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India’s cities don’t have a hundred thousand problems, they have the same hundred problems repeated a thousand times
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Cities are complex systems. To diagnose urban problems and - more importantly - solve them, we need to view them in a systems framework. The “City-Systems” framework is such a framework that helps us identify the root causes of our urban challenges. The City-Systems framework comprises four components - Urban Planning & Design, Urban Capacities & Resources, Empowered & Legitimate Political Representation and Transparency, Accountability & Participation. The Annual Survey of India’s City-Systems (ASICS) is a study of City-Systems of India’s cities and is meant to serve as an annual health check-up of the quality of laws, policies, institutions and institutional processes underlying quality of life in our cities. With this 5th edition we seek to push the envelope on transformative reforms to city governance in India’s cities.
ASICS evaluates the quality of governance in cities by assessing the quality of laws, policies, institutions and institutional processes that together help govern them. These are what we refer to as City-Systems. City-Systems are the foundation on which good quality of life is built.

Why ASICS?

ASICS evaluates urban governance using the City-Systems framework consisting of four distinct but inter-related components that help govern a city and deliver good quality of life to all citizens. It scores cities on a scale of 0 to 10.

The ASICS score of a city is an indication of the health of its governance systems and therefore its ability to deliver good quality of life in the medium to long-term. It aims to push the envelope on transformative reforms in city governance.

City-Systems Framework

- Urban Planning & Design
- Urban Capacities & Resources
- Transparency, Accountability & Participation
- Empowered & Legitimate Political Representation

City-Systems are the root causes underlying quality of life in cities.

How the 5th edition was done?

- 26 Cities
- 89 Questions
- 150+ Parameters
- 3,200+ Points of Investigation
- 50+ Laws
- 100+ Budgets, Audited Annual Accounts & Audit Reports
- 250+ RTI Requests

ASICS evaluates and scores India’s cities on 89 objective parameters developed using the City-Systems framework and compares them with the benchmark cities of London, New York and Johannesburg.

The ASICS 2017 report has two parts - this main report with key findings and the ASICS 2017 Data Book. This ASICS 2017 Data Book can be accessed at www.janaagraha.org/asics2017databook. The ASICS 2017 report is also available in Hindi and can be accessed at www.janaagraha.org/asics2017hindireport.
55% citizens live in cities where the mayor has a term of 2.5 years or less

Only 13% cities have enacted town & country planning acts post liberalisation

Only 2 cities have formed both ward committees and area sabhas

10 months is the average tenure of a municipal commissioner

54% cities do not generate enough revenue to meet their salary costs

39% is the average percentage of own revenues to total expenditure

70% cities had budget variance of over

30% is the average staff vacancy

35%
### ASICS Scores 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score Change over 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pune</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thiruvananthapuram</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bhubaneswar</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Surat</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ahmedabad</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ranchi</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Raipur</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Guwahati</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bhopal</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ludhiana</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Visakhapatnam</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dehradun</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chandigarh</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bengaluru</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pace of City-Systems reforms in India has been painfully slow; India’s cities need to address five systemic challenges urgently.

Our cities presently have broken City-Systems and are improving at a snail’s pace. They score between 3.0 and 5.1 while London and New York score 8.8. Johannesburg, a city from a developing country scores 7.6. Scores of benchmark cities indicate how far our City-Systems need to be strengthened before we can expect our cities to deliver good quality of life. The graph below shows the slow pace at which scores have improved - the average score has moved from 3.4 to just 3.9 over the last three years.

The key messages from ASICS since its first edition in 2013 have remained consistent. India’s cities need to address the following five systemic challenges in order to deliver better quality of life to citizens in a sustainable manner. These are:

1. Lack of a modern, contemporary framework of spatial planning of cities and design standards for public utilities
2. Weak finances, both in terms of financial sustainability and financial accountability of cities
3. Poor human resource management, in terms of number of staff, skills and competencies of staff, organisation design and performance management
4. Powerless mayors and city councils and severe fragmentation of governance across municipalities, parastatal agencies and state departments
5. Total absence of systematic citizen participation and transparency
Our cities lack a modern, contemporary urban planning framework. This may be denying us up to 3% of our GDP each year\(^1\).

### What’s the problem?

- Outdated town & country planning acts
- Weak preparation, implementation and enforcement of spatial development plans
- Lack of design standards for public utilities

### How do we fix it?

#### City Councils
- Implement an effective system to monitor, report and penalise SDP violations

#### State Governments
- Overhaul planning acts, mandate creation of three levels of SDPs with defined objectives & metrics and covering the planning PIE
- Constitute an empowered MPC anchored by elected representatives from municipalities

#### Government of India
- Publish model spatial planning framework and design standards for public utilities

---

1. *Green Economy Report - UNEP, 2011*
2. Rafel Tuts, Director of Programme Division of UN-Habitat
Both availability of money and its management are showstoppers in India’s cities. Several cities don’t generate enough funds to even cover staff salaries and have grossly inadequate financial management systems.

What’s the problem?

- Financial sustainability of most municipalities is presently in a precarious position
- Their financial accountability systems and processes are ridden with holes allowing leakages, both wilful and otherwise

How do we fix it?

**City Councils**

- Sharply focus on improving collection efficiencies, explore technology and outsourcing solutions to enable the same
- Reform bases of assessment of revenue streams through market-orientation
- Improve return on assets, particularly on leased properties
- Implement a performance MIS framework

**State Governments**

- Undertake systematic fiscal decentralisation of additional, buoyant revenue streams; devolve full powers over tax rates and assessments
- Enact FRBM legislation, mandate audit of annual accounts by CAs by 31 July each year

**Government of India**

- Create and own a national performance reporting framework for municipalities, publish annual fiscal rankings of municipalities
- Publish models and templates for outsourcing of property tax collections, FRBM for municipalities, medium-term fiscal plans, performance MIS and annual accounts
- Incentivise better financial governance in future missions

Cities need significant amounts of capital to invest in not just creating new infrastructure and catching up on service delivery deficits, but also for revenue expenditure such as operations and maintenance and hiring of talent. On average, the cities assessed in this study, generate only 39% of the funds they spend, leaving them highly dependent on state and central government grants. Our analysis revealed that for several cities, their own revenues do not even cover staff salaries. Lack of adequate own revenue sources severely constrains the ability of our cities to invest in infrastructure and service delivery.

![Graph showing the relationship between population and own revenue as a percentage of total expenditure.](image-url)

However, with the abysmal standards of financial management and accountability systems existing in Indian cities today, enhancing revenues will be akin to pouring money down a leaky bucket. This is evident in the fact that no Indian city, barring Guwahati, is required to have a Medium or Long Term Fiscal Plan (MTFP/LTFP) in place. No city is required to mandatorily undertake external audit of annual accounts or internal audits. The weak state of budget management is also evident in budget variance figures (budget v/s actuals) which on average over last three years is 36% across cities and as high as 75% in the cities of Raipur and Ranchi.
Human resource management is the Achilles’ heel of India’s cities. Municipalities have far fewer staff than they need. Their staff do not possess the required skills and competencies and their overall HR system is broken.

What’s the problem?

- Municipalities do not have enough number of skilled staff required to meet infrastructure and service delivery needs of citizens
- Municipalities lack proper organisation design and have very poor human resource management policies

How do we fix it?

City Councils
- Create a medium-term workforce plan and an annual workforce plan, aligned to medium term fiscal plan and annual budgets
- Evolve adequate financial visibility to fill in required staff vacancies and explore technology and outsourcing-based solutions
- Put in place quantitative performance metrics at staff and department level

State Governments
- Overhaul cadre and recruitment rules to bring them up to modern, contemporary standards of HR management
- Provide one-time financial support to municipalities to meet target workforce levels or adopt technology and outsourcing-based solutions

Government of India
- Publish model HR policies for municipalities including destination organisation charts, normative standards for job roles and number of staff, model job descriptions, other policies and model cadre and recruitment rules
- Sponsor pilot projects to test feasibility of technology and outsourcing-based solutions in select functional areas such as property tax collections, accounting
- Create a municipal service sector skill council to ensure municipal staffing is mainstreamed as part of the skills agenda

Arguably the single most important City-System for India’s cities presently is that of urban capacities. Our cities do not have adequate number of skilled staff. Their HR policies are outdated and HR systems and processes broken. The average staff vacancy is 35%, with the highest vacancy being 60% in the case of Guwahati. These vacancies have been evaluated against sanctioned posts, which themselves in many cases have not been updated in a scientific manner commensurate with the growth of cities. None of the cities has cadre and recruitment rules that contain modern job descriptions covering both technical skills and managerial competencies for each role or position in the municipality.

While it is true that 15 out of the 23 cities have access to a municipal cadre, the underlying rules are quite weak. What we need in our cities are robust and modern HR policies which have normative standards for job roles and number of positions, clearly defined job descriptions covering both technical skills and managerial competencies, principles in respect of organisation design and span of control, a comprehensive performance management system, staff benefit policies and learning and development policies.
Mayor and Councillors, the elected leaders of a city, are not the ones in charge of several key functions in a city. Fragmentation of governance and low levels of empowerment renders them toothless.

What’s the problem?

- Low levels of devolution of the proverbial three Fs - Funds, Functions and Functionaries
- Fragmentation of governance with multiple parastatals and state departments operating within cities

Mayors and councils in our cities are toothless. They don’t have full decision-making authority over critical functions and services such as planning, housing, water, environment, fire and emergency services etc. On average, only 9 out of the 18 functions under the 74th CAA have been effectively devolved. Large cities such as Bhopal, Kanpur and Lucknow have a directly elected mayor with five year tenure, compared to mega cities such as Bengaluru and Delhi which have an indirectly elected mayor with one year tenure.

Mayors and councils also cannot hire and fire their own management teams, severely constraining their ability to exact accountability for performance from city officials. They have limited say when it comes to investing or borrowing monies or finalising budgets - only four cities assessed can borrow without the sanction of state governments (with a debt-limitation policy), of which one is a medium sized city and three are large cities. Only seven cities can invest without prior state government approval, of which three are large cities and four are mega cities. Only 11 out of 23 have full independence in budget-setting. Of these 11, one is a medium sized city, six are large cities and four are mega cities.

All of the above have resulted in the municipality becoming a glorified service provider, far from a local self-government or a city government. Parastatal agencies like the development authorities (which cover planning), water authorities or boards (that cover water and sewerage), transport corporations (that cover bus transport) report directly to state governments and to different departments/ministers within it. Exacerbating this fragmentation is the role of state departments, such as public works (roads) and police (traffic, law and order) which in many cities also have important roles to play in infrastructure and service delivery.

This structure, which has resulted in fragmented governance throws up the challenge of low levels of accountability as parastatals are answerable to the state government and not to the municipality and therefore are removed from the citizens.

How empowered are our cities and their leaders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium &amp; Large City</th>
<th>Mega City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population in cities (in millions)</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of cities with a five year mayoral tenure</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of cities with a directly elected mayor</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score for taxation powers</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of own revenues to total expenditure %</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per capita capex</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of functions devolved</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>11/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score for powers over staff</td>
<td>4.3/10</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over 55% of citizens live in cities where the mayor has a tenure of 2.5 years or less
- On average, a mayor’s salary is as low as 12% of the salary of municipal commissioners
- No city mayor or council has the power to appoint their city’s commissioner
- Only Mumbai and Pune have devolved the function of urban planning. Parastatals call the shots in other cities

How do we fix it?

City Councils

- Create a national-level platform for mayors and city councils that can strengthen advocacy for decentralisation
- Connect with citizens, build trust and gain their support for the decentralisation agenda

State Governments

- Overhaul municipal corporation acts to ensure mayors have five year terms, critical functions are meaningfully devolved, and mayors and councils have full powers over staffing and finances
- Clarify reporting structures by ensuring in a phased manner reporting of parastatal agencies to the mayor and council

Government of India

- Amend 74th CAA for it to meet its intended purpose of municipalities serving as local-self governments
- Lead the effort on a metropolitan governance paradigm, evolve consensus with state governments
India’s cities have virtually no platforms where citizens can participate in civic matters in their neighbourhoods. This impacts not just accountability of municipalities, but quality of democracy itself. Low levels of transparency in finances and operations of municipalities worsens this problem.

What’s the problem?

- Ward committees and area sabhas do not exist and therefore citizens are disconnected from decision-making in the city and their neighbourhood
- Public disclosure law, a mandatory reform under the JnNURM, not implemented in spirit despite being enacted

India’s cities are characterised by low levels of citizen participation and transparency. There are no structured platforms for citizen participation (such as ward committees and area sabhas), no coherent participatory processes (such as participatory budgeting), weak citizen grievance redressal mechanisms and very low levels of transparency in finances and operations. All of this put together has resulted in weak levels of engagement between citizens and governments, as a consequence low levels of trust and in general poor quality of democracy in a city.

Only 10 out of the 23 cities assessed have a Community Participation Law (CPL), a reform measure introduced under the JnNURM that mandates constitution of both ward committees and area sabhas for citizen participation. Even so, while most have constituted ward committees, only two cities, Guwahati and Hyderabad have constituted area sabhas.

Citizen charters, powerful tools of accountability and grievance redressal, are missing in nine of the 23 cities assessed. Where they do exist, there is no mention of service levels, and few mention timelines for service delivery and processes for obtaining relief where service levels are not met. An ombudsman, specifically for resolving such issues, is missing in all but three Indian cities, Bhubaneswar, Ranchi and Thiruvananthapuram.

Data and information are useful only if they are easily usable by citizens. While PDF formats may be good say for citizens to look up a list of citizen service centres, they do not lend themselves to information on city finances and public works. To have citizens engage meaningfully, they have to be enabled with actionable information, aspect which an open data framework addresses - by not just allowing citizens to access data more easily, but also enabling civil society organisations, the media and others to aggregate and analyse information and drive advocacy efforts around specific causes. We find that 19 of the 23 Indian cities assessed are neither mandated to nor release basic yet important data sets in an open data format.

How do we fix it?

- Adopt open data standards, usher in radical transparency in finances and operations; systematically provide actionable data at a neighbourhood level
- Implement participatory budgeting
- Enact CPL and PDL, notify rules and implement them in spirit
- Create an office of ombudsmen for citizen grievance redressal exclusively for municipalities

City Councils

State Governments

Government of India

3 These cities have enacted CPL with provisions for both ward committees & area sabhas and have also notified corresponding rules
So, how do we go about fixing India’s City-Systems?

Political leaders and administrative leaders across city councils, state governments and government of India should adopt a two track approach of projects plus reforms. The below City-Systems reforms will massively transform the ability of our cities to deliver high quality infrastructure and services.

**Urban Planning & Design**

- Implement an effective system to monitor, report and penalise SDP violations
- Overhaul planning acts, mandate creation of three levels of SDPs with defined objectives & metrics and covering the planning PIE
- Constitute an empowered MPC anchored by elected representatives from municipalities
- Publish model spatial planning framework and design standards for public utilities

**Urban Capacities & Resources**

- **Municipal Finance**
  - Sharply focus on improving collection efficiencies, explore technology and outsourcing solutions to enable the same
  - Reform bases of assessment of revenue streams through market-orientation
  - Improve return on assets, particularly on leased properties
  - Implement a performance MIS framework
  - Undertake systematic fiscal decentralisation of additional, buoyant revenue streams; devolve full powers over tax rates and assessments
  - Enact FRBM legislation, mandate audit of annual accounts by CAs by 31 July each year
  - Create and own a national performance reporting framework for municipalities, publish annual fiscal rankings of municipalities
  - Publish models and templates for outsourcing of property tax collections, FRBM for municipalities, medium-term fiscal plans, performance MIS and annual accounts
  - Incentivise better financial governance in future missions

- **Municipal Staffing**
  - Create a medium-term workforce plan and an annual workforce plan, aligned to medium-term fiscal plan and annual budgets
  - Evolve adequate financial visibility to fill in required staff vacancies and explore technology and outsourcing-based solutions
  - Put in place quantitative performance metrics at staff and department level
  - Overhaul cadre and recruitment rules to bring them up to modern, contemporary standards of HR management
  - Provide one-time financial support to municipalities to meet target workforce levels or adopt technology and outsourcing-based solutions
  - Publish model HR policies for municipalities including destination organisation charts, normative standards for job roles and number of staff, model job descriptions, other policies and model cadre and recruitment rules
  - Sponsor pilot projects to test feasibility of technology and outsourcing-based solutions in select functional areas such as property tax collections, accounting
  - Create a municipal service sector skill council to ensure municipal staffing is mainstreamed as part of the skills agenda

**Empowered & Legitimate Political Representation**

- Create a national-level platform for mayors and city councils that can strengthen advocacy for decentralisation
- Connect with citizens, build trust and gain their support for the decentralisation agenda
- Overhaul municipal corporation acts to ensure mayors have five year terms, critical functions are meaningfully devolved, and mayors and councils have full powers over staffing and finances
- Clarify reporting structures by ensuring in a phased manner reporting of parastatal agencies to the mayor and council
- Amend 74th CAA for it to meet its intended purpose of municipalities serving as local-self governments
- Lead the effort on a metropolitan governance paradigm, evolve consensus with state governments

**Transparency, Accountability & Participation**

- Adopt open data standards, usher in radical transparency in finances and operations; systematically provide actionable data at a neighbourhood level
- Implement participatory budgeting
- Enact CPL and PDL, notify rules and implement them in spirit
- Create an office of ombudsman for citizen grievance redressal exclusively for municipalities
- Include implementation of CPL and PDL as performance conditions in future urban missions

For an actionable blueprint that city leaders can adopt, please refer Bengaluru Blueprint (http://janaagraha.org/files/publications/Blueprint-Vol1.pdf) and City-Systems Strategy (http://janaagraha.org/files/CSS_BOOK_FINAL.PDF)
METHODOLOGY

The Approach

ASICS is an evaluation of the state of urban governance of India’s cities.

ASICS 2017 is an objective benchmarking of 23 Indian cities across 20 states on 89 questions, covering 150 parameters, 3900 points of investigation and takes a systematic, data-driven approach towards urban governance; scoring cities on a scale of 0 to 10. It also compares Indian cities with benchmark cities - London, New York as they are cities with functional democracies and are widely considered to be offering their citizens a high quality of life. In this edition, we have also added Johannesburg, the largest city in South Africa, as a comparable city to get a sense of where India’s cities stand against a global city with a comparable democratic governance structure and demographic distribution.

ASICS 2017 builds on the approach taken in the editions since 2013. This edition has increased the coverage and representativeness of the survey by including Guwahati and Visakhapatnam in the evaluation. Effort was also taken to make the survey more robust by adding 16 new questions and modifying the approach of evaluation to 15 existing questions to make them more relevant. Towards this guidelines of AMRUT and smart cities mission were also considered.

ASICS employs the size (in terms of population) and the geographic distribution of cities as the main criteria for inclusion in the evaluation.

ASICS uses a quantitative assessment that is reflected in individual scores. The score sheet that is comparable across cities is meant to provide administrators and policymakers with a diagnosis of systemic reforms needed in their respective areas.

In this report we have used the terms ‘city’ and ‘municipality’ to refer to an Urban Local Body (ULB).

Data Collection

Data collection spanned over a period of seven months. The survey is predominantly based on primary research with the sources being relevant laws, policy documents and websites of city & state governments. The latest amendments in laws and policies have been factored in and we have taken care to ensure that the data collected in the early months was re-checked up to the cut-off date of 31 Dec 2017. For a detailed break-up of sources, please refer to the ASICS 2017 Data Book (www.janaagraha.org/asics2017databook).

We filed more than 250 RTI applications and subsequent follow up RTIs with municipalities and the state urban development departments. While the response to RTIs was far better than in prior years, it was far from satisfactory.

Classification of Cities

Cities have been classified on the basis of population as follows:

1. Mega cities (5+ Mn)
   - Ahmedabad, Bengaluru, Delhi, Hyderabad and Mumbai

2. Large cities (1+ to 5 Mn)
   - Bhopal, Chennai, Jaipur, Kanpur, Kolkata, Lucknow, Ludhiana, Patna, Pune, Surat and Visakhapatnam

3. Medium cities (upto 1 Mn)
   - Bhubaneswar, Chandigarh, Dehradun, Guwahati, Raipur, Ranchi and Thiruvananthapuram

Scoring and Weightage

All questions have been scored on a range of 0 to 10, with 10 being the highest that a city can score. Select questions have been divided into sub-questions and given graded scores to ensure that various facets are captured within a single parameter. Uniform weightage has been assigned to individual questions. We believe that each question probes a defining quality and is equally important in fixing City-Systems. Each category within the City-Systems framework has also been weighted equally.

Please refer ASICS 2017 Data Book for the methodology in detail and complete set of score sheets and data (www.janaagraha.org/asics2017databook).
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