supply & Sanitation, computerisation and other core municipal functions.
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Key issues and challenges
1. High urban poverty - linked to housing and skill deficiency
2. Inadequate basic facilities, with further rising demand
3. Poor focus on environmental effects of urbanisation
4. Metropolitanisation of Bangalore
5. Lack of integration in Urban Planning & Management of Urban Spaces & Urban Growth
6. Inadequate empowerment of urban local bodies
1. High urban poverty - linked to housing and skill deficiency

- Karnataka’s Urban poverty ratio (32.6%) is higher than comparable states & India avg.

- Karnataka ranks a low 10th in Urban Monthly Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (MPCE) among all states

- MPCE shows high inter-group disparity and this low MPCE indicates poor translation of the state’s strong economic position into actual purchasing power of its people.

Comparison of select states - MPCE in Urban Areas

- Karnataka State of Environment report (2003) reports severe deficiency in the provision of basic services in slums, posing severe health/environmental concerns

- KSCB has identified 2511 slums in the state with an estimated pop. of 35.5 lakh. 66% notified slums in the state have no latrines, against the national average of 17%.

- The main reason for growth of slums is the lack of available land at affordable prices in the urban centres

- Coverage of urban poor under SJSRY has been around 20% though it has been implemented since 10 years. An evaluation of this scheme carried out in 2005-06 by the Human Settlement Management Institute has come out with recommendations to improve effectiveness.

- Skill development is essential to deal with migration and meeting increased demand

Source: Sachar Committee report, 2006

- Two critical issues affecting livelihood and impact poverty - i.e. space to live and carry out livelihood activity, & skill development, and these have had poor attention
2. Inadequate basic facilities, with further rising demand

- Rapid pace of urbanisation has caused "infrastructural deficit"
- **Planning Commission** recognises the biggest constraint on rapid growth to be the inadequacy and poor quality of urban infrastructure compared to the global scenario
- Growth of urban pop. 1.79 cr (2001) to 2.2 cr (2011) to 2.82 cr (2026) means increasing demand for all urban services
- Adjoining map shows the inadequacy in basic services of water supply, sanitation and electricity; **Currently only 72.64% of urban HH have all 3 services**. 2,44,719 households in state do not have any of the 3 facilities. Also there exists regional disparity
- Significant issues in access and coverage, unaccounted losses, quality, O&M, institutional lacunae, poor capacity, financial sustainability etc. plague these sectors.
3. Poor focus on environmental effects of urbanisation

Water supply and Sanitation

- Growing dependence on tube-wells resulting in falling water table leading to poor quality of drinking water and related health effects.
- Karnataka SOE report estimates that poor quality & inadequate quantity of water accounts for 10% of disease burden in state.
- It also reports that in Bangalore, sewerage systems are sometimes not connected to the trunk sewers, and the effluents get into natural drains leading to tanks and lakes.
- Lack of sanitation and poor sewerage facilities leads to soil pollution, and growth of pathogens that cause various diseases affecting public health.
  - Almost 25% urban HH do not have latrines; 20.7% have pit latrines.
  - 19% urban HH do not have drainage; 39.3% have open drainage.
  - Large cities such as Belgaum, Hubli-Dharwad and Davangere do not have sewage treatment plants.

Solid Waste Management

- State capacity for composting is only 291 TPD compared to 4312 TPD generated. Only 3303 TPD is collected;
- Unscientific disposal of wastes at dump sites results in land degradation and ground water pollution through leachate percolation; Plastic, bio-medical, industrial and e-waste require special handling.

Transport and Air Quality

- Pollution problems are severe in Bangalore with other urban centres such as Hubli-Dharwad, Mysore, Belgaum, and Mangalore reasonably better.
- In a report released in January 2008 by KSPCB on the Greenhouse Gas Inventory in Bangalore, it is stated that 2-wheelers alone accounted for 56% of the carbon monoxide emission while heavy-duty diesel vehicles accounted for 60% of the carbon dioxide emission in the city.
4. Metropolitanisation of Bangalore

- Growth of Bangalore is one of the major challenges facing the state.
- Keeping in view the growth, in 2006, 7 CMCs and 1 TMC (Kengeri) along with 110 villages around the city were brought under the jurisdiction of the ULB. Area increased from 226 sq km to 696 sq km and an est. pop. of 8 million. This growth is accompanied by concomitant increase in population, and the resultant demand in infrastructure and basic services.
- Bangalore is a key contributor to the state's economy; PwC study shows that Bangalore is the 4th largest city economy in the country and is expected to retain its position by 2020. Bangalore and Mumbai have the highest per capita income of $6923. However, Bangalore will be the second fastest growing city economy after Delhi, growing at 6.14% annually.
- Growth of Bangalore threatened by insufficient resources and competition from other cities.
- If properly managed, Bangalore holds significant potential to lead the state on the path of development and improve the quality of life of lakhs of citizens.

Source: Which are the largest city economies in the world and how might this change by 2020, PwC Economics, March 2007
5. Lack of integration in Urban Planning & Management of Urban Spaces & Urban Growth

• Karnataka Town and Country planning act 1961, “Physical planning has to precede economic planning as otherwise, cities, towns and villages in our country will grow to unmanageable sizes without proper planning, resulting in unhealthy surroundings”.

• SOE reports that critical aspects integral to urban planning, such as environmental impact assessment and transportation requirements, have largely been neglected so far

• Plans and actual development on the ground seem to exist independent of each other
  - Planning norm for density adopted is 125 persons/ha; old BMP already had 287 persons/ha in 2006
  - Norm for parks and open spaces in 15% of total land use; only 1 town, Rabakavi-Banahatti, meets this

• Planning Commission has commented that the “master plan” concept is not well suited to rapidly growing cities and multi-jurisdiction urban agglomerations and is not in wide use in the world. By locking in supply of buildable land and space, the master plan, inter-alia, inhibits the development of housing markets

• Stupendous growth of urban centres has led to haphazard and unplanned development and growth of "revenue sites" especially in peri-urban areas which usually lack provision of basic services

• Housing activity in tank beds is another consequence of poor planning and implementation. Nearly 17 major lakes/tanks in Bangalore have been encroached by urban structures

• In terms of infrastructure provision, technological developments have given rise to many options. However, the typical approach currently taken is to adopt the least upfront cost option, not a lifecycle cost option. Poor planning and option evaluation results in non-optimal choices.

• UDAs were created to ensure orderly development of urban areas have shown poor performance. KDR reports that only 4/27 UDAs show cumulative profits of more than Rs 10 cr (1995-2002)

• The 74th amendment to the constitution has put a major thrust on regional planning and mandated the integration of planning between urban and rural areas through the formation of District Planning Committee (DPC) and Metropolitan Planning Committee (MPC). The implementation of this statute needs to be hastened to co-ordinate planning and implementation to rapidly give results.
6. Inadequate empowerment of urban local bodies

Issues with Governance

- 74th amendment stipulates audit of accounts of the Municipal Corporations by CAG of India and laying of reports before the State Legislature. However, this process needs **significant improvement in quality of information divulged**. Standardisation of reporting formats/social audit are critically required.
- The structure of municipal governance and tenure of the mayor (currently 1 year) needs to be addressed.
- The KARC report (2001), has come out with a series of recommendations regarding policy and institutional reforms in the departments serving the urban sector which need to be revisited.
- KARC reports that the discretion and limits in financial approvals accorded to directorates and ULBs is low, and this causes administrative delays.

Limited access to funds and dependence on state grants

- ULBs lack creditworthiness and are unable to raise funds from the market; Professional skills for structuring and development of commercially bankable projects are necessary;
- Lack of confidence amongst the lenders about the ability of local governments to service the debt coupled with poor information availability;
- ULBs are increasingly dependent on state grants for their O&M requirements; They have limited powers to raise taxes;
- State Transfers are a disincentive to own revenue mobilisation as plan or budgetary allocations are treated as soft money. Efforts for Pricing and cost recovery, therefore, may not be taken up fully.

Poor state of Municipal finances

- Decentralisation initiatives through the 74th amendment have transferred greater responsibility for planning and financing investment projects to local governments.
- However, **many ULBs in the state face fiscal imbalances** in the form of large budgetary deficits, very slow growth in non tax revenues, and a rising share of non development expenditures.
- ULBs have poor revenue generation from own source of revenue.
- The state has moved towards capital value system (CVS). However even this system has been unable to generate potential gains due to the **absence of a well functioning real estate market** in many cities and poor information.
- ULBs lack creditworthiness and are unable to raise funds from the market; Professional skills for structuring and development of commercially bankable projects are necessary;
- Lack of confidence amongst the lenders about the ability of local governments to service the debt coupled with poor information availability;
- ULBs are increasingly dependent on state grants for their O&M requirements; They have limited powers to raise taxes;
- State Transfers are a disincentive to own revenue mobilisation as plan or budgetary allocations are treated as soft money. Efforts for Pricing and cost recovery, therefore, may not be taken up fully.