

A. A letter has been received from Mayor, Howrah Municipal Corporation regarding allowing them to consider EWS people into the definition of urban poor for selection of beneficiaries under NULM. SECC data has not yet been published and as per their opinion present BPL list is erroneous.

B. As per para 4 of NULM guideline under Social Mobilization and Institutional Development "under NULM Self Help group of urban poor will be formed. Now poor may be included as member in SHGs where strong affinity or special reason exists. However at least 70% of the SHG member should be urban poor to qualify for funding support under NULM."

C. Beneficiaries under National Food Security Act (NFSA-2013) have been identified from SECC data using the identification methodology given by Planning Commission of India. [Methodology Guideline and eligibility criteria for selection of eligible beneficiaries under National Food security Act (NFSA-2013) as approved by Hon'ble MIC MA & UD Dept placed in Flag-A]

As per eligibility criteria as approved by Hon'ble MIC total no of household coming under Automatic Inclusion in Below Poverty line among entire urban household of West Bengal is about 14,24,033 nos of families i'c 31.30% of total urban families of 45,49,601 as per SECC data (page 5 of the said approved note sheet.)

D. Now as per point B of this note sheet SHG's containing 70% urban poor and 30% above poverty line people can get the benefit from NULM funds.

X So there is a scope for inclusion of 30% above poverty line people within the beneficiary list of SHG in NULM. Hence there is a scope to include nearly 6,10,299 nos of families (30% of 14,24,033 nos) within the ambit of beneficiary list of SHG in NULM. So total beneficiary household under SHG in NULM may come to (20,34,332 nos.)

E. As per the approved note sheet of Hon'ble MIC for selection of beneficiaries under NFSA-2013 eligibility criteria having score 4 to 12 including figure of Automatic inclusion has been taken into consideration to obtain total beneficiary under NFSA-2013.



Based on above criteria total families under NFSA-2013 beneficiary have come to 19,85,393 families which is almost close to the maximum limit of beneficiary that can be taken into consideration under SHG beneficiary in NULM (20,34,299 families).

F. NFSA- Beneficiary list has already been prepared and under the custody of SUDA.

Hence proposed that entire beneficiary list of NFSA-2013 may be taken under the preview of SHG beneficiary within NULM in West Bengal.

N. Saha
17/3/15
Joint Director (SD), SUDA

Director, SUDA
&
Mission Director,
WBSULM

Note from pre-page.

As stated at 'i' prepage, in the operational guideline of NULM, there is scope of 30% (maximum) inclusion of urban people other than urban poor for formation of Self-Help Groups (SHG) and getting benefits under NULM. So there is a need to fix criteria for families of such persons outside existing BPL list. It may be mentioned that the existing BPL list is very old one (i.e. updated in 2008-10) and we are yet to receive criteria for BPL for 2011 for prepn of fresh BPL list from SECC final survey data.

In view of that above for the present purpose of formation of SHGs under NULM we may allow BPL to include maximum 30% beneficiary out of existing list of NFSA-2013 as proposed at 'i' above.

WJS
17/3/15

Principal Secretary
M. A. Deptt
& Chairman, SUDA

O. No. SUDA: 224/15

Dated: 17-03-15

File No: 79/2015

Prasanna

JAL (MC)

pl. see & put up
Date sendy the file to MIC, 18/3
it may be ascertained how this 30% inclusion will be identified for NULM. Criteria for identification of eligible persons. To clarify, here

23/3/15

As per direction in previous page identification criteria's for 30% additional household are as follows : -

Socio Economic and Caste Census stratify the Socio Economic condition of the households based on Residential, Occupational & Social Vulnerabilities which includes **Automatic Inclusion, Automatic Exclusion and Scoring index 1 to 12 on twelve (12) vulnerabilities of remaining households** [attached for ready reference at CP – 6-8]. Using these 3-Stage Identification Process viz. **Automatic Inclusion, Automatic Exclusion and Scoring index of remaining households** frequency distribution of the Urban households based on these degree of deprivation criteria as per Draft SECC result is shown in the table below in brief :

Sl. No.	Criteria	No. of Household	HHs %	Total Population as per Draft SECC-2011 Data
A)	Total Households as per SECC-2011	45,49,601	100.00 %	1,94,26,796
B)	No. of Households under Automatic Exclusion	12,36,041	27.17 %	52,77,895
C)	No. of Households under Automatic Inclusion	14,24,033	31.30 %	60,80,621
D)	No. of Households falling under Scoring Index Criteria	18,89,527	41.53 %	80,68,280

I. AUTOMATIC EXCLUSION : Using the methodology for identification of Urban Poor , at the first instance automatic exclusion of households criteria applied based on indicators listed below :

Criteria	Number of Households	Percentage
1. No. of dwelling rooms exclusively in possession of the household in 3 and above (Dwelling room with well of concrete or burnt bricks or stone packed with mortar; roof of concrete or burnt bricks or machine made tiles)	9,90,448	21.77%
2. Households possessing any one of the following: i. 4 wheeler motorized ; ii. A.C. & iii. Computer or laptop with internet	2,41,330	5.31 %
3. Households possessing any 3 of the following: i. Refrigerator (non-commercial) ; ii. Telephone (land-line) iii. Washing machine (non-commercial) & iv. 2 wheeler motorized vehicle	4,263	.09 %
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS AUTOMATICALLY EXCLUDED	12,36,041	27.17%

II. AUTOMATIC INCLUSION : In the second stage, the defined criteria for automatic inclusion of households had been applied. The households facing any of the vulnerabilities listed as under may be automatically included.

The following automatic inclusion criteria had been applied in the second stage:

a) Residential Vulnerability	HHs	%
i. Household is Houseless	11999	0.26
ii.HHs has a house of roof and wall made of plastic/polythene	6666	0.15
iii.HHs has a only one room with the material of wall being Grass/thatch/bamboo / mud /unburnt-brick/wood and the material of roof being Grass/thatch/bamboo /wood/mud	33600	0.74
b) Occupational Vulnerability	HHs	%
i.HHs has no income from any source	146493	3.22
ii.Any HH Member who is engaged in a vulnerable occupation like Beggar/ragpicker/domestic worker/sweeper/sanitation worker/Mali	105698	2.32
iii.All earning adult members are daily/ir-regular wagers	996222	21.90
c) Social Vulnerability	HHs	%
i.Child Headed Household ie. No member aged 18 years and above	1387	0.03
ii.All members of the Household aged between 18-60 years either have a disability or are chronically ill	7961	0.17
iii.All earning Adult Members are either disabled, chronically ill or aged more than 65 Years	114007	2.51
TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD AUTOMATCALLY INCLUDED	14,24,033	31.30

III. Scoring Index on the remaining Households: Once the automatic exclusion and inclusion criteria had been applied, in the third phase the remaining households were ranked on the basis of an index score with an overall cap to 12 points (maximum of 5 points for residential vulnerability, maximum of 5 points for social vulnerability and maximum of 2 points for occupational vulnerability). Taking the Index Score into consideration as per criteria, Score 12 is most deprived Households whereas gradually deprivation is being decreased to Score 0 , which is lowest deprivation.

a) Residential Vulnerability

Sl.	Indicator	Score
A	Households living in houses with roof of Grass/Thatch/bamboo/wood/mud etc. and wall of grass/thatch/bamboo etc.	2
B	Households living in houses with roof of handmade tiles or G.I/metal/asbestos sheet and wall of mud/ unburnt brick or wood or stone not packed with mortar or G.I/metal/asbestos sheets.	1
C	Household with non-availability of drinking water source within or near the premises	1
D	Households with main source of lighting other than electricity	1
E	Households with no exclusive water-seal latrines	1

Maximum Score -5

b) Social Vulnerability

Sl.	Indicator	Score
A	Female-headed households i.e. households where there is no adult male member or where the principal bread-earner in the family is a women.	2
B	Schedu Caste (SC) households	2
C	Schedu Tribe (ST) households	2
D	No Literate Adult	2
E	No adult in the household educated up to primary level	1
F	For every Disabled/ Chronically ill person in the household	1

Maximum Score -5

c) Occupational Vulnerability

Sl. No	Indicator	Score
A	Any of the following occupation of the head of the household: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street vendor/cobbler/bawker • Construction/ plumber/masson/labour/painter/ welder/ sec guard • Home-based/ artisans/Tailor • Transport worker/driver/conductor/helper to drivers and conductors/ cart puller/ rickshaw • Washermen/ Dhobi/ Chowkidar • Coolie/ Head-loader 	2
B	Any of the following occupations of the head of the household: Shop-worker/ Assistant/ Helper/ Peon in small establishment/ Attendant/ Waiter Electircian/ mechanic/ assembler/ repair worker	1
C	Households were the main source of income of the head of the household is through a weekly/ daily wage earning.	2
D	Household where there is no enterprise/ wage earning i.e. non-work and the earnings chiefly through any one of the following means i.e. (a) Pension; (b) Interest; and/ or (c) Rent.	1

Maximum Score -2

The following Scoring Index on the remaining households had been applied in the third stage:

Distribution of Households as per Deprivation Score 12 TO 0

(Taking the Score into consideration, Score 12 is most deprived Households whereas gradually deprivation is being decreased to Score 0, which is lowest deprivation)

A.		Distribution of Households as per Deprivation Score 12 TO 0 (Taking the Score into consideration, Score 12 is most deprived Households whereas gradually deprivation is being decreased to Score 0, which is lowest deprivation)	No. of HHs	Cumulati ve No. of HHs including Auto Included HHs	% w r to Total HHs	Cumulative No. of Population including population covered under "Auto Inclusion"
A	1.	No. of Households having Score 12	2	14,24,035	31.30	60,80,629
A	2.	No. of Households having Score 11	80	14,24,115	31.30	60,80,971
A	3.	No. of Households having Score 10	827	14,24,942	31.32	60,84,502
A	4.	No. of Households having Score 9	31,765	14,56,707	32.02	62,20,139
A	5.	No. of Households having Score 8	12,314	14,69,021	32.29	62,72,720
A	6.	No. of Households having Score 7	82,484	15,51,505	34.10	66,24,926
A	7.	No. of Households having Score 6	53,912	16,05,417	35.29	68,55,131
A	8.	No. of Households having Score 5	2,28,060	18,33,477	40.30	78,28,947

A	9.	No. of Households having Score 4	1,51,916	19,85,393	43.64	84,77,628
A	10.	No. of Households having Score 3	2,18,045	22,03,438	48.43	94,08,680
A	11.	No. of Households having Score 2	4,25,876	26,29,314	57.79	1,12,27,171
A	12.	No. of Households having Score 1	1,32,747	27,62,061	60.71	1,17,94,000
A	13.	No. of Households having Score 0	5,51,499	33,13,560	72.83	1,41,48,901
B	1.	No. of Households automatically excluded	12,36,041	45,49,601	100.00	1,94,26,796

From the table it transpires that 85 Lakh ie. 43.64% of total population will be covered if "the degree of deprivation up to score - 4 is being considered. This figure includes the individuals coming under automatic inclusion. It is worthwhile to mention here that, Committee recommended for adopting the criteria of " the degree of deprivation within the range of Score 4-12" in addition to the number of households considered for automatic inclusion for identifying beneficiaries under National Food Security Act -2013 (NFSA), as already approved by Hon'ble Minister-in-Charge, MA & U.D Departments. Relevant documents placed in the file for your kind perusal at CP 9- 29). Accordingly, Notification has been issued from the Food & Supplies Department, Govt. of West Bengal regarding criteria to determine eligible households in the Urban Areas , including AAY and Priority Households for the purpose of extending benefits under National Food Security Act -2013. [CP 30-32].

Now as discussed in point D, NSP- 1 we may consider automatically included household i.e 14,24,033 in nos (31.30% of total urban household) as urban poor and the household falling within the range score of 4 to 12 amounting to 5,61,360 household within 30% category.

Both the list of automatically included categories and household falling under range score of 4 to 12 for all the ULBs (i.e 70% category list and 30% category list as required for NULM) have been prepared and at the disposal of SUDA.

Hence the proposal as made in point no F at NSP-2 to include entire list of NFSA-2013 as a beneficiary household for SHG formation in NULM may kindly be approved.

Submitted for Approval.

M. Sen
17/4/15
Joint Director (SD), SUDA

Director, SUDA
&
Mission Director,
WBSULM

In pursuance of further instruction at NSP-2, details of criteria for selection of beneficiaries under NFSA, which was earlier approved by Hon'ble M.C. & forwarded to Food & Supply Deptt. as narrated above at NSP 3 to 6. It may be mentioned that Food & Supply Deptt. has already issued notification in R/S, regard on 16.2.2014, a copy of which is placed at CP side.

Principal Secy
M.A. Deptt
& Chairman SUDA

U.O. No. SUDA: 28/15
Dated: 22-04-15
Rto- 79/2015

pl. See 2 pur up. hml
2/4

of M.C.)

on the basis of the letter from govt. of India dated 17th February, 2016 on subject of BPL population in NULM cities - req. We are submitting the document to the govt. of India.

S.P. Das.

~~St. Director~~

X

MOHUPA vide letter no F.No - K - 14014 / 11 / 2014 - UDA / FTS - 10201 sought information regarding fixing of eligibility criteria in selection of beneficiaries under NULM.

As per approval of HMIC of NSP - 6 decision regarding beneficiaries under SHGS has been communicated to all ULBs (Flag - X)

We may reply to GO MOHUPA, GOI in format provided by them in this regard.

Draft placed may be approved & signed.

15/3/16

~~Director~~

Reference letter (x above) not found. Instead of forwarding our letter addressed to ULBs, a summary of content to be forwarded to all. A revised draft pl.

15/3/16

JDF(SD)

Pleno. SMM-SMID.

Observation of the department may please be seen at nsp/2.

Accordingly, LDK has sent detail note on selection of beneficiaries under NRM.

Accordingly, 'A' at nsp/6 may be approved.

[Signature]
12/5/2015

[Signature]
14/5/15

~~A/Sy, HA~~

~~M/E~~

~~Jc(MO)~~

[Signature]
20/5/15

~~JD(SD)~~

~~24/5/15~~

To intimate the decision as approved by HMIC to all WUZM form a draft is placed for kind approval and signature.

[Signature]
29/5/15

~~Director~~

~~JD(SD)~~

Draft re-submitted incorporating the changes directed.

[Signature]
19/5/15

[Signature]
2/6/15

~~Director~~

Draft w/rd. kept

[Signature]
8/6/15

~~JD(SD)~~

~~Advsr~~

FC as modified after consultation is placed for kind signature.

~~Director~~

~~JD(SD)~~

[Signature]
1/7/15

[Signature]
2/7/15

Sub: Selection of Households for formation of Self Help Groups (SHGs) under NULM

Formation of SHG groups under NULM is a mandatory component (Refer Component 1.1: Building Community Institutions – Self Help Groups and their Federations) wherein in section 4 of the Guideline, memberships of SHGs has been elucidated as ***“Under DAY – NULM, Self Help Groups of Urban Poor will be formed. Non-Poor may be included as members of SHGs where strong affinity or special reasons exist. However, at least 70% of the SHG members should be Urban Poor to qualify for funding support under DAY – NULM.”*** [Flag Marked “P”]. However, the rest 30% may constitute citizens belonging to APL and/or marginally above BPL and/or Urban Poor.

As approved by Hon'ble Minister-In Charge, Urban Development & Municipal Affairs Department, necessary directions have been issued to all ULBs vide Letter No. SUDA – 79/2015/728 dated June 30, 2015, [Flag Marked “Q”] wherein it has been communicated that 70% of the SHG members for group formation, may be identified from the list of existing BPL list as per Urban Household Survey 2006 BPL survey data and the rest 30% shall have to be Identified from Urban Poor Households covered under National Food Security Act prepared from SECC 2011 data.

As per the Mission Document ***“DAY-NULM would lay particular emphasis on the mobilisation of vulnerable sections of the urban population”***. The target group members and SHG members since mostly reside in close neighborhood in slums and maintain a close liaison within the group members, hence, apportioning the ratio for selecting SHG members becomes extreme necessity for formation of more SHGs.

Considering the above scenario, it becomes difficult for the ULBs to identify and select the SHG members for group formation and as a result targets for group formation have fallen short. This issue has been reiterated by the ULBs from time to time in various meetings.

As of date, the total BPL Households as per Urban Household survey is 12,49,208 (Population: 64,58,412).

- As per National Food Security Act, number of households is 19,85,393 (Population: 84,77,628).

Currently the ULBs are selecting SHG members following the guidelines issued by SUDA wherein 70% of the members are selected from BPL households as per Urban Household survey and the rest 30% Urban Poor from Households under National Food Security Act.

সুডা

১১০০

NOTE SHEET ²⁰¹⁹⁻²⁰

SUDA

Against a target of ~~5000~~ SHGs for FY 2018-19, as set by Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Govt. of India, we have already formed ~~4897~~ SHGs as per MIS Reports. **[Flag Marked "R"]** ³³⁷⁵

In the various review meetings with the ULBs till date, emphasis is laid upon formation of more SHGs thereby attaining the target. However, the ULBs are facing extreme difficulties, as the aforesaid identification method as per the Guideline (70:30 ratio) imposes the challenge towards identifying and selecting members and formation of SHGs, as the group formation has reached to the level of saturation. Moreover, the requisite number of households coming under Food Security as well as Urban Households BPL list remains insufficient, and the number of SHG formation falls short of the desired targets. In addition, few ULBs have requested to include deserving beneficiaries not falling under any of the above groups, hence not being able to include themselves in the SHGs under NULM. **[Flag Marked "S"]**

Now, for better coverage and provision of increased benefits to the Urban Poor as demanded by ULBs, it is suggested that, 70% of the SHG members, may be selected collectively from the BPL Households as per Urban Household survey and Urban Poor Households covered under National Food Security Act/ Khadya Sathi. Selection of rest 30% SHG members, may remain with the ULBs, which may comprise belonging to APL and/or marginally above BPL and/or Urban Poor as the ULBs are the implementing authorities. However, these may be selected as deemed fit by the ULBs based on vulnerabilities like occupational / residential / social pattern existing in the ULBs.

As criteria for identification of Urban Poor is not yet been finalized by MoHUA, Govt. of India, based on SECC 2011, hence several states like Odisha, Gujarat, Kerala have adopted selection strategy using the previous BPL list, NFSA list, State sponsored schemes which meant primarily for the Urban Poor. Likewise, our State may consider selection of SHG members; 70% combinedly from the lists of BPL households as per Urban Household survey and Urban Poor Households covered under National Food Security Act prepared from SECC 2011 data / KhadyaSathi, and rest 30% from APL and/or marginally above the Urban Poor within the ULBs .

In case, the above methodology for selection of SHG members is approved, may result to substantial increase in number of deserving SHGs on one hand, and on other hand may require additional funds from MoHUA, Govt. of India.

The above approach will also enable the ULBs to form SHGs having requisite group size as well as forming SHGs in a time bound manner.

~~AMU~~ (Contd.)

S. I. D. V.

Part of a memorandum note w.r.t
 ascertaining the Urban poor Criteria.
 Urban poor may be defined using
 BLS H.H. Survey, NFSA beneficiary or
 SEC deprivation index. \therefore 100%
 membership of an urban SLU
 may thus be defined accordingly.

Sanjib

20/11/19

The National Urban Livelihood Mission launched in the year 2014 is a follow through of the earlier 'Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana' (SJSRY) with the similar programme framework to provide livelihood opportunities to the urban poor both through self and wage employment. Beneficiaries may either be individuals or women organized to Self Help Groups.

Director, SUDA issued a guideline vide no. SUDA-79/2015/728 dated 30.06.2015 (copy flagged 'A') articulating the households that are eligible for formation of SHGs under the NULM Programme. As mentioned in Point No. 4 of the Revised Operational Guideline-DAY-NULM under the component 1.1 Building Community Institutions - Self Help Groups and their federations, Self Help Groups of urban poor are to be constituted and non poor may also be included as members in SHGs where there is a strong affinity on special reason exists. However, at least 70% of the SHG members should be urban poor to qualify for funding support under DAY-NULM.

In this context, the Department has approved the households coming under the purview of the existing BPL category as per existing BPL list to constitute 70% members of SHGs and households coming under the purview of National Food Security (NFSA) Beneficiary list prepared from SECC-2011 survey data and criteria notified by the Food and Supplies Department, GOWB will constitute the rest 30% of the SHG members. This would be the maximum permissible non BPL households to be included in a SHG.

The above criteria has been in place and followed by the ULBs since July-2015 and at present there are 62,000 SHGs under the programme. We have been receiving the submission by different ULBs citing that they are facing difficulty in further formation of SHGs keeping to this 70:30 ratio within a given area as the urban poor in the State have been identified only through the BPL list published by the Department in the year 2006. BPL list was last prepared almost 14 years back.

In accordance with Section 10 of the National Food Security Act, 2013, the Food and Supplies Department, GOWB notified the criteria to identify the eligible households in the urban areas to be benefited. Using the SECC-2011 data and in terms of the criteria enunciated by the Food and Supplies Department, GOWB, the eligible beneficiaries under the NFSA have been identified. Beneficiaries so identified are also urban poor households in terms of NFSA and the criteria adopted by the State. This list is relatively more recent than the BPL list of urban population published in 2006.

Therefore, it is suggested instead of keeping to 70% households from the BPL list published in 2006 as a mandatory criteria for formation of SHG and 30% from the list of NFSA beneficiaries, we may revise the criteria for SHG formation with beneficiaries covered under the list published by the Food and Supplies Department, GOWB as 'Khadyasathi' beneficiaries and / or the BPL list published in 2006, constituting 70% of the members and the rest 30% of the SHG members may belong to the APL / marginally above BPL and/or urban poor as decided by the ULBs. There may be no such fixed ratio for constituting a SHG. With this modification in the criteria for formation of SHG, many more Self Help Groups can be constituted under the NULM Programme. This would also ensure the near complete coverage for occupational and socially vulnerable urban households.

X

It is pertinent to mention, the SHG&SE Department has sought concurrence of this Department for formation of SHGs in the urban areas apparently with no fixed criteria for formation of SHG. This would both be operationally and administratively difficult with two different Departments forming Self Help Groups in the same administrative area i.e., ULBs, with different set of activities and benefits/entitlements of the SHGs.

Director, SUDA

Shanbhag
05/02/2020

AMD

We may discuss.

05/02/20

Discussed with Director, SUDA.

The proposal at 'X' page-11-12/N may be approved.

Director

Shanbhag
05/02/2020

AMD

Note prepage and above.

The referred issue is an important one and a policy decision needs to be taken in this context. As per existing arrangement, Deptt. has approved in 2015 and communicated to all ULBs vide No. SUDA -79/2015/728 Dtd. 30.06.2015, where 70% households of SHGs are to be taken from BPL list and rest 30% to be taken from khadyasatti beneficiaries. But as this criteria is creating steady hindrance towards creation of ^{fresh} groups, proposal is floated now for partial modification of the criteria. As per revised proposal, we may keep [BPL listed + 'khadyasatti'] beneficiaries within 70% and rest 30% from APL/marginally above

BPL/ and on unbar poor as decided by ULBs. If this modification is approved by the authority, may more SHGs may be formed and a fresh momentum may be added to the programme.

Placed for kind consideration.

bj

23.03.2020.

Pn. Sefer

U.O. No. SUDA 674

Dated 24-03-2020

File No. 79/2015

We may study the guidelines of the counterpart scheme for small areas and whether there is any modification at the state level.

[Signature]
8/11/2020.

Director, SUDA

bj

17.04.2020.

AMD(JC)

S.P. Das SAM

17.04.2020