



**GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI**

---

# **Urban Slums in Delhi**

**Based  
on  
NSS 69<sup>th</sup> ROUND SURVEY  
(JULY 2012 – DEC 2012)**

**STATE SAMPLE**

---

DIRECTORATE OF ECONOMICS & STATISTICS  
3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR, B-WING, VIKAS BHAWAN-2, CIVIL LINES,  
DELHI – 110054

Website: <http://des.delhigovt.nic.in>

**February, 2015**



## PREFACE

The present report on “Urban Slums in Delhi” is brought out by this directorate on the basis of sample survey conducted under the 69<sup>th</sup> NSS Round (July 2012- Dec 2012) in respect of state sample.

This report contains information relating to 2012 on ownership, area type, structure, living facilities like electricity, drinking water, latrine, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal, and distance of slums from the nearest primary school and government hospital/health centre. It also provides information on the change in condition of the slums during the five years preceding the date of survey.

This report was prepared by the Data Processing & Analysis Unit headed by Shri Sabir Ali, Assistant Director under the able guidance of Dr. R.N.Sharma, Joint Director and Shri. C.K.Dutta, Deputy Director. The extraordinary efforts put in by Smt. Varsha Kumar, Sh. K. Prasanth Kumar and Dr. Prateek Jain, Statistical Assistants in the data analysis and report making stages deserves special mention. The fieldwork was conducted by socio-economic unit under the guidance Sh. K. R. Chhibber and Sh. P.K.Chaurasia, Statistical Officers. The role played by this unit in collection of data from the field against all odds is appreciated. The data processing was done by the EDP unit under the close guidance of Sh. Praveen Srivastava, Programmer.

The technical assistance provided by National Sample Survey Organisation, Government of India and the co-operation extended by the households is acknowledged.

I hope the report will be found useful by policy makers, academicians and researchers. Suggestions for improvement of the content of the report will be greatly appreciated.

New Delhi  
Date: February , 2015

**DR. B. K. SHARMA**  
**Director cum Special Secretary**

## **TEAM**

<b>DR. R.N.SHARMA</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>JOINT DIRECTOR</b>
<b>SH. C.K.DUTTA</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>DEPUTY DIRECTOR</b>
<b>SH. SABIR ALI</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>ASSISTANT DIRECTOR</b>
<b>SMT. VARSHA KUMAR</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>
<b>SH. K.PRASANTH KUMAR</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>
<b>DR.PRATEEK JAIN</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>
<b>SH. ASHUTOSH SINGH</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>
<b>SMT. SEEMA RANI</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>
<b>MS. POONAM KUMARI</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL ASSISTANT</b>

## **EDP UNIT**

<b>SH. PRAVEEN SRIVASTAVA</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>PROGRAMMER</b>
<b>SMT. NIDHI RAJPAL</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>ASSISTANT PROGRAMMER</b>
<b>SMT. MADHU YADAV</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>ASSISTANT PROGRAMMER</b>

## **FIELD OFFICERS**

<b>SH. K. R. CHHIBBER</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL OFFICER</b>
<b>SH. P.K.CHAURASIA</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>STATISTICAL OFFICER</b>

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
	HIGHLIGHTS	i - iv
ONE	INTRODUCTION	1 - 4
TWO	SAMPLE DESIGN & ESTIMATION PROCEDURE	5 - 9
THREE	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	10 - 14
FOUR	SUMMARY FINDINGS	15 - 34
Appendix A	THE FACSIMILE OF THE SCHEDULE OF ENQUIRY (SCH. 0.21)	A1 - A6

## Highlights

### Objective of Survey

For this survey, conducted during July 2012 to Dec. 2012 in urban Delhi, **“A slum is a compact settlement of at least 20 households with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions”**.

The objective of the survey was to come out with a status report on the length and breath of slums in urban Delhi with respect to number of slum clusters and households therein and more importantly to ascertain the relative change in their physical status in the light of various measures taken by government/local bodies and the residents themselves over a period of time in the existing facilities in these slum clusters.

The main findings of the survey are as follows:

### Characteristics of Slums

- ❖ About 6343 slums with approximately 10.20 lakhs households were estimated to be in existence in urban Delhi in 2012.
- ❖ Average 161 households per slum were found to be in these slums.

- ❖ About 90% of slums were built on public land, owned mostly by local bodies (46%), railways (28%) and state government (16%), etc.
- ❖ 16.19% of the slums have cropped up along nallah/drain, around 27.64% along railway lines, approximately 27.73% at open places/parks and the remaining 28% of the slums at other places.
- ❖ About 74.46% slums are surrounded by residential areas, 3.36% by industrial areas, 0.66% by commercial areas and rest by other type of areas.
- ❖ 54.91% of slums are composed of pucca structure, 29.47% semi pucca and only 15.62% of slums were having unserviceable katcha structure.
- ❖ For 86.50% of slums, the major source of drinking water was either tap or hand pump.
- ❖ The most of the residents of about 30% of the slums are using septic tank/flush type of latrine facility. At the other extreme, 22% slums did not have any latrine facility at all.
- ❖ Underground sewerage existed in only about 16.30% slums.
- ❖ About 98.38% of the slums were having underground/covered pucca/open pucca open katcha drainage system. Only 1.62% of the slums were having no drainage system.

- ❖ Local bodies were collecting garbage from 31.45% of slums. Out of the slums in which garbage collection is done by local bodies, the frequency of the collection was 37% on daily basis, while in 32% of slums garbage was collected atleast once in two days, once in 3 to 7 days in 29% slums and once in 8 days to 15 days in 0.68% of slums and remaining 2% falls in other category having no regular mechanism for garbage disposal.
- ❖ About 48% of the slums had a motorable (Pucca/Kutchha) approach road.
- ❖ About 77% of slums were having pucca road/lane/path within the slum.
- ❖ About 16.76% of slums were electrified with both street light and household use, 23.90% for household use only, 58.96% for street light only, while in 0.38% of slums there was no electricity.
- ❖ About 86.74% of the slums were having primary schools in the proximity of less than 0.5 km.
- ❖ About 19.28% of the slum clusters were having the government hospital within a distance of 0.5 km, 28.33% in the distance 0.5-1 km, 36.31% in the distance 1-2 km, 14.27% in the range of 2-5 km and 1.81% slum clusters are covered by government hospitals in the distance of 5 km and above.
- ❖ About 9.30% of the slums were usually affected by water logging (inside of slum as well as approach road also) during monsoon.

- ❖ About 4% of the slums in Delhi were having associations either formal/informal for improving the condition of the slums formed by the slum dwellers themselves.

### **Improvement of Facilities:**

- ❖ As per the assessment of the knowledgeable person of the slums from whom the information is collected facilities had improved in all of slums in terms of 11 facilities viz. water supply, electricity, street light, latrine, drainage, sewerage, garbage disposal, approach road to slum, road with in the slum, education facility at primary level and medical facility over the last five years. The incidents of deterioration of all of the existing facilities in slums during the last five years were quite low.

### **Source of Improvement of Facilities:**

- ❖ Where improvement had been brought about during the last 5 years, it was due to the Government's efforts in the slums, for all the facilities. The contribution of NGOs is particularly noticeable in providing electricity and latrine facilities in the slum. However, residents themselves also played an important role in improving latrine and garbage disposal facility in slums.



A decorative border with a repeating geometric pattern in black, gold, and brown surrounds the page content.

**SECTION ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

## Section one: Introduction

Slums are an urban phenomenon which comes into existence on account of industrialization in and around cities thereby attracting in migration of population from country side. Though slums are a rich source of un-skilled and semi-skilled manpower, they tend to result in burden on the existing civic amenities. Government agencies and NGOs have flung into action and initiated several measures to improve the plight of slum dwellers and make the slum areas livable for the habitants as of late they are viewed as effective agents in the process of urban development rather than burden on urban infrastructure.

The UN Millennium Summit held in September, 2000 also included this aspect under Millennium Development Goals. In the light of the universal attention, the findings of this survey attain vital importance for perusing the agenda of bring out improvement in the lives of slum dwellers with more vigor.

The first nationwide survey on the 'economic condition of slum dwellers in urban cities' was conducted by the NSSO in its 31st round enquiry (July 1976 - June 1977). The survey was restricted to all the Class I towns having 1971 census population one lakh or more. Only the cities proper and not the urban agglomerations were considered for the survey coverage.

The second nationwide survey on particulars of slums was conducted in 49th round enquiry (January - June 1993), which covered rural as well as urban areas. Two kinds of slums - 'declared' and 'undeclared' - were covered. Certain areas declared as 'slums' by the appropriate municipality,

corporation, local body or development authorities were the 'declared slums'. Outside the declared slums, any compact area with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together – usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities – in unhygienic conditions was considered an 'undeclared slum', if at least 20 households lived in that area.

After a gap of nearly ten years, the third survey in the series was conducted in the 58<sup>th</sup> NSS round enquiry (July-December 2002). The concept of slum being basically urban, it was decided, to cover only urban slums in the survey. It is worth mentioning that the results of both the 49<sup>th</sup> and the 58<sup>th</sup> round survey reflect only the availability and not the adequacy of the facilities available in the slums.

The fourth survey in the series was conducted in 65<sup>th</sup> NSS round during the period July 2008 to June 2009. Like the 49<sup>th</sup> and 58<sup>th</sup> round surveys, this survey, too, dealt with the availability and not the adequacy of facilities available in the slums. The aim was to collect information on the present condition of the slums and on the change in the condition of some facilities available therein. Like the 58<sup>th</sup> round survey, this survey was confined to the urban sector. Only slums found in the randomly selected urban blocks were surveyed.

The present survey carried out in 69<sup>th</sup> round of NSS was thus the fifth nationwide NSS survey on slums. It relates to the period July 2012 to December 2012. The survey was confined to the urban sector. Only slums found in the randomly selected urban blocks were surveyed.

**Scope & Coverage:** The main aim of the survey was to come out with an estimate on the length & breath of slums in urban Delhi with respect to

approximate number of slum clusters and households therein and more importantly ascertain the relative change in their physical status in the light of various measures taken by government/local bodies and the residents themselves over a period to time in the existing facilities in these slum clusters. The survey covered the urban areas of whole of the Delhi State.

**Schedule of Enquiry:** A single schedule was used for each sample UFS block for filling up details of slums. If, for a sample block, more than one slum was eligible for survey, particulars of each such slum were recorded separately in the schedule. When the slum lay only partly within the sample UFS block, the slum characteristics recorded related to only the part of the slum which fell within the block.

**Total Sample Size:** For the State sample, there were about 306 UFS blocks allocated for Delhi. At Delhi level, a total of **31** slums were located and covered in the surveyed urban blocks of the State sample.

**Mode of Data Collection:** Unlike household surveys where data are collected from each household, data were collected in a holistic manner in respect of each slum from the **knowledgeable persons** available at the time of survey. However, due care was taken in selecting such persons.

**Presentation of Results:** The relevant concepts and definitions used in this survey are presented in section two. The sample, design and estimation procedure for the survey is given in section three. The summary of findings based on the survey data is discussed in section four. A copy of the schedule of enquiry is given in Appendix A.

## Limitations

- ❖ It may please be noted that the definition of slum adopted in this 69<sup>th</sup> round NSS survey and that of Slum Act of the Delhi State with respect to the physical characteristics of a slum are similar except in one important aspect viz. **the number of households**. As per NSS survey a compact settlement of atleast 20 households having slum like physical characteristics was treated as a Slum cluster whereas under the "Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956" the number of household is 50 or more.
- ❖ As per the Delhi Urban Shelter Improvement Board, Government of Delhi the *notified slums are the areas which had been notified slum under Section-3 of Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act 1956. The said notified slums area is falling mostly in the walled city and its extension. So far as Non-notified slum are concerned, all the JJ clusters which are located across the city is an illegal encroachment on public land. All these clusters are falling under the category of non notified/listed/identified slums.*
- ❖ The number of slum cluster estimated on the basis of this survey conducted during 2012 are bound to be different from that of the records maintained by "Delhi Urban Shelter Improvement Board" as there is a basic difference in definition of deciding a slum cluster in terms of minimum number of households in a slum.
- ❖ The status of a slum that is notified/non-notified is collected from the knowledgeable persons of the area. This aspect therefore is likely to be affected by recall lapse of the respondent. As such the data was not presented separately for notified and non-notified slums in the report.

A decorative border with a repeating geometric pattern in black, gold, and brown surrounds the central text.

**SECTION TWO**

**CONCEPT, DEFINITIONS AND PROCEDURE**

## Section Two: Concepts, Definitions and Procedure

For collection of data on the condition of slums, certain concepts and definitions were used in the survey. These are explained below.

**Slum:** A slum is a compact settlement with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions in that compact area (commonly known as “Jhuggi Jhopri”). Such an area, for the purpose of this survey, was considered as a “**slum pocket**” if at least 20 households lived in that area. For this survey, only slums in urban areas were considered.

**Notified Slum:** Areas notified as slums by the concerned State Governments/UTs, Municipalities, Corporations, Local Bodies or Development Authorities were termed as “Notified Slums”.

**Non-Notified Slum:** Such a settlement, if not notified as slum, is called a non-notified slum while a non-notified slum must consist of at least 20 households, no such restriction is imposed in case of notified slum.

**Slums eligible for survey:** For each sample UFS block, any slum (notified or non-notified) lying wholly or partly within the block was eligible for survey and had to be covered. If, for a sample block more than one slum was eligible for survey, particulars of each such slum were obtained separately.

**Part Slum:** When the slum lies only partly within the sample urban block, the part of the slum which falls within the block was considered a part

slum. In such cases all the slum particulars recorded were related to only the part slum unless the relevant item in schedule 0.21 mentions that the information is to given for the "whole slum". Such 'part slums' were surveyed even if the approximate number of households in the part slum (i.e. the part of the slum within the sample block) is less than 20. This differs from the procedure followed in previous survey, where a part slum qualified for survey only if it contained 20 or more households.

**House:** Every structure, tent, shelter, etc. was considered as a house irrespective of the nature of its use. It might be used for residential or non-residential purpose or both or even might be vacant.

**Household:** A group of person's normally living together and taking food from a common kitchen constituted a household. The members of a household might or might not be related by blood to one another.

Each inmate (including residential staff) of a hostel, mess, hotel, boarding and lodging house, residential institutions for disabled, etc. constituted a single member household. If, however, a group of persons among them normally pooled their income for spending, they together were treated as forming a household. For example, a family living in a hotel was treated as a separate household by itself.

In deciding the composition of a household, more emphasis was placed on 'normally living together' than on 'ordinarily taking food from a common kitchen'. In case the place of residence of a person was different from the place of boarding, he or she was treated as a member of the household with whom he or she resided.



A resident employee, or domestic servant, or a paying guest (but not just a tenant in the household) will be considered as a member of the household with whom he or she resides even though he or she is not a member of the same family.

When a person sleeps in one place (say, in a shop or in a room in another house because of space shortage) but usually takes food with his or her family, he or she should be treated not as a single member household but as a member of the household in which other members of his or her family stay.

If a member of a family (say, a son or a daughter of the head of the family) stays elsewhere (say, in hostel for studies or for any other reason), he/ she will not be considered as a member of his/ her parent's household. However, he/ she will be listed as a single member household if the hostel is listed.

**Pucca structure:** A pucca structure was one having walls and roofs made of "pucca materials".

**Pucca and non-pucca materials:** In the present survey, cement, concrete, oven burnt bricks, hollow cement/ash bricks, stone, stone blocks, jack boards (cement plastered reeds), iron, zinc or other metal sheets, timber, tiles, slate, corrugated iron, asbestos cement sheet, veneer, plywood, artificial wood of synthetic material and polyvinyl chloride (PVC) material constituted the list of pucca materials. All other materials were classified as "non-pucca materials". Non-pucca materials included unburnt bricks, bamboo, mud, grass, leaves, reeds, thatch, etc.

**Katcha structure:** A structure having both roof and walls made of non-pucca materials was called a katcha structure. Katcha structures could be of the following two types:

- (a) **'Unserviceable katcha,'** which included all structures with thatch walls and thatch roof i.e. walls made of grass, leaves, reeds etc. and roof of a similar material, and
- (b) **'Serviceable katcha,'** which included all katcha structures other than unserviceable katcha structures.

**Semi-pucca structure:** The term was used for a structure that had either the walls or the roof, but not both, made of pucca materials.

**Type of latrine:** Latrines serviced by scavengers were called "service latrines". A latrine connected to an underground sewerage system was called a "flush system latrine". A latrine connected to underground septic chambers was called a "septic tank latrine". A latrine connected to a pit dug in earth was called a "pit latrine". Information on type of latrine was recorded for the slum as a whole, which means that the type used most commonly by the slum dwellers, was recorded.

**Underground Sewerage system:** This means a system of underground pipes or conduits for carrying off drainage water, discharge from water closets, etc.

**Drainage system:** This means a system for carrying off waste water and liquid wastes of the area.

**Garbage disposal:** In the urban areas, some arrangements usually exist to carry away the refuse and waste of households to some dumping place away from the residential areas. In some places, the public bodies collect the garbage from the premises of the household or from some fixed points in the locality where the residents put their garbage. In some places, a body of residents themselves makes the arrangement of carrying the garbage to the dumping place away from residential areas without participation of any public body till the final disposal. Information on the arrangement prevailing for the colony/ locality of the slum was obtained in the survey.

**Distance of slum from nearest facility (government primary school, government hospital/ health centre):** The distance from the centre of the slum to the nearest facility of the type in question (e.g. government primary school, government hospital/health centre) availed by/available to the slum dwellers was considered.

A decorative border with a repeating geometric pattern in black, gold, and red surrounds the central text.

**SECTION THREE**

**SAMPLE DESIGN AND ESTIMATION  
PROCEDURE**

## Section Three: Sample Design and Estimation Procedure

**Geographical coverage:** The survey covered all urban areas of Delhi State.

**Period of survey and work programme:** The period of survey was of six months duration starting on 1st July 2012 and ending on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012. The survey period of this round was divided into two sub-rounds of three months' duration each as follows:

sub-round 1 : July - September 2012

sub-round 2 : October - December 2012

In each of these two sub-rounds equal numbers of sample villages/blocks (FSUs) were allotted for survey with a view to ensuring uniform spread of sample FSUs over the entire survey period. Attempts were made to survey each of the FSUs during the sub-round to which it was allotted.

**Schedules of enquiry:** During this round, the following schedules of enquiry were canvassed:

Schedule 0.0 : list of households

Schedule 1.2 : drinking water, sanitation, hygiene and housing condition

Schedule 0.21 : particulars of slum

Schedule 0.21 was canvassed in the Urban areas only.

## **Sample Design**

**Outline of sample design:** A stratified multi-stage design was adopted for the 69<sup>th</sup> round survey. The first stage units (FSUs) in the urban sector were Urban Frame Survey (UFS) blocks. For the survey of slums, there was, unlike the other surveys of the 69th round, no second stage of sampling involving selection of households. Nevertheless, the paragraphs that follow will refer to the sampling units for the slum survey as FSUs.

**Sampling Frame for First Stage Units:** For the urban sector, the list of latest updated/available Urban Frame Survey (UFS) blocks (2007-12) was considered as the sampling frame.

**Stratification in Urban sector:** Within the urban areas of a district, each town with population of 10 lakhs or more as per population census 2011 formed a separate basic stratum and the remaining urban areas of the district, were together considered as another basic stratum.

**Sub-Stratification:** Each stratum was divided into 2 sub-strata as follows:

sub-stratum 1: all UFS blocks having area type 'slum area'

sub-stratum 2: remaining UFS blocks

**Total sample size (FSUs):** A total number of 306 UFS blocks formed the State sample as against the 153 UFS blocks of Central sample.

**Allocation to strata/ sub-strata:** Within each sector of a State/ UT, the sample size was allocated to the different strata in proportion to the

stratum populations as per Census 2011. Stratum allocations were distributed among the two sub strata in proportion to the number of blocks in the sub strata. Minimum allocation for each sub strata was 2. Equal number of samples had been allotted among the two sub rounds.

**Selection of UFS Blocks:** The NSS urban frame survey (UFS 2007-12 phase) blocks were used for all towns and cities. From each Stratum/Sub-stratum (formed from UFS towns), the UFS blocks were selected using Simple Random sampling Without Replacement (SRSWOR). Sample FSUs were selected in the form of two independent sub-samples and an equal number of sample FSUs were allocated to the two sub- rounds. Also, an additional sample of UFS Blocks in the form of sub-sample 3, equal to the number of sample UFS blocks in each of the sub-sample 1 & 2, was allocated to the sub-stratum 1 only.

**Survey on urban slums:** Information on each slum, notified or non-notified, found in the entire selected FSU was collected through Schedule 0.21. In case the slum was spread over more than one FSU, only the part within the selected FSU was surveyed (even if the approximate number in the part slum is less than 20) and considered as 'one slum'.

## **Estimation Procedure**

### **Notations**

s = subscript for stratum

t = subscript for sub-stratum (only for UFS towns)

m = subscript for sub-sample (m =1, 2)

i = subscript for FSU (block/ non-UFS town)

a= subscript for a<sup>th</sup> slum (whole or part) found within the UFS Block

N = total number of FSUs in any urban sub-stratum

n = number of sample FSUs surveyed including zero cases but excluding casualty for a particular sub-sample and stratum/sub-stratum.

L= total number of slums (whole or part) found within the sample UFS block

b= total number of UFS blocks intersecting the slum

x, y = observed value of characteristics x, y under estimation

$X^{\wedge}$  ,  $Y^{\wedge}$  = estimate of population total X, Y for the characteristics x, y

In terms of the above symbols,

$Y_{stmijk}$  = observed value of the characteristic Y for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  household in the  $j^{\text{th}}$  second stage stratum of the  $d^{\text{th}}$  hg/sb ( $d=1,2$ ) of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  FSU belonging to the  $m^{\text{th}}$  sub-sample for the  $t^{\text{th}}$  sub-stratum of the  $s^{\text{th}}$  stratum.

However, for ease of understanding, a few symbols have been suppressed in following paragraphs where they are obvious.

**Formulae for estimation of aggregates for a particular sub-sample and stratum/sub-stratum:**

**For sub-sample 1,2 & 3:**

For estimating the aggregate value of a characteristic (no. of slums with a given feature) for the  $t^{\text{th}}$  sub-strata of the  $s^{\text{th}}$  stratum on the basis of the  $m^{\text{th}}$  sub-sample:

$$\hat{Y}_{sm} = \sum_{t=1}^2 \hat{Y}_{stm}$$



Where  $\hat{Y}_{stm} = \frac{N_{st}}{n_{stm}} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{stmi}$  and  $\hat{Y}_{stmi}$  is the total observed values for the characteristic  $y$  for the  $i$ -th FSU.

**Overall estimate for aggregates:**

Overall estimate for aggregates for a stratum ( $s \hat{Y}$ ) based on two sub-samples is obtained as:

$$\hat{Y}_s = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^2 \hat{Y}_{sm}$$

**Overall Estimate of Aggregates at State/UT:**

The overall estimate  $\hat{Y}$  at the State/ UT level is obtained by summing the stratum estimates ( $\hat{Y}_s$ ) over all strata belonging to the State/ UT.

A decorative border with a repeating geometric pattern in black, gold, and brown surrounds the central text.

**SECTION FOUR**

**SUMMARY FINDINGS**

## Section Four: Summary Findings

The 69th round of survey, inter-alia, include the subject on condition of urban slums. Unlike the previous surveys conducted under the NSS rounds, where the information was collected from each selected household, information on the civic facilities of the slums was collected from one or more knowledgeable persons in respect of each of the selected slums. This was the fifth survey on slums after the 65<sup>th</sup> round (July,2008 - June,2009), 58<sup>th</sup> round (July – December, 2002), 31st round (July, 1976- June, 77) and the 49th round (January-June 1993). As the slum is essentially an urban phenomenon, this survey covered only the urban areas.

The findings are based on the survey conducted in a sample of 32 urban slums. The present report contains information on ownership of the land of slums , area type, its surroundings, structure type, availability of living facilities like electricity, drinking water, latrine, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal, distance of the slum from nearest primary school and government hospital/health centre. It also provides information on the change in the condition of the urban slums during the last five years along with the sources of improvement of the facilities, if any.

### **Estimated No. of Slums and Households**

The survey estimated the total number of slums as 6343 and the total number of households therein was estimated as 10.20 lakhs. About 29% of slums were having 20-60 households, while rest 71% of slums were having more than 60 households each. Average 161 households per slum were found to be in these slums.

**Statement No.4.1: Estimated number of slums and estimated approximate number of households within these slums and no. of sample slums**

Item	with approximate numbers		
	20<h<60	h>60	All
Estimated no. of slums	1827	4516	6343
%	28.80	71.20	100.00
Estimated no. of households	82884	937540	1020423
%	8.12	91.88	100.00
No. of sample slums	6	26	32

The approximate area of the slum in hectares was ascertained during the survey. The survey revealed that about 39% of the slums were on the plot area of approximately less than 0.5 hectares another 58% on plot area of 0.5 - 1 hectares, 0.24% of them on 1-2 hectares. And the remaining slums were found to be having around 2 hectare or more area.

**Statement No.4.2: Distribution of Slums by approximate area of Slum**

Particulars	Approximate area of slums (in hectares)								Total
	Less than 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-6	6-8	8 or above	
No. of Slums	2447	3704	15	22	112	42	0	1	6343
%	38.58	58.40	0.24	0.34	1.77	0.66	0.00	0.02	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	19.86	28.84	47.84	2.62		0.84			100.00

**Statement No.4.2.1: Distribution of Households by approximate area of Slum**

Particulars	Approximate area of households (in hectares)								Total
	Less than 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-6	6-8	8 or above	
No. of Households	474168	522083	1603	2434	11162	8800	0	173	1020423
%	46.47	51.16	0.16	0.24	1.09	0.86	0.00	0.02	100.00

About 98% households were in the slums those spread out on a plot area less than 1 hectare another 0.16% on the plot area of 1-2 hectare and the remaining were in the slums those on a plot area ranged between 2 hectares and above.

**Statement No.4.2.2: Estimated approximate number of households per slum by approximate area of slum**

Particulars	Average number of households per slum by approx area of slum (in hectares)								Total
	Less than 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-6	6-8	8 or above	
No. of Households	194	141	107	111	100	210	0	173	161

About 173 households per slum were found to be in the slums those spread out on a plot area ranged 8 hectares or above, the average for the slums those spread out on a plot area ranged 6-8, 4-6, 3-4, 2-3, 1-2, 0.5-1 and less than 0.5 hectares was 0, 210,100,111,107,141 and 194 households respectively per slum.


**Land owner of Slum Area**

The survey estimated that 90.24% of the slums are on the public land which constitutes 45.83% are on the land owned by local bodies, 28.24% on the land owned by Railways and remaining 16.18% are on the land of other

government agencies. About 2% of the slums are on the private land and about 8% of the slums were on the land whose ownership was not known to the knowledgeable persons of the locality.

**Statement No.4.3: Distribution of Slums by ownership of land**

Particulars	Ownership type					Total
	Private	Public			Not known	
		Local bodies	Railway	Others		
No. of Slums	117	2907	1791	1026	501	6343
%	1.84	45.83	28.24	16.18	7.90	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	9.38	54.17	13.51	10.57	12.37	100.00



**Location of slum**

As per findings of the survey, about 16.19% of the slums have cropped up along Nala (drainage), around 27.64% along railway track, 27.73% at open place/park and the rest of the slums at other places.

#### Statement No.4.4: Distribution of Slums by their location

Particulars	Location of Slum						Total
	Along Nallah	Along Railway Line	River Bank/River Bed	Park/Open space	Hilly terrain/slope	Others	
No. of Slums	1027	1753	24	1759	13	1767	6343
%	16.19	27.64	0.38	27.73	0.20	27.86	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	8.18	25.19	66.63				100.00

#### Type of Area of Slum

During the survey, information was also collected regarding the type of area, surrounding the slums. It has come to understand that about 74.46% of the slums are surrounded by residential areas, about 3.36% by industrial areas, 0.66% by commercial areas and rest by other type of areas.

#### Statement No.4.5: Distribution of Slums by type of area surrounding the Slum


Particulars	Type of area surrounding the slum					Total
	Residential	Industrial	Commercial	Others	n.r.	
No. of Slums	4723	213	42	1365	0	6343
%	74.46	3.36	0.66	21.52	0	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	64.28	15.51	7.88	8.02	4.31	100.00

#### Type of Structure

Under the survey, data was collected on the over all status of majority of structures of the slums rather than collecting the micro level information at the household level. Accordingly, it was found that about 55% of the slums were found to be having pucca and 29% of the slums were having semi pucca type dwellings in Delhi and the remaining 16% were unserviceable kutcha in nature.

**Statement No.4.6: Distribution of Slums by type of structure of the majority of houses**

Particulars	Type of structure of the majority of houses					Total
	Pucca	Semi pucca	Servicable katcha	Unserviceable katcha	No structure	
No. of Slums	3483	1869	0	991	0	6343
%	54.91	29.47	0.00	15.62	0.00	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008)	49.75	41.78	8.47	0.00	0.00	100.00



**Availability of Basic Civic Amenities in Slums**


The main focus of the survey is on the availability of various basic civic facilities in the slums of Delhi in order to assess the quality of life in slums of Delhi. The facility covers include source of drinking water, availability of approach road and roads within slums, type of latrine, drainage system, for garbage disposal arrangement and frequency of garbage collection etc.



**Statement No.4.7: Distribution of Slums by source of drinking water**

Particulars	Major source of drinking water			
	Tap	Hand pump/Tube well	Others	Total
No. of Slums	5487	855	1	6343
%	86.50	13.48	0.02	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	87.63	8.91	3.46	100.00

It was observed that for the 86.50% of slums in Delhi the major source of drinking water was tap. About 13.48% were dependent on hand pump/tube well as major source and rest 0.02% of the slums were served by other sources.



Survey has brought to the notice that 30% of the slums having latrine with the facility of septic tank/flush (owned, shared and community basis) and about 22% of the slums having reported with no latrine facility.

**Statement No.4.8: Distribution of Slums by type of latrine facility used**

Latrine facility used by most of the residents of the slum	No. of Slums	%
<b>Owned</b>		
Septic tank/flush	117	1.84
Pit	1002	15.80
Service	24	0.38
<b>Shared</b>		
Septic tank/flush	0	0.00
Pit	0	0.00
Service	835	13.16
<b>Public/Community</b>		
Septic tank/flush	1815	28.61
Pit	23	0.36
Service	1156	18.22
<b>No Latrine</b>	1371	21.61
<b>Total</b>	6343	100.00

Underground sewerage system has been available in the 16.30% of the slums whereas 83.70% of the slums not having any underground sewerage system.


**Statement No.4.9: Distribution of Slums by type of sewerage systems**

Particulars	Underground sewerage System		
	Available	Not Available	Total
No. of Slums	1034	5309	6343
%	16.30	83.70	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	22.71	77.29	100.00

Coming to the drainage system available in slums, the survey has brought to the notice that about 1.62% of slums does not have any drainage and 98.38% of the slums were having under ground/covered pucca/open pucca/kutchha type of drainage system.

**Statement No.4.10: Distribution of slums by type of drainage system**

Particulars	Type of drainage system					Total
	Under-ground	Covered pucca	open pucca	open katcha	No drainage	
No. of Slums	13	486	5187	554	103	6343
%	0.20	7.66	81.78	8.73	1.62	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	2.76	3.42	66.70	11.12	16.01	100.00



**Garbage Disposal Arrangement**

The arrangement for the disposal of garbage by local bodies was prevalent in about 31.45% of the slums, 58.70% of the slums were having the arrangement made by the residents themselves, about 9.85% were covered by other type of arrangement for garbage disposal.

**Statement No.4.11: Distribution of Slums by type of garbage disposal arrangement**

Particulars	Garbage disposal systems					
	Arranged by				No arrangement	Total
	Local body	Residents	Others	Sub-Total		
No. of Slums	1995	3723	625	6343	0	6343
%	31.45	58.70	9.85	100.00	0.00	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	66.47	8.52	1.05	76.04	23.96	100.00

Further study reveals that out of the slums having garbage disposal arrangement provided by local bodies, and the frequency in which garbage was collected from slums was also closely studied. It was found that in 69% of such slum, garbage clearance is carried out daily or once within two days and in 29% of slums, garbage is cleared once in 3-7 days and 0.68% in 8 days & above category.

**Statement No.4.12: Distribution of Slums by frequency of garbage collection by local body and others**

Particulars	Frequency of collection of garbage by local body and others					
	Daily	Once in			other	Total
		2 days	3 to 7 days	8 days to 15days		
No. of Slums	2321	2049	1832	43	98	6343
%	36.60	32.30	28.88	0.68	1.55	100.00

**Status of Approach/internal roads**

It was found that 48% of the slums were connected by motorable pucca/kutchha roads which by all standards is a satisfactory state in this respect.

**Statement No.4.13: Distribution of slums by type of approach roads**

Type of approach roads/path to the Slum	No. of Slums	%	65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)
<b>Motorable</b>			
Pucca	3006	47.39	80.66
Kutchha	48	0.76	3.39
Total	3054	48.15	84.05
<b>Non-motorable**</b>			
Pucca	2788	43.95	15.95
Kutchha	501	7.90	0.00
Total	3289	51.85	15.95
<b>Total</b>			
Pucca	5794	91.34	96.61
Kutchha	549	8.66	3.39
Total	6343	100.00	100.00

\*\* In case of slums those not having motorable approach roads were having the motorable road with in a distance of less than 0.5 km.

Coming to the roads/path lanes, road within slums, it was observed that about 77% of the slums were having pucca roads/lanes within slums and 23% were having kutchha type of roads which may not perhaps make the life comfortable during rainy season.

**Statement No.4.14: Distribution of Slums by type of internal roads**


Particulars	Type of roads/lane/path constructed within the slums		
	Pucca	Katcha	Total
No. of Slums	4887	1456	6343
%	77.05	22.95	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	76.77	23.23	100.00

## Availability of Electricity

Electricity connections in the slums may be for household use, street lights or both. About 17% of slums were having electricity for both street lights and for household use, about 24% of slums were having electricity for household use only, 59% of slums having street lights where 0.38% households were having no electricity connection.

### Statement No.4.15: Distribution of Slums by type of electricity facilities

Particulars	Number of Slum				
	Electricity for			No electricity	Total
	both street lights and household use	household use only	street light only		
No. of Slums	1063	1516	3740	24	6343
%	16.76	23.90	58.96	0.38	100.00



## Education and Health Facilities

The other important parameters in the context of status of slums is the availability of educational and health facilities at the reach of slum dwellers. For this purpose, the proximity of slum colonies to the nearest govt. primary schools and govt. hospitals was ascertained during the survey. It was observed that about 87% of the slums were having primary schools in the proximity of less than ½ km., 11% in the range of 0.5 to 1 km, 2% in the range of 1-2 km and only 0.38% of the slum colonies were having primary schools in a distance of 2-5 km which is very comfortable by any standard.

### Statement No.4.16: Number of slums from nearest government primary school

Particulars	Distance from nearest primary school (km)					Total
	Less than 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-5	5 & above	
No. of Slums	5502	714	103	24	0	6343
%	86.74	11.26	1.63	0.38	0.00	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	60.91	33.30	4.85	0.93	0.00	100.00

On the other hand, in respect of health facilities, 19% of the slum colonies were having the government hospital facilities within the distance of ½ km followed by 28% slums in the distance of 0.5-1km, 36% in the distance of 1-2 km, 14% in the range of 2-5 km and about 2% slum colonies are covered by government hospitals in the distance of 5 km and above.

**Statement No.4.17: Number of slums from nearest government hospital**

Particulars	Distance from nearest hospital (km)					Total
	Less than 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-5	5 & above	
No. of Slums	1223	1797	2303	905	115	6343
%	19.28	28.33	36.31	14.27	1.81	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	26.40	24.65	18.61	17.61	12.73	100.00

It was further noticed that around 9.30% of the slums experienced water logging during monsoon season. This conclusion is based on the experience of the last five years

**Statement No.4.18: Distribution of slums by status of water logging**

Particulars	Number of slums usually water logged during monsoon		
	Yes	No	Total
No. of Slums	590	5753	6343
%	9.30	90.70	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2008) (%)	15.72	84.28	100.00

**Association for Development**

The knowledgeable persons present at the time of survey were asked to provide information as to the existence of any association of slum dwellers in the given slum working for the betterment of these slums conditions. It has come to understand that about 4% of the slums in Delhi were having association either formal/informal to oversee the betterment of slums formed by the slum dwellers themselves.



#### **Statement No.4.19: Distribution of slums by Existence of Association**

Particulars	Association for improving the conditions of slums		
	Yes	No	Total
No. of Slums	281	6062	6343
%	4.43	95.57	100.00
65 <sup>th</sup> NSS Round (2012) (%)	35.28	64.72	100.00

#### **Improvement of facilities**

In order to assess the change in the quality of civic amenities provided to the people living in slums the knowledgeable persons present at the time of survey were asked whether the facilities had undergone any improvement or deterioration during the last five years.

The Statement 4.20 provides the position with respect to 11 such facilities. It may be observed from the table that facilities had improved in about 50% of slums in terms of 9 facilities viz. water supply, electricity, street light, drainage, garbage disposals, approach road to slum, roads with in the slum, education facility at primary level and medical facility. The incidents of deterioration of most of the existing facilities in slums during the last five years were quite low.

**Statement No.4.20: Distribution of slums by status of improvement in facilities during the period of last five years**

Facility		No. of Slums			
		Improved	Did not change	Deteriorated	neither existed earlier nor existing now
Water Supply	No.	3817	1588	0	938
	%	60.18	25.04	0.00	14.79
Electricity	No.	5595	222	501	24
	%	88.21	3.50	7.91	0.38
Street Light	No.	5083	653	1	606
	%	80.14	10.29	0.02	9.55
Latrine	No.	2018	2819	35	1471
	%	31.81	44.44	0.55	23.19
Drainage	No.	4649	1591	0	103
	%	73.29	25.08	0.00	1.62
Sewerage	No.	1469	2715	31	2128
	%	23.16	42.80	0.49	33.55
Garbage Disposal	No.	3742	1965	514	122
	%	58.99	30.98	8.10	1.92
Approach road to the Slum	No.	5495	835	13	0
	%	86.63	13.16	0.20	0.00
Road within the Slum	No.	4687	1536	41	79
	%	73.89	24.22	0.65	1.25
Educational facility at primary level	No.	5128	1215	0	0
	%	80.85	19.15	0.00	0.00
Medical Facility	No.	6071	272	0	0
	%	95.71	4.29	0.00	0.00

**Source of Improvement of Facilities**

Informants reporting improvement in any facility during the last 5 years were also asked about the source of the improvement: whether it had been brought about by the government, by NGOs, by the residents, or by others. The results, shown in Statement 4.21, indicate that the Government has played a vital role in the development of facilities in slums. The contribution of NGOs is particularly noticeable in providing electricity and latrine facilities in the slum pockets. However, residents themselves also

played an important role in improving latrine and garbage disposal facility in slum pockets.

**Statement No.4.21: Distribution of slums reporting improvement of facility during last five years by type of authority responsible for improvement**

Facility		No. of Slum			
		Govt.	NGO	Residents	Others
Water Supply	No.	3817	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Electricity	No.	5571	24	-	-
	%	99.57	0.43	-	-
Street Light	No.	7625	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Latrine	No.	1977	24	17	-
	%	97.97	1.19	0.84	-
Drainage	No.	4649	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Sewerage	No.	1469	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Garbage Disposal	No.	2907	-	835	-
	%	77.69	-	22.31	-
Approach road to the Slum	No.	5495	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Road within the Slum	No.	4687	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Educational facility at primary level	No.	7859	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-
Medical Facility	No.	6071	-	-	-
	%	100.00	-	-	-

## Comparison of key findings

Selected findings of State, Central and at all India level are presented in the following Statement 4.22. The important indicators were by and large found to be comparable in both sets of data (i.e. State Sample and Central Sample).

### Statement No.4.22: Comparison of key results of State and Central Sample viz-a-viz all India level

SN	Item	State Sample (All)	Central Sample			All India		
			Notified	Non-notified	All	Notified	Non-notified	All
1	Number of Sample Slums surveyed	32				441	440	881
2	Estimated number of Slum Pockets	6343				13761	19749	32510
3	Estimated number of households within these Slums (in lakhs)	10.20				55.60	32.49	88.09
4	% distribution of Slums by type of ownership of land							
	Private	2				48	41	44
	Public	90						
	Not known	8						
5	% distribution of Slums by type of structure of majority of houses							
	Pucca	55				85	42	60
	Semi Pucca	29						
	Katcha	16						
	No structure	0						
6	% distribution of Slums by major source of drinking water							
	Tap	86				82	64	71
	Hand Pump/Tube well	14						
	Others	0						

SN	Item	State Sample (All)	Central Sample			All India		
			Notified	Non-notified	All	Notified	Non-notified	All
7	% distribution of Slums by type of availability of electricity connections							
	Household and Street Light	<b>17</b>						
	Household only	<b>23</b>						
	Street light only	<b>59</b>						
	No electricity	<b>0</b>				1	11	<b>65</b>
8	% distribution of Slum by location of slums							
	Along Nallah/Drain	<b>16</b>						
	Along Railway Line	<b>28</b>						
	Others	<b>28</b>						
	Park	<b>28</b>						
9	% distribution of Slums having pucca road within the slum and pucca approach road to the slum							
	Pucca road within the slum	<b>77</b>				83	55	<b>66</b>
	Pucca approach road to the slum							
	a. Motorable	<b>47</b>						
	b. Non motorable	<b>44</b>						
10	% distribution of Slums by usually water logging during monsoon							
	Water logged	<b>9</b>						
	Not water logged	<b>91</b>						
11	% distribution of Slums having septic tank/flush latrine and not having							
	Septic tank/flush latrine	<b>30</b>						
	No latrine	<b>22</b>				16	42	<b>31</b>
12	% distribution of slums having under ground sewerage	<b>16</b>						
13	% distribution of Slums by type of drainage system							
	Under ground/covered	<b>8</b>						
	Opened	<b>91</b>						
	No drainage	<b>1</b>				11	45	<b>31</b>

SN	Item	State Sample (All)	Central Sample			All India		
			Notified	Non-notified	All	Notified	Non-notified	All
14	% distribution of Slums by type of agency disposing of garbage							
	Government	<b>31</b>						
	Residents	<b>59</b>						
	Others	<b>10</b>						
	No arrangements	<b>0</b>				11	38	<b>27</b>
15	% distribution of Slums by distance from nearest government primary school							
	Within 1 km	<b>98</b>						
	More than 1 km	<b>2</b>						
16	% distribution of Slums by distance from nearest government hospital							
	Within 1 km	<b>48</b>						
	More than 1 km	<b>52</b>						

**APPENDIX –A**

**THE FACSIMILE OF THE SCHEDULE OF  
ENQUIRY (SCH. 0.21)**

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY OFFICE  
SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY  
SIXTY-NINTH ROUND: JULY - DECEMBER 2012

CENTRAL	*
STATE	

SCHEDULE 0.21: PARTICULARS OF SLUMS

<b>[0] descriptive identification of sample UFS block</b>	
1. state/ UT:	4. investigator unit:
2. district:	5. block:
3. town name:	

<b>[1] identification of sample UFS block</b>									
sl. no.	item	code			sl. no.	item	code		
1.	srl. no. of sample UFS block				8.	stratum			
2.	round number	6		9	9.	sub-stratum			
3.	schedule number	0	2	1	10.	sub-round			
4.	sample (central -1, state -2)				11.	sub-sample			
5.	sector (rural -1, urban -2)		2		12.	FOD sub-region			
6.	NSS region				13.	no. of slum(s) wholly or partly within the sample UFS block			
7.	district								

<b>[2] some salient features of the slum(s) lying wholly or partly within the sample UFS block</b>						
sl. no.	particulars	serial number of the slum				
1.	srl. number of the slum in the UFS block	1	2	3	4	5
2.	is the slum a notified one? (yes -1, no -2)					
3.	if code 1 in item 2, year of notification (4-digit)					
4.	total number of UFS blocks intersecting the slum					
5.	approximate number of households in the slum (within UFS block*)					
6.	approximate number of households in the WHOLE SLUM#					
7.	approximate area of the slum (within UFS block*) (code)					
8.	approximate area of the WHOLE SLUM# (code)					

# including part of slum lying outside sample UFS block, if any

\*irrespective of sub-block formation

item no. 7,8: **approximate area of the slum:** class intervals in hectares: less than 0.05 -1, 0.05 to 1.00 -2, 1.00 to 2.00 -3, 2.00 to 3.00 -4, 3.00 to 4.00 -5, 4.00 to 6.00 -6, 6.00 to 8.00 -7, 8.00 or more -8

\* tick mark (✓) may be put in the appropriate place



**CODES FOR BLOCK 3**

item 2	<b>ownership of the land where slum is located:</b> private - 1; public: railway - 2, local bodies - 3, others - 9; not known - 4
item 3	<b>type of area surrounding the slum:</b> residential -1, industrial -2, commercial -3, slum(s) -4, others -9
item 5	<b>physical location of the slum:</b> along nallah/drain -1, along railway line -2, river bank/ river bed -3, hilly terrain/ slope -4, park/ open space -5, others - 9.
item 8	<b>whether the slum has electricity:</b> <u>yes:</u> for street lights only -1, for household use only -2, for street lights and household use -3; <u>no</u> -4
item 9	<b>type of structure of the majority of houses:</b> pucca -1, semi-pucca -2, serviceable katcha -3, unserviceable katcha -4, no structure-5
item 11	<b>approach road/ lane/ constructed path to the slum:</b> <u>motorable:</u> pucca -1, katcha -2; <u>non- motorable:</u> pucca -3, katcha -4
item 12	<b>distance from the nearest motorable road:</b> less than 0.5 km -1, 0.5 to 1 km -2, 1 to 2 km -3, 2 to 5 km -4, 5 km or more -5
item 13	<b>major source of drinking water:</b> tap -1, tube well/ borehole -2, protected well -3, unprotected well -4, others -9
item 14	<b>latrine facility used by most of the residents:</b> <u>public/community latrine (without payment):</u> dry pit -01, flush/ pour-flush -02, others - 03; <u>public/community latrine (with payment):</u> dry pit -04, flush/ pour-flush -05, others - 06; <u>shared latrine:</u> dry pit -07, flush/ pour-flush -08, others - 10; <u>own latrine:</u> dry pit -11, flush/ pour-flush -12, others - 13; <u>no latrine facility</u> -14
item 16	<b>type of drainage system:</b> underground -1, covered pucca -2, open pucca -3, open katcha - 4, no drainage system -5
item 17	<b>garbage disposal for the slum:</b> arrangement by: municipality / corporation -1, resident(s) -2, others -9; no arrangement -3
item 18	<b>frequency of garbage collection:</b> daily -1, once in two days -2, once in 3 to 7 days -3 , once in 8 to 15 days -4, others -9
items 19, 20	<b>distance:</b> less than 0.5 km -1, 0.5 to 1 km -2, 1 to 2 km -3, 2 to 5 km -4, 5 km or more -5
item 23	<b>informant code:</b> knowledgeable person from (i) the slum: male -1, female -2; (ii) outside the slum -9

<b>[3] characteristics of slum(s) lying wholly or partly within the sample UFS block</b>						
sl. no.	item	serial number of the slum				
1.	serial number of the slum in the sample UFS block	1	2	3	4	5
2.	ownership of the land where slum is located (code)					
3.	type of area surrounding the slum (code)					
4.	location of slum (fringe area - 1, other area - 2)					
5.	physical location of the slum (code)					
6.	does the slum usually remain water-logged due to rainfall? (yes -1, no -2)					
7.	does the approach road / lane / constructed path usually remain waterlogged due to rainfall? (yes -1, no -2)					
8.	whether the slum has electricity (code)					
9.	type of structure of the majority of houses (code)					
10.	type of road/ lane/ constructed path <u>within the slum</u> (pucca -1, katcha -2)					
11.	approach road/ lane/ constructed path <u>to the slum</u> (code)					
12.	for code 3 or code 4 in item 11, distance from the nearest motorable road (code)					
13.	major source of drinking water (code)					
14.	latrine facility used by most of the residents (code)					
15.	does the slum have underground sewerage system? (yes -1, no -2)					
16.	type of drainage system (code)					
17.	garbage disposal for the slum (code)					
18.	frequency of garbage collection (code)					
19.	distance from nearest government primary school (code)					
20.	distance from nearest government hospital/ health centre/ etc. (code)					
21.	do the slum dwellers have an association for improving the condition of the slum? (yes -1, no -2)					
22.	whether the slum has benefited from JNNURM/RAY/any other slum improvement scheme (yes -1, no -2)					
23.	informant code					

**Note: If slum lies partly inside sample UFS block and partly outside it, all information recorded in this block will relate to that part of the slum that is inside the sample block.**

**[4] change during the last 5 years in the condition of the slum(s) lying wholly or partly within the sample UFS block**

sl. no.	item	serial number of the slum										
		1		2		3		4		5		
		change in condition (code)	for code 1 in col. (3), source of improvement (code)	change in condition (code)	for code 1 in col. (5), source of improvement (code)	change in condition (code)	for code 1 in col. (7), source of improvement (code)	change in condition (code)	for code 1 in col. (9), source of improvement (code)	change in condition (code)	for code 1 in col. (11), source of improvement (code)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	
1.	road: approach											
2.	road: within											
3.	water supply											
4.	street lights											
5.	electricity											
6.	latrine facility											
7.	sewerage											
8.	drainage											
9.	garbage disposal											
10.	educational facility at primary level											
11.	medical facility											

cols. 3/5/7/9/11: **change in condition:** improvement - 1, no change - 2, deterioration - 3; neither existed earlier nor existing now - 4

cols. 4/6/8/10/12: **source of improvement:** government - 1, non-governmental organisation - 2, residents - 3, others - 9

**Note:** If slum lies partly inside sample UFS block and partly outside it, all information recorded in this block will relate to that part of the slum that is inside the sample block.

<b>[5] particulars of field operations</b>										
sl. no.	item	field investigator (FI)/ asstt. superintending officer(ASO)			field officer (FO)/ superintending officer (SO)					
(1)	(2)	(3)			(4)					
1(a).	(i) name (block letters)									
	(ii) code									
	(iii) signature									
1(b).	(i) name (block letters)									
	(ii) code									
	(iii) signature									
2.	<b>date(s) of:</b>	DD	MM	YY	DD	MM	YY			
	(i) commencement of survey/ inspection									
	(ii) completion of survey / inspection									
	(iii) receipt									
	(iv) scrutiny									
	(v) despatch									
3.	number of additional sheet(s) attached									
4.	total time taken to canvass the schedule by the team of investigators (FI/ASO) (in minutes) [no decimal point]									
5.	number of investigators (FI/ASO) in the team									
6.	whether any remark has been entered by FI/ASO/supervisory officer (yes-1, no-2)	(i) in block 6/7								
		(ii) elsewhere in the schedule								

<b>[6] remarks by field investigator / asstt. superintending officer</b>

**[7] comments by supervisory officer(s)**

--