

Digitisation of Local Governance in India

An Exploratory Study Using Public-Domain Evidence
(October 2026)



Institute of Public Auditors of India
IPAI Gujarat Chapter

Disclaimer

This Knowledge Paper is an exploratory study prepared by the IPAI Gujarat Chapter for knowledge development and professional capacity building, based on information available in the public domain.

Due care has been exercised in compiling and presenting the information. Any inadvertent error, omission or discrepancy is purely incidental and should not be construed as a considered opinion or official position of the Institute of Public Auditors of India (IPAI).

The study does not constitute an audit, assurance, certification, rating, ranking or formal evaluation. Readers may refer to the original sources for the latest and authoritative position.

IPAI shall not be responsible or liable for any action, decision or consequence arising from the use or interpretation of this Knowledge Paper.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
2. Purpose of the Study
3. Scope of the Study
4. Nature and Boundaries of the Study
5. Local Governance Landscape in India
6. Emerging Digital Local Governance Ecosystem
7. From Local Government Functions to Digital Processes
8. Information Generated Through the Digital Ecosystem
9. Sectoral Evidence Landscape
10. What the Evidence Reveals
11. Emerging Issues and Opportunities
12. Conclusion and Road Ahead

Annexure I — State/UT-wise Functional and Institutional Landscape of PRIs and ULBs

Annexure II — Digital Applications and Public-Domain Evidence Ecosystem for PRIs and ULBs

Annexure III — Information Generated through the Digital Local Governance Ecosystem

Annexure IV — Comparative Sectoral Evidence Profile

Annexure V — Illustrative Sectoral Evidence Demonstration (SED)

Annexure VI — Principal Public-Domain Sources

Executive Summary

This exploratory study examines the **Digitisation of Local Governance in India** using publicly available evidence relating to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) and the wider institutional and sectoral ecosystem within which they operate.

The study indicates that digitisation has progressed beyond individual applications and transactions into a **distributed digital ecosystem** supporting planning, financial management, programmes, assets, beneficiaries, public services, monitoring, audit and reporting.

An illustrative examination across twelve development sectors identifies substantial digital information at varying levels—from individuals, households, institutions and assets to Local Bodies, districts, States/UTs and the national level. This information, however, remains distributed across multiple systems and authorities.

The emerging opportunity is therefore not merely to generate more digital information, but to improve its **quality, connectivity and effective use** for planning, service delivery, monitoring, accountability and informed decision-making—progressively moving towards **informed and evidence-enabled Local Governance**.

1. Introduction

Local Governance occupies a critical position in India's governance and development architecture. Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs), constitutionally recognised through the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments, function at the level where public institutions, development interventions, service delivery and citizens interact most directly.

The functioning of Local Governments is shaped not only by their constitutional and statutory responsibilities but also by the actual assignment of functions, finances and functionaries under State and Union Territory-specific legislative, administrative and institutional arrangements. Local development also involves sectoral departments, implementing agencies, development authorities and other institutions operating within the same geographical space.

Over the years, this governance environment has increasingly become digitised. Digital applications, portals, Management Information Systems (MIS), dashboards, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), financial management systems and sector-specific platforms now support a wide range of governmental functions including planning, budgeting, accounting, payments, works management, asset management, beneficiary administration, service delivery, grievance redressal, monitoring, audit and reporting.

Digitisation has consequently created something larger than a collection of individual government applications. These systems collectively generate substantial information relating to institutions, finances, plans, programmes, projects, assets, beneficiaries, services and development interventions.

At the same time, much of this information is generated through different institutions and applications for different administrative, financial, regulatory, programme-management and service-delivery purposes. Information relating to the same village, town, district or population may therefore reside across multiple digital systems and sectoral platforms.

Against this background, the Institute of Public Auditors of India (IPAI), Gujarat Chapter, undertook this exploratory study to understand the emerging landscape of Digitisation of Local Governance in India using information available in the public domain.

2. Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study is knowledge development and professional capacity building by examining the nature and extent of digitisation associated with Local Governance in India.

The study seeks broadly to understand:

- the institutional and functional landscape within which Local Governance operates;
- the digital applications and systems supporting PRI and ULB functions and processes;
- the nature of information generated and made available through these digital systems;
- the extent to which digital information relating to development sectors is visible in the public domain;
- the spatial and institutional levels at which such information is available; and
- the broad patterns, issues and opportunities that emerge from the publicly available evidence.

The study is exploratory in character. It does not begin with a predetermined conclusion regarding the effectiveness of digitisation. Rather, it seeks to understand the digital landscape from the evidence that is publicly visible.

3. Scope of the Study

The study broadly covers the digital governance environment associated with Panchayati Raj Institutions and Urban Local Bodies and, where relevant to Local Governance and local development, Development Authorities, Notified Areas, district and State institutions, sectoral departments and implementing agencies.

The geographical and institutional context may include rural, tribal and PESA areas, rural and peri-urban areas, towns and cities, industrial and notified areas and metropolitan settings.

The study examines digital systems and publicly available evidence relating, inter alia, to:

- institutional governance and administration;
- planning and resource deployment;
- budgeting, accounting and financial management;
- programmes, projects, works and assets;
- citizen and beneficiary services;
- monitoring and reporting;
- transparency, accountability, grievance redressal and audit;
- spatial and geographical information; and
- selected development sectors having significant interface with Local Governance.

For examining the wider development-information landscape, the study considers twelve illustrative sectors: Education; Health & Nutrition; Livelihoods & Skill Development; Water & Sanitation; Energy Access; Environment & Sustainability; Governance & Institutional Development; Social Protection; Agriculture & Food Security; Industry & MSME Development; Infrastructure & Transport; and Climate Action & Gender Equity.

The sectoral examination is illustrative and selective. It is intended to understand the nature, extent and granularity of information available through the digital ecosystem and not to undertake separate performance assessments of individual sectors, schemes or programmes.

4. Nature and Boundaries of the Study

The study is based primarily on information available in the public domain, including official websites, portals, Management Information Systems, dashboards, statistical and data systems, published reports, policy and statutory documents, accounts and audit-related information and other relevant authoritative sources.

It is a desk-based exploratory study. No information has been requisitioned from individual entities specifically for this study, nor does the study involve surveys, questionnaires, interviews, stakeholder consultations or field verification.

Accordingly, the study does not constitute an audit, assurance engagement, certification, rating, ranking or formal evaluation of any institution, digital system, programme, State, Union Territory, PRI or ULB.

The availability of information in the public domain is also not treated as synonymous with performance, and non-availability of information is not treated as evidence of non-performance or absence of the underlying activity. Observations are therefore confined to what can reasonably be established, indicated or explored from the public-domain evidence examined.

5. Local Governance Landscape in India

India's Local Governance architecture broadly comprises Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in rural areas and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) in urban areas. The 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments provided the constitutional framework for democratic decentralisation and recognised Local Governments as an important tier of governance.

The Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution identifies 29 subjects that may be entrusted to Panchayats, while the Twelfth Schedule identifies 18 functions in relation to Municipalities. These cover a wide spectrum of local development and public services including agriculture, water, sanitation, health, education, roads, poverty alleviation, social welfare, urban planning, environmental protection and other matters affecting everyday life.

The constitutional listing of subjects and functions, however, does not by itself determine the actual functional responsibilities exercised by individual PRIs and ULBs. Their roles are shaped by State and Union Territory legislation, rules, notifications, activity mapping, administrative arrangements and the actual devolution of functions, finances and functionaries.

Local Governance therefore operates within a wider institutional ecosystem. State departments, district administration, sectoral agencies, development and area authorities, utilities, implementing agencies and other public institutions may perform functions or implement programmes within the same local geography.

This institutional distribution is particularly relevant to understanding digitisation. A digital application used by a State department or sectoral agency may contain information directly relevant to a Gram Panchayat, Municipality, village, ward or local population even though the application itself is not owned or operated by the Local Government.

Accordingly, for the purpose of this study, **Digitisation of Local Governance is viewed more broadly than the digitisation of Local Government institutions alone.** It encompasses the wider digital ecosystem through which institutions, functions, resources, interventions and services affecting local areas are planned, administered, monitored and reported.

6. Emerging Digital Local Governance Ecosystem

Digitisation of Local Governance has evolved progressively from computerisation of individual administrative and accounting processes towards interconnected digital systems supporting planning, financial management, programme implementation, asset management, citizen services, monitoring and decision support.

For PRIs, digital applications increasingly support areas such as local planning, accounting, financial reporting, works monitoring, asset information, audit, spatial planning and public disclosure. Applications such as eGramSwaraj, Local Government Directory, Gram Manchitra, mActionSoft and AuditOnline illustrate the range of functions that have progressively entered the digital environment.

Similarly, ULBs increasingly use digital systems for municipal finance, property taxation, water and other user charges, birth and death registration, trade licences, building permissions, works and asset management, grievance redressal, Geographic Information Systems, service delivery and management reporting. The precise configuration differs across States, cities and municipal systems.

The digital environment of Local Governance extends further through national and State-level platforms supporting sectoral programmes and public services. Systems relating to education, health, nutrition, drinking water, sanitation, livelihoods, social protection, agriculture, infrastructure, energy, environment and enterprise development generate information concerning the same people, institutions and geographical areas served by Local Governments.

The resulting ecosystem may therefore be understood in three broad layers:

Local Government Systems — applications directly supporting the institutional, administrative, financial and service-delivery functions of PRIs and ULBs.

Sectoral and Programme Systems — digital platforms supporting development programmes, sectoral administration, implementing agencies and beneficiary-oriented interventions operating within local areas.

Common and Enabling Systems — platforms supporting payments, procurement, identity, geographical information, directories, financial flows, audit, data exchange and other functions used across institutions and sectors.

Viewed together, these layers demonstrate that Digital Local Governance is not represented by any single portal, application or database. It comprises a distributed digital ecosystem operating across institutions, functions, sectors and levels of government.

7. From Local Government Functions to Digital Processes

The expanding digital ecosystem has progressively brought different stages of public administration and service delivery within digital workflows.

At the planning stage, digital systems may support institutional profiles, baseline information, needs identification, local plans, project proposals, budgeting and resource allocation.

During implementation, they may record sanctions, releases, expenditure, procurement, beneficiaries, works, physical progress, geo-tagged assets, service transactions and programme milestones.

At the monitoring and accountability stages, digital systems may provide Management Information Systems, dashboards, financial statements, utilisation information, audit trails, grievance information, performance indicators and public disclosures.

The digitisation of a governmental function can therefore generate information at several points in its lifecycle:

**Planning → Resource Allocation → Implementation → Financial Transactions →
Physical Progress → Service Delivery → Monitoring → Reporting → Audit /
Accountability**

The extent of digitisation across this lifecycle varies between functions, sectors, States, Union Territories and Local Governments. Some systems may cover only a particular transaction or process, while others may connect several stages.

Digitisation should therefore not be understood merely in terms of the existence of an application. Its wider significance lies in **which governance processes have entered the digital environment, what information those processes generate, at what level that information is captured, and how it becomes available for administration, monitoring, accountability and decision-making.**

8. Information Generated Through the Digital Ecosystem

The examination of digital applications and public-domain systems indicates that Local Governance and related sectoral systems generate information across a wide range of categories.

These broadly include:

Information Category	Illustrative Information Generated
Institutions & Functionaries	Local bodies, administrative units, elected representatives, officials, institutional structures and jurisdictions
Planning	Local plans, sectoral plans, proposed works, priorities, activities and approved interventions
Financial	Budgets, receipts, expenditure, releases, payments, accounts and financial statements
Programmes & Interventions	Schemes, projects, sanctioned activities, implementing institutions and implementation progress
Works & Assets	Works, infrastructure, location, physical progress, geo-tagging and asset information
Beneficiaries & Households	Eligibility, coverage, benefits, transfers and service access, subject to applicable disclosure and privacy safeguards
Public Services	Applications, licences, certificates, service requests, delivery and transaction information
Sectoral Information	Education, health, water, sanitation, livelihoods, agriculture, environment and other development information
Monitoring	Physical and financial progress, indicators, dashboards and management reports
Accountability	Audit, grievances, public disclosures, social accountability and related information
Spatial Information	Village, ward, Local Body, block, district, State and geo-referenced information

A particularly important feature is the **varying spatial granularity** of this information. Depending upon the system and sector, information may be generated or available at the level of:

Individual / Beneficiary / Household / Enterprise / Asset / Institution

→ **Village / Ward / Gram Panchayat / ULB**

→ **Block / District**

→ **State / Union Territory**

→ **National**

Not every system provides information at every level, nor is all information necessarily publicly accessible. Nevertheless, the range of digital systems examined indicates that a substantial information footprint relating to Local Governance and local development already exists across different institutional and sectoral platforms.

This raises an important question for the present study: **How extensive is this information landscape when viewed across the principal sectors of development that intersect with Local Governance?**

The following section therefore presents the broad picture emerging from an examination of publicly visible digital evidence across twelve selected development sectors.

9. Sectoral Evidence Landscape

The study examined the availability and nature of digital evidence across the twelve development sectors identified within its scope. The examination was illustrative and intended to understand the **breadth, diversity and spatial visibility of information**, rather than to assess sectoral performance.

The evidence indicates that substantial digital information is available across all twelve sectors, covering institutions, programmes, finances, beneficiaries, assets, services, implementation and sector-specific information. Its depth and granularity vary across sectors and systems, extending in many cases from individuals, households, institutions and assets to Local Bodies, districts, States/UTs and the national level.

The comparative examination also indicates that information relating to the same local geography may reside across multiple institutional and sectoral systems. Viewed together, these systems constitute a **distributed digital information environment surrounding Local Governance**, extending beyond information generated by Local Governments themselves.

Availability of such information does not, however, establish its completeness, quality, interoperability, utilisation or the achievement of development outcomes.

A **Comparative Sectoral Evidence Profile** covering the twelve sectors is placed at **Annexure IV**, with the detailed **Illustrative Sectoral Evidence Demonstration (SED)** at **Annexure V**.

10. What the Evidence Reveals

The examination so far suggests that the digitisation of Local Governance in India has progressed beyond the computerisation of individual Local Government offices or transactions.

A wider digital ecosystem has emerged in which Local Governments, sectoral departments, implementing agencies and national and State-level platforms generate information relating to the same local institutions, populations, services, assets and geographical areas.

This produces three broad observations.

Digitisation is distributed rather than confined to a single institutional system. Local development information is generated through multiple applications operated by different authorities.

Digital visibility increasingly extends to the local and spatial level. Information may relate not merely to States and districts but, depending upon the system, to Local Bodies, villages, wards, institutions, assets, households and beneficiaries.

The information generated for different administrative purposes creates a wider knowledge resource. Information originally captured for planning, payments, programme management, service delivery, monitoring or reporting may also contribute to a broader understanding of the local governance and development environment when viewed together.

At the same time, **availability of information should not be equated with integration, interoperability, information quality or effective use in decision-making.** These are separate questions requiring examination in their own right.

The emerging picture is therefore not simply one of increasing digitisation. It is one of an expanding and increasingly granular **digital information environment surrounding Local Governance.**

The next section examines the issues and opportunities arising from this evolving environment.

11. Emerging Issues and Opportunities

The expanding digital information environment presents significant opportunities for Local Governance, while also raising issues that merit attention.

Interoperability: Information relating to the same geography, institution or population is generated across multiple systems. Greater interoperability can improve the usefulness of such information across functions and sectors.

Data Quality and Consistency: The value of digital information depends upon its completeness, accuracy, timeliness and consistency. Differences in definitions, reporting periods and data structures may affect comparability.

Institutional and Digital Capacity: Effective use of digital systems requires appropriate infrastructure, skilled personnel, capacity building and continuity of institutional knowledge at the Local Government level.

Information Security and Privacy: Increasingly granular information relating to citizens, households and institutions reinforces the need for appropriate access controls, cybersecurity, privacy and data-governance safeguards.

From Reporting to Decision Support: Much digital information is generated for administration, programme management, compliance and reporting. Its systematic use for local planning, resource allocation, monitoring and evidence-based decision-making offers a wider opportunity.

Cross-Sectoral and Spatial Use: The availability of information across multiple sectors and geographical levels creates opportunities to view local development more comprehensively rather than through isolated departmental or programme perspectives.

These issues also indicate an important transition: the next stage of Digitisation of Local Governance may increasingly concern not merely **generation of digital information**, but its **quality, connectivity and effective use for governance and decision-making**.

12. Conclusion and Road Ahead

The study indicates that Digitisation of Local Governance in India has evolved beyond individual applications and administrative processes into a wider digital ecosystem spanning Local Governments, sectoral institutions and multiple levels of government.

Across the twelve sectors examined, substantial information is digitally available at varying institutional and spatial levels. However, it remains distributed across multiple systems developed for different purposes.

The opportunity ahead lies in improving the **quality, connectivity and effective use of this information** for planning, service delivery, monitoring, accountability and informed decision-making—progressively moving from digital administration towards **informed and evidence-enabled Local Governance**.

ANNEXURE I

State/UT-wise Functional and Institutional Landscape of PRIs and ULBs

(Evidence Position: September 2026)

Coverage: All 28 States and 8 Union Territories of India

1. Scope and Basis

Article 243G read with the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution provides the constitutional basis for devolution of functions to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), while Article 243W read with the Twelfth Schedule provides the corresponding basis for Urban Local Bodies (ULBs).

Actual assignment and exercise of these functions vary across States/UTs depending upon the applicable legislation, rules, notifications, activity mapping, institutional arrangements and operational responsibilities.

Accordingly, this Annexure presents the State/UT-wise institutional position emerging from publicly available evidence examined and validated up to September 2026.

Evidence discipline: Functional assignment has not been presumed merely from inclusion of a subject in the Eleventh or Twelfth Schedule. The position recorded below is based on identifiable public-domain statutory, regulatory, administrative, audit, Finance Commission or other authoritative evidence. Where operational assignment could not be established from the sources examined, the position is recorded accordingly.

2. Consolidated State/UT-wise Position

Sl. No.	State / UT	PRI Institutional / Functional Position	ULB Institutional / Functional Position	Special Shared Institutional Arrangement	Evidence Position
---------	------------	---	---	--	-------------------

A. STATES (28)

1	Andhra Pradesh	Three-tier PRI framework under State Panchayat Raj legislation; functional responsibilities distributed across tiers	Municipal framework provides for urban local functions; State/directorate and sectoral interfaces remain relevant	PESA applies in Scheduled Areas	Direct / subject to function-wise operational evidence
2	Arunachal Pradesh	PRI framework under State Panchayati Raj legislation	Urban local-government arrangements operate under applicable State law	Hill/tribal and other special institutional contexts retained where evidenced	Direct
3	Assam	GP–Anchalik Panchayat–Zilla Parishad structure; statutory planning	Municipal bodies exercise assigned urban functions	Sixth Schedule areas constitute a distinct governance regime	Direct / Partially evidenced

		and development responsibilities; operational evidence indicates continuing departmental involvement in several functions			operationally
4	Bihar	Three-tier PRI structure with Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad	Municipal governance under State municipal framework	Gram Katchahry is an additional village-level institutional feature	Direct
5	Chhattisgarh	Three-tier PRI statutory framework	Urban local-government framework under State legislation	PESA applies in Scheduled Areas	Direct / operational position function-specific
6	Goa	Village Panchayat and Zilla Panchayat framework with State/BDO supervisory interfaces	Municipal Councils and Corporation exercise urban functions; audit evidence shows significant Government/parastatal interfaces	Several urban functions are shared or only partly devolved operationally	Direct
7	Gujarat	Village-Taluka-District Panchayat structure under Gujarat Panchayats Act	Municipalities and Municipal Corporations governed under separate urban legislation	PESA areas; State/sectoral/development-authority interfaces where applicable	Direct / function-wise operational evidence
8	Haryana	Gram Panchayat-Panchayat Samiti-Zila Parishad framework	Municipal framework covers urban planning, water, sanitation, roads, environment, welfare and other functions	State/sectoral institutional interfaces retained where evidenced	Direct
9	Himachal Pradesh	Three-tier PRI statutory framework	ULBs exercise assigned municipal functions; audit evidence indicates substantial devolution but incomplete activity mapping in the period examined	PESA applies in applicable Scheduled Areas	Direct / Partially evidenced operationally

10	Jharkhand	Three-tier PRI framework	Urban local-government framework under State legislation	PESA; Jharkhand PESA Rules, 2025	Direct
11	Karnataka	GP–Taluk Panchayat–Zilla Panchayat framework; legislation provides tier-wise responsibility mapping	Municipal framework under State urban legislation	Government may assign additional functions; institutional interfaces retained	Direct
12	Kerala	Explicit Village–Block–District Panchayat functional differentiation; transferred institutions form part of the decentralised architecture	Municipalities/Corporations have separately assigned functions	Strong tier-wise functional and institutional differentiation	Direct
13	Madhya Pradesh	Three-tier PRI framework	Municipal framework under State legislation	PESA applies in Scheduled Areas	Direct / function-specific operational evidence
14	Maharashtra	Village Panchayats governed separately from Panchayat Samitis/Zilla Parishads; tier-wise statutory architecture	Municipal Corporations, Municipal Councils, Nagar Panchayats and other urban forms operate under differentiated statutes	PESA Scheduled Areas; metropolitan/industrial and other special institutional contexts	Direct
15	Manipur	Panchayati Raj framework applies in relevant areas	Urban local bodies operate under applicable municipal legislation	Hill areas/Autonomous District Councils constitute a distinct governance arrangement	Direct
16	Meghalaya	Ordinary Part IX PRI framework not treated as the governing template for the State's autonomous areas	Municipal/local urban arrangements treated separately where applicable	Khasi, Garo and Jaintia Hills Autonomous District Councils under Sixth Schedule	Direct / special regime

17	Mizoram	Village Council/local-administration arrangements rather than a uniform ordinary PRI template	Municipal bodies under Mizoram Municipalities Act; functions may progressively transfer from Development Authorities as municipal capacity develops	Lai, Mara and Chakma Autonomous District Council areas; Development Authority interface	Direct
18	Nagaland	Village and Area Council framework rather than ordinary three-tier PRI structure	Urban governance under applicable municipal legislation	Distinct customary/Village Council institutional architecture	Direct / special regime
19	Odisha	Separate legislation for Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti and Zilla Parishad; activity mapping provides tier-wise functional evidence	Municipal framework with State/sectoral institutional interfaces	PESA Scheduled Areas; line-department involvement remains important in operational assignment	Direct / Partially evidenced operationally
20	Punjab	Three-tier PRI framework; evidence identifies full and partial devolution across subjects	Municipal framework under State legislation	Health, education and other functions show departmental/local-body interfaces	Direct / Partially evidenced operationally
21	Rajasthan	Three-tier PRI structure; devolution orders cover Eleventh Schedule subjects but operational qualifications/with drawals are evidenced	ULB evidence shows substantial but not necessarily complete functional devolution	PESA Scheduled Areas; State/sectoral interfaces	Direct / Partially evidenced operationally
22	Sikkim	Gram Panchayat and Zilla Panchayat structure; activity mapping allocates responsibilities between State, GP and ZP	Municipal framework under State legislation	State–local institutional sharing explicitly relevant	Direct
23	Tamil Nadu	Village Panchayat–	Corporations, Municipalities and	ULB category materially affects	Direct

		Panchayat Union–District Panchayat structure with differentiated responsibilities	Town Panchayats show different levels of functional devolution; water and other functions may involve specialised agencies	operational responsibility	
24	Telangana	Three-tier PRI framework under Telangana Panchayat Raj Act	Municipal framework with substantial Twelfth Schedule functional assignment	PESA applies in Scheduled Areas; State/sectoral interfaces	Direct / period-specific operational evidence
25	Tripura	Three-tier PRI system in ordinary areas	Urban local-government framework under State legislation	TTAADC/Sixth Schedule areas constitute a separate governance regime	Direct
26	Uttar Pradesh	Gram Panchayat legislation separate from Kshetra Panchayat/Zila Panchayat legislation	Municipal bodies under State urban legislation	Tier-specific statutory architecture	Direct
27	Uttarakhand	Gram–Kshetra–Zila Panchayat framework	Urban local-government framework under State legislation	Hill/geographic context retained where authoritative evidence establishes relevance	Direct
28	West Bengal	GP–Panchayat Samiti–Zilla Parishad structure with Act and detailed administration rules	Municipal framework under State legislation	Operational rules supplement statutory assignment	Direct

B. UNION TERRITORIES (8)

29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Panchayat framework applies subject to territorial/institutional exclusions	Municipal governance applies in designated urban area(s)	Tribal areas and municipal areas require separate treatment; island geography retained contextually	Direct / special territorial arrangement
30	Chandigarh	No current PRI system following abolition of Panchayat arrangements	Municipal Corporation constitutes principal local-	Predominantly urban UT	Direct / PRI not applicable

			government structure		
3 1	Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu	UT-specific Panchayat Regulation provides local rural governance framework	Municipal arrangements apply under relevant UT legislation	Post-merger UT institutional framework retained	Direct
3 2	Delhi (NCT)	No present Panchayati Raj system	Municipal governance constitutes the principal local-government framework	Metropolitan governance involves multiple public institutions/agencies	Direct / PRI not applicable
3 3	Jammu & Kashmir	Panchayati Raj framework under applicable J&K legislation, subject to current UT arrangements	Municipal bodies under applicable municipal legislation	Current statutory/administrative position retained following reorganisation	Direct
3 4	Ladakh	Panchayat institutions operate under applicable adopted statutory framework	Urban local arrangements apply where constituted	Ladakh Autonomous Hill Development Councils constitute an additional institutional layer	Direct / special regime
3 5	Lakshadweep	Island Panchayat/District Panchayat institutional framework	Separate urban stream not treated as applicable unless evidenced	Island geography and current administrative arrangements retained	Direct / special territorial arrangement
3 6	Puducherry	Village and Commune Panchayat framework	Municipalities/other urban local bodies under applicable UT legislation	Commune Panchayat institutional form retained rather than normalised as an ordinary GP	Direct

3. Evidence Classification

Evidence underlying the above consolidated position has been classified as:

Directly Evidenced — expressly supported by the applicable Act, rules, notification, activity mapping, official institutional document, audit report or other authoritative public-domain source.

Partially Evidenced — formal assignment is evidenced but the complete operational distribution of responsibility is not established.

Proxy Evidenced — an authoritative source provides relevant indirect evidence but does not itself conclusively establish the functional position.

Not Evidenced from Public-Domain Sources Examined — the matter could not be established from the sources examined.

Where audit or other evidence relates to an earlier period, it has been retained as period-specific evidence and has not automatically been treated as the position prevailing in September 2026.

4. Evidence Sources

The evidence base includes, as applicable:

Constitution of India; State/UT Panchayat and Municipal legislation; rules, notifications and activity mappings; Central and State/UT Ministries and Departments; PRIs and ULBs; Local Fund/Local Accounts Audit institutions; Comptroller and Auditor General of India and concerned Principal Accountant General/Accountant General offices; Union and State Finance Commissions; and other authoritative public-domain sources.

Source validation principle: Every evidence point used in the study is required to be traceable to an identifiable public-domain source. The study report/annexure may carry a concise source reference or footnote; screenshots of the underlying evidence are not required.

5. Analytical Boundary

This Annexure establishes the institutional and functional landscape emerging from the public-domain evidence examined. It does not assess the adequacy, effectiveness or quality of devolution and does not rank or score States/UTs.

A function appearing in the Eleventh or Twelfth Schedule has not, by that fact alone, been treated as operationally devolved.

Accordingly: - Constitutional inclusion $\neq$ Statutory assignment $\neq$ Administrative devolution $\neq$ Operational exercise.

Where the evidence does not establish the position, the study records: - “Not evidenced from public-domain sources examined.” Absence of publicly available evidence is not treated as evidence of absence.

ANNEXURE II

Digital Applications and Public-Domain Evidence Ecosystem for PRIs and ULBs

(Evidence Position: September 2026)

1. Purpose

This Annexure presents the populated public-domain evidence universe relating to digital applications, platforms, modules, digital assets and enabling systems associated with Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs).

The mapping distinguishes between:

Digital Asset → Platform → Application → Module/Service

and records the functional purpose, institutional ownership, coverage, information/evidence potential and public-domain evidence position of the identified systems.

The existence of an application or platform is not treated, by itself, as evidence of its effective utilisation or of governance capability.

Accordingly:

Application available ≠ Application accessible ≠ Application operational ≠ Application regularly utilised ≠ Governance capability established.

2. National/Common Digital Ecosystem — Panchayati Raj Institutions

Sl. No.	Application / Digital Asset	Classification	Owner / Institutional Anchor	Principal Function / Governance Purpose	Coverage / Level	Information / Evidence Potential	Evidence Position
1	eGram Swaraj	Integrated Application / Platform	Ministry of Panchayati Raj (MoPR) / NIC	Integrated information gathering, decentralised/micro-level planning, progress reporting and work-based accounting for Panchayats; approved Gram Sabha works are entered as activities and linked with budget/administrative-sanction processes	PRI ecosystem; MoPR reports user base exceeding 2.7 lakh PRIs across 28 States and 6 UTs	Panchayat plans; activities/works; budget allocation; physical progress; financial/accounting information; planning and implementation evidence	Directly Evidenced
2	AuditOnline	Application	MoPR / NIC;	Facilitates online audit	PRI / State	Audit coverage;	Directly

			interfaces with State audit arrangements	processes relating to Government Departments/P RIs; MoPR documentation also evidences an Action Taken Report (ATR) module	audit ecosystem	audit observations; audit status; ATR/action taken; accountability information	Evidenced
3	Local Government Directory (LGD)	National Master Directory / Digital Infrastructure	MoPR / NIC with State/UT updating agencies	Maintains authoritative hierarchy and identity of local governments and administrative/geographic units; assigns unique LGD codes; supports data standardisation, sharing and interoperability	Rural and urban local governments nationally; includes Panchayats, municipalities, wards, traditional local bodies, ADCs, village councils and related administrative units	Institutional identity; tier; location; hierarchy; boundary/reorganisation changes; rural/urban conversion; standard codes for cross-system integration	Directly Evidenced
4	Gram Manchitra	GIS / Spatial Planning Application	MoPR / NIC	Supports Panchayat-level spatial planning and creation of planning scenarios using geographic information; facilitates facility planning and management and use of	Panchayat / village spatial level	Geographic distribution of facilities/assets; roads; buildings; land parcels; water tanks; open plots; spatial planning evidence; location-linked development information	Directly Evidenced

				village/base-map layers			
5	SVAMITVA digital/spatial ecosystem	Scheme-linked Digital / GIS Asset Ecosystem	MoPR with State Revenue Departments, State Panchayati Raj Departments and Survey of India	Drone-based mapping of rural inhabited/Abadi areas and creation of property/Record-of-Rights related spatial outputs and property cards	Notified rural villages in participating States/UTs	Drone-survey status; mapped villages; maps handed over; enquiry-stage maps; property cards; parcel/property information; spatial/property-right evidence	Directly Evidenced
6	Service Plus	Common e-Service Delivery Framework / Enabling Application	Government/NIC ecosystem; recognised by MoPR for Panchayat service delivery	Framework for electronic delivery of citizen services; used in the Panchayat service-delivery context where adopted	Applicable State/UT/PRI service-delivery arrangements	Service applications; service requests; approvals/certificates; transaction/service-delivery information depending upon implementation	Directly Evidenced as framework; operational coverage varies across States/UTs.
7	Panchayat NIRNA Y / Gram Sabha NIRNA Y	Panchayat Governance Application	MoPR	Digital initiative associated with Gram Sabha/Panchayat meeting processes and governance documentation	Panchayat / Gram Sabha context	Meeting/governance-process information; participation and decision-related evidence, subject to system accessibility and States/UT adoption	Application existence directly evidenced; detailed operational coverage varies across States/UTs.

8	SabhaS aar	AI- enabled Governan ce Document ation Applicati on	MoPR	Uses AI to process Gram Sabha/local- governance audio/video recordings, including transcription, multilingual translation and generation of structured Minutes of Meeting	Dashbo ard publicly evidenc es Gram, Block and District Panchay at use across multiple States	Meeting recordings; transcripts; multilingual documentatio n; structured minutes; institutional deliberation and participation evidence	Directl y Eviden ced
9	Meri Pancha yat	Citizen/Pa nchayat Digital Interface	MoPR ecosyste m	Identified within the national Panchayat digital ecosystem as a citizen- facing/local- governance initiative	Panchay at context	Potential citizen access, Panchayat information and participatory- governance evidence	Existe nce directl y eviden ced; functio nality and covera ge are subject to the public- domai n eviden ce availab le.
10	Legacy PRIAS oft / PlanPlu s / Action Soft and related e- Pancha yat applicat ions	Legacy / Subsumed Applicati ons	MoPR / NIC	Earlier digital architecture for Panchayat accounting, planning and implementatio n/progress functions subsequently consolidated/e volved into the contemporary ecosystem	Historic al PRI ecosyste m	Historical planning, accounting and implementati on information; useful for longitudinal/e volution analysis	Period- specifi c / Legacy Eviden ce

Evidence Notes — PRI National Layer

MoPR describes eGramSwaraj as an integrated technology-based system bringing together information gathering, micro-level planning and work-based accounting, with more than 2.7 lakh PRI users across 28 States and six UTs. Current FY 2026–27 planning documentation also confirms continuing use of the portal.

LGD performs a different foundational role. It maintains local-government and territorial hierarchies, assigns unique LGD codes and is explicitly intended to support data standardisation and interoperability across e-governance applications. It covers both rural and urban local bodies, including special forms such as traditional local bodies and Autonomous District Councils.

Gram Manchitra provides the spatial-planning dimension. MoPR states that it supports planning scenarios and decision-making using geographic information, including high-resolution village maps and features such as buildings, roads, land parcels, water tanks and open plots.

AuditOnline is separately maintained by MoPR for the audit ecosystem, with State-level participation and an Action Taken Report module documented in the Ministry's public-domain material.

SVAMITVA constitutes a distinct spatial/property evidence ecosystem rather than merely another Panchayat application. Its public dashboard provides State/District/Tehsil-level information on notified and completed villages, maps and property-card related progress.

SabhaSaar is particularly relevant to the participation and institutional-governance evidence universe. Its public interface describes AI-based transcription, multilingual translation and structured generation of meeting minutes from Sabha recordings and displays institutional coverage across Gram, Block and District Panchayats.

3. National/Common Digital Ecosystem — Urban Local Bodies

Sl. No.	Application / Platform / Module	Classification	Owner / Institutional Anchor	Principal Function / Governance Purpose	Coverage / Level	Information / Evidence Potential	Evidence Position
1	UPYOG — Urban Platform for delivery of Online Governance	National Reference Platform / Shared Digital Infrastructure	Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs / NUDM / NIUA	Open-source, configurable and extendable municipal digital-governance platform supporting delivery of urban services	State/UT and ULB adoption through different implementation models	Common municipal transaction and service-delivery data across adopted modules	Directly Evidenced
1.1	Property Tax Assessment	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Property assessment, demand and payment	ULB	Properties, assessments, demand, collections/pa	Directly Evidenced

	nt & Payments					yments and related revenue information	as available module; adoption State/ UT-specific
1. 2	Trade Licence Issuance & Payment	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Issue/renew trade licences and collect licence fees	ULB	Applications, renewals, licences, fees, payment receipts, processing status and module statistics	Directly Evidenced
1. 3	Public Grievance Redressal	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Web/mobile registration, routing, monitoring and resolution of civic grievances	ULB	Complaint type, location, responsible department, status, resolution time, SLA/escalation and dashboard information	Directly Evidenced
1. 4	Water & Sewerage Connection Management	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Municipal water/sewerage service management	ULB	Connections, applications, service/transaction information and related municipal service evidence	Directly Evidenced as available module
1. 5	Desludging / FSM	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Desludging/ Faecal Sludge Management services	ULB	Service requests, delivery and FSM-related operational information	Directly Evidenced as available module

1.6	Online Building Plan Approval	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Digital processing of building-plan approvals	ULB	Applications, approvals, processing status and development-control transactions	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.7	Fire NOC	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Fire No Objection Certificate processing	Applicable urban authorities	Applications, approvals/NOCs and processing information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.8	Birth & Death Certificates	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Civil-registration related municipal service interface	ULB where adopted	Registration/certificate service transactions	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.9	Accounting & Finance	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Municipal financial/accounting functions	ULB	Accounting and financial-management information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.10	Asset Management	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Municipal asset information/management	ULB	Asset registers, location/type/status information as configured	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.11	Street Vending Management	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Management of municipal street-vending processes	ULB	Vendor/service/permission information	Directly Evidenced as

							available module
1.1.2	Estate Management	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Municipal estate/property management	ULB	Estate/property-related administrative information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.1.3	Garbage Collection	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Digitally supported municipal waste-service processes	ULB	Collection/service information where implemented	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.1.4	Construction & Demolition Waste	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	C&D waste-service management	ULB	Requests, waste-service/transaction information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.1.5	Citizen Request Service	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Citizen-facing municipal service requests	ULB	Request, routing and service-status information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.1.6	Challan Generation / Miscellaneous Collections	UPYOG Modules	UPYOG ecosystem	Digital municipal collection/receipt processes	ULB	Challans, fees, collections and receipts	Directly Evidenced as available modules

1.17	Council Resolution / Participatory Governance	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Digitisation/ support of council and participatory -governance processes	ULB	Resolutions and governance-process information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.18	Works Management	UPYOG Module	UPYOG ecosystem	Municipal works-management processes	ULB	Works/project-related administrative and progress information	Directly Evidenced as available module
1.19	GIS Service	UPYOG Module / Shared Service	UPYOG ecosystem	Spatial/location-linked support to municipal applications	ULB	Geographic/spatially referenced municipal information	Directly Evidenced as available service
2	UMEED — Urban Monitoring for Efficient and Effective Decision-making	National Dashboard / Decision Support System	MoHUA / NUDM	Consolidated national urban dashboard using standardised municipal information/ KPIs for monitoring and decision support	National → State/UT → ULB drill-down	Revenue and service KPIs; State project status; tax/non-tax revenue indicators; SLA compliance and other municipal performance information	Directly Evidenced
3	State/UT municipal e-Governance platforms	State/UT Platforms	Respective State/UT Governments / Urban Departments	State-wide or State-specific municipal digital-service platforms which may coexist with or integrate	State/UT → ULB	State-specific municipal financial, service, revenue, works, grievance and other information	State/UT-specific; evidenced through respective

				with UPYOG/NU DM architecture			public - domai n syste ms and source s
4	Individual ULB applications/portals	Local Applications	Respective ULB / authorised agency	Local digital systems developed/operated independently or in conjunction with State/national platforms	Individual ULB	Local transactions, service delivery, revenue, works, assets and citizen-interface information	ULB-specific; included where materially evidenced from public - domain sources
5	Integrated Command and Control Centres (ICCCs)	Integrated Urban Digital/Operational Infrastructure	Relevant Smart City/SPV/ULB/State institutional arrangements	Integrated monitoring/management of selected urban services and city operations	Selected cities	Real-time/near-real-time operational, spatial and service information depending upon city architecture	City-specific; coverage and functions evidenced through authoritative public - domain sources

Evidence Notes — ULB National Layer

UPYOG should be recorded as the platform, with its municipal functions recorded as modules/services, rather than counting each module as an independent national application.

The official UPYOG portal currently identifies modules including property tax, trade licensing, grievances, water/sewerage, building-plan approval, Fire NOC, birth/death certificates, finance/accounting, asset management, street vending, waste management, council resolutions, works management and GIS services.

The official NUDM architecture also recognises different adoption pathways. States/UTs may use UPYOG, operate hybrid arrangements alongside pre-existing systems, or continue existing municipal platforms while integrating data through standards/APIs. Therefore, national availability of UPYOG must not be interpreted as uniform operational deployment of every module in every ULB.

UMEED constitutes a separate information/decision-support layer. The official NUDM page describes national, State and ULB-level drill-down and KPIs covering revenue and municipal service delivery. It presently reports data contribution from 14 States and more than 2,000 ULBs; this is a dashboard-reported coverage position and should therefore remain period-labelled rather than being treated as universal coverage.

4. Common/Enabling Digital Systems

The following systems are not classified as PRI- or ULB-specific merely because local governments use or interface with them. They constitute a separate enabling/interoperability layer and are mapped where a functional connection with local governance is evidenced in the public domain:

System / System Type	Governance Relationship	Information/Evidence Potential
Public Financial Management System (PFMS)	Fund-flow/payment/financial interface	Integration, grants, payments, transaction trail where evidenced
Government e-Marketplace (GeM)	Procurement	Procurement transactions/process interface
State Treasury / IFMS	State-local financial interface	Receipts, expenditure, treasury integration, accounting interface
e-Procurement Systems	Procurement of works/goods/services	Tender/procurement process and transaction information
DBT-related Systems	Beneficiary/fund-transfer interface	Beneficiary/payment information where local bodies have an evidenced role
Identity / Authentication Systems	User/citizen authentication	Authentication/access architecture where evidenced
Payment Gateways	Digital municipal/Panchayat payments	Collection/payment channels
GIS / Spatial Platforms	Spatial planning/asset/service evidence	Geographic and asset/service layers
e-Office / Document Management	Administrative process	File/document workflow evidence
State Single-window / Service-delivery Platforms	Citizen-service integration	Applications, approvals and service transactions

Sectoral MIS	Development-sector interface	Health, education, water, sanitation, housing, livelihoods, social protection and other sectoral information
--------------	------------------------------	--

5. State/UT Digital Ecosystem

The national/common digital systems presented above coexist with State/UT-specific platforms, applications and institutional arrangements. Accordingly, the digital ecosystem may vary across States/UTs in terms of applications deployed, functions supported, coverage, access, information generated and interoperability with national or other systems.

State/UT-specific evidence has not been inferred merely from the availability of a national platform. Where relevant, the position is based on identifiable authoritative public-domain evidence.

The Ministry of Panchayati Raj also maintains a State/UT Panchayati Raj Department directory, including links to State-specific digital Panchayat environments. Such State/UT systems form part of the wider digital ecosystem examined in this study.

ANNEXURE III

Information Generated through the Digital Local Governance Ecosystem

(Evidence Position: September 2026)

1. Purpose and Evidence Basis

This Annexure consolidates the principal categories of information generated or made available through the digital applications, platforms, modules and enabling systems identified in Annexure II. It presents the information landscape collectively rather than repeating the application-by-application mapping already contained in Annexure II.

The availability of information is recorded at the level supported by the public-domain source. Administrative transactions, expenditure, infrastructure, beneficiaries, service requests, approvals, assets or physical progress do not, by themselves, establish service quality, outcomes or impacts.

2. Principal Information Categories

Information Category	Illustrative Information Generated	Typical Institutional / Spatial Visibility	Evidence Boundary
Institutional & Governance	Local bodies, administrative units, elected representatives, officials, committees, jurisdictions, institutional hierarchy and identifiers	Institution / Local Body → District → State/UT → National	Institutional visibility does not establish institutional capability or effectiveness
Planning	Local and sectoral plans, priorities, proposed works, activities, approved interventions and spatial planning information	Village / Ward / GP / ULB → District → State/UT	Planning does not establish execution
Financial	Budgets, sanctions, releases, receipts, expenditure, vouchers, payments, accounts, taxes, fees and collections	Transaction / Institution → Local Body → State/UT → National	Financial flows do not establish physical delivery or outcomes
Programmes & Implementation	Schemes, projects, sanctioned activities, implementing institutions, approvals, milestones and physical/financial progress	Activity / Project / Institution → Local Body → District → State/UT → National	Implementation progress does not by itself establish functionality or outcome

Works, Assets & Spatial	Works, infrastructure, assets, location, geo-tagging, GIS layers, property and asset-status information	Asset / Site / Village / Ward → Local Body → District → State/UT	Asset creation or location does not establish functionality, accessibility or utilisation
Beneficiaries & Households	Eligibility, enrolment, coverage, benefits, transfers and service access, subject to applicable privacy safeguards	Individual / Household / Beneficiary → Local → District → State/UT → National	Coverage or payment does not by itself establish adequacy or outcome
Public Services	Applications, licences, certificates, service requests, connections, grievances, approvals, delivery and transaction information	Citizen / Property / Service Location → Local Body → State/UT	Digital transaction does not necessarily establish accessibility, quality or user outcome
Accountability & Participation	Audit, observations, action taken, grievances, meeting records, resolutions, public disclosures and related information	Institution / Local Body → State/UT → National	Process visibility does not establish responsiveness, participation quality or corrective action
Management & Decision Support	MIS, dashboards, KPIs, service indicators, financial indicators, spatial views and drill-down information	Local Body / District → State/UT → National	Dashboard availability does not establish completeness, comparability or effective use
Sectoral Information	Education, health, nutrition, water, sanitation, livelihoods, agriculture, energy, environment, enterprise, infrastructure, social protection, climate and gender-related evidence	Individual / Institution / Asset / Local Body → District → State/UT → National	Sector-specific conclusions require the relevant sectoral evidence and its stated definitions and limitations

3. Spatial and Institutional Visibility

Depending upon the system, information may be generated or made available at different levels:

Individual / Beneficiary / Household / Enterprise / Asset / Institution → Village / Ward / Gram Panchayat / ULB → Block / District → State / Union Territory → National

Not every system provides information at every level, and not all information is publicly accessible. Common institutional and geographic identifiers, GIS layers and geo-tagged records nevertheless create opportunities to relate information generated through different systems to the same place, institution, asset or population.

4. Evidence Visibility Across the Administrative and Service-delivery Process

Taken collectively, the digital ecosystem provides varying degrees of information across the following progression:

Planning → Resource Allocation → Financial Transactions → Implementation → Physical Progress → Asset / Service Creation → Service Delivery → Monitoring → Accountability

The nature and extent of information available at each stage vary across systems, functions and sectors. Information relating to sustained service conditions and development outcomes may also require reference to sector-specific statistics, surveys, evaluations or other authoritative evidence.

5. Evidence Boundary

This Annexure records the nature of information that the digital ecosystem makes visible. It does not assess the performance of individual applications, institutions, sectors, States/UTs, PRIs or ULBs. Where a matter cannot be established from the public-domain sources examined, non-availability of evidence is not treated as evidence of absence.

The sector-wise visibility of this information is summarised comparatively in Annexure IV and demonstrated in greater detail through selected public-domain evidence streams in Annexure V.

ANNEXURE IV
Comparative Sectoral Evidence Profile
(Evidence Position: September 2026)

Sector	Headline Facts & Numbers	Digital Evidence Visibility	Spatial Visibility	Emerging Factual Signals	Evidence Boundary
1. Education	2024–25: 14.71 lakh schools; 24.69 crore students; 1.01 crore teachers. (DSEL Education)				
Schools, students, teachers, management, infrastructure, facilities, participation, equity, programme inputs and learning evidence	School → Block → District → State/UT → National	Very deep institutional and student-level digital visibility; participation and learning evidence are also available	Enrolment, infrastructure or expenditure alone cannot establish continuity or learning		
2. Health & Nutrition	About 1.87 lakh functional Ayushman Arogya Mandirs; includes about 1.35 lakh SHCs and 24,500 PHCs. (Ayushman Arogya Mandir)				
Facilities, service delivery, maternal/child health, immunisation, nutrition, beneficiaries and population-	Beneficiary/Facility → District → State/UT → National	Administrative, facility, beneficiary and survey evidence coexist, permitting a multidimen	Facility existence does not establish availability, utilisation or health outcome		

health indicators		sional health picture			
3. Livelihoods & Skill Development	Large-scale evidence available through Skill India, DDU-GKY, DAY-NRLM and MGNREGS; SED deliberately does not prescribe one aggregate national number	Courses, training centres, certification, placement, SHGs, employment demand, person-days, works and assets	Individual/Household/SHG → Village → Block → District → State → National	Evidence spans training, employment, collective institutions and livelihood interventions	Training/certification or employment provision alone cannot establish sustainable livelihood
4. Water & Sanitation	JJM provides household/village-level tap-connection, functionality and water-quality information; SBM provides rural and urban sanitation/waste evidence	Connections, village status, schemes, functionality, water quality, sanitation, waste and used-water management	Household → Village/GP/ULB → Block/District → State → National	Particularly strong local and service-delivery visibility; water quantity, quality and sanitation can be spatially examined	Infrastructure/connection does not itself establish safe, reliable or sustained service
5. Energy Access	SED records 295.55 GW renewable capacity at 31 Aug 2026, including 168.04 GW solar; PM-KUSUM evidence reaches beneficiary/project level	Installed capacity, solar pumps, feeder solarisation, household connections and decentralised renewable assets	Household/Beneficiary/Project → District/Utility → State → National	Digital evidence distinguishes system capacity, connections and decentralised energy assets	Installed capacity or connection cannot establish reliability, utilisation or productive/social benefit
6. Environment & Sustainability	Evidence covers 130 NCAP city action plans in the SED, pollution-monitoring stations, forest/tree	Air/water quality, interventions, expenditure, forest cover, fires, clearances	Monitoring station/Site/City/Forest area → District → State → National	Highly spatial and multi-institutional evidence; environmental condition	Intervention undertaken does not establish environmental improvement or sustained ecological outcome

	cover, fires, restoration and environmental clearances	and geospatial evidence		can be observed independently of programme reporting	
7. Governance & Institutional Development	eGramSwaraj covers more than 2.7 lakh PRIs in the SED; ServicePlus records thousands of digital public services	Institutions, plans, accounts, works, audits, services, applications, processing and delivery	Citizen/GP/Local Body → Block/District → State → National	Local-government institutions themselves have substantial digital visibility across planning, finance, implementation and services	Digital representation or service availability does not itself establish institutional capability or governance effectiveness
8. Social Protection	DBT currently covers 320 schemes across 56 Ministries; cumulative transfers are about ₹53.46 lakh crore.	Schemes, beneficiaries, eligibility, sanctions, transfers, food entitlements, pensions and other benefits	Beneficiary/Household → Local/District → State → National	Very large beneficiary and transaction footprint; potentially strong visibility of entitlement delivery	Electronic transfer establishes payment, not necessarily awareness, access, adequacy or developmental outcome
9. Agriculture & Food Security	SED records 1,473 e-NAM mandis across 23 States and 4 UTs; PM-KISAN, PMFBY and agricultural/geospatial systems provide additional farmer evidence	Farmers, land/crop, payments, markets, prices, insurance, claims, weather and geospatial information	Farmer/Farm/Village/Mandi → District → State → National	Farmer, production, market, risk and spatial evidence coexist across multiple systems	Beneficiary/payment coverage cannot establish productivity, income or food-security outcome
10. Industry & MSME Development	As at 22 September 2026, Udyam				

	+ UAP recorded about 9.66 crore registrations and portal-reported employment of about 42.73 crore.				
Enterprise registration, classification, reported employment, assisted enterprises, licences and procurement/market participation	Enterprise → Ward/ULB/District → State → National	Very large enterprise-level digital footprint; local regulatory and market information can potentially add spatial context	Registration and reported employment do not by themselves establish that enterprises remain operational or sustainable		
11. Infrastructure & Transport	PMGSY, PMAY-U/G and geo-tagged works/asset systems provide extensive project, habitation, housing and asset evidence	Roads, habitations, sanctions, expenditure, houses, construction stages, payments, geo-tagging and assets	Asset/Household/Habitation → Village/Ward → District → State → National	Strong physical and geographic visibility allows infrastructure to be related to settlements and service areas	Physical completion does not establish functionality, accessibility, utilisation or development outcome
12. Climate Action & Gender Equity	SED identifies State Action Plans, SACHET hazard alerts, Mission Shakti/One Stop Centres and gender-disaggregated sectoral evidence	Climate risks, hazards, vulnerabilities, interventions, women-support services and gender-disaggregated evidence	Beneficiary/Location → District → State → National	Unlike most other sectors, climate and gender cut horizontally across virtually all sectors and geographies	Individual programme or hazard indicators cannot alone establish resilience, equity or sustained outcome

ANNEXURE V

Illustrative Sectoral Evidence Demonstration (SED)

(Evidence Position: September 2026)

Purpose and Evidence Boundary

The Illustrative Sectoral Evidence Demonstration (SED) presents selected public-domain evidence streams across the twelve development sectors identified for the study.

The SED is illustrative and selective and is not an exhaustive inventory of schemes, systems, applications or indicators. Its purpose is to demonstrate the nature, scale, spatial granularity and potential linkage of information available through different digital and public-domain systems.

Inclusion of an evidence stream indicates the availability and relevance of information; it does not establish performance, adequacy, effectiveness, outcome or causality. Quantitative information relates to the period, geography, definition and universe reported by the respective source and should not be mechanically compared across systems.

The evidence is presented through the following common structure:

Sector → Mission / Scheme / System → Evidence Available → Illustrative Quantum / Evidence → Spatial / Institutional Level → Potential Linkage → Relevant Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)

1. EDUCATION

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Unified District Information System for Education Plus (UDISE+)	Schools, enrolment, teachers, management, infrastructure, facilities, participation, equity and Pupil-Teacher Ratio	2024–25: 14,71,473 schools and 24,69,32,680 enrolments, 1.01 crore teachers	School → Block → District → State/UT → National	Institution ↔ students ↔ teachers ↔ infrastructure ↔ interventions	SDG 4
Samagra Shiksha Project Appraisal, Budgeting, Achievements and Data Handling System	Plans, approved interventions, financial allocations, releases, infrastructure and implementation	Programme-wise physical and financial evidence	School → Block → District → State/UT	Resources ↔ intervention ↔ implementation ↔ UDISE+ evidence	SDG 4

(PRABANDH)					
Pradhan Mantri Poshan Shakti Nirman (PM POSHAN)	Covered children/schools, meals, working days, foodgrain, costs and implementation	2024-25: about 11.20 crore children in 10.36 lakh eligible schools	School → Block → District → State/UT → National	Enrolment ↔ nutrition support ↔ participation/continuity	SDG 2, 4
NIPUN Bharat Foundational Learning Study PARAKH Rashtriya Sarvekshan	Foundational literacy/numeracy and competency/learning evidence	PARAKH 2024 design covered 782 districts , with 87,619 grade-wise school selections and 22,94,377 students envisaged	Sampled School → District → State/UT → National	Inputs/services ↔ learning evidence	SDG 4.1
PM Schools for India Rising (PM SHRI)	Identifiable schools, infrastructure, inclusion, sustainability and monitoring	13,092 schools across 776 districts and 8,538 blocks	School → Block → District → State/UT	Intervention ↔ institutional conditions ↔ learning/sustainability	SDG 4

SED observation: Education provides a strong institutional evidence backbone through UDISE+, supplemented by programme, nutrition, infrastructure and learning evidence.

Potentially related evidence includes:

Enrolment → Attendance/Participation → Continuity → Learning

The latter stages cannot be inferred merely from enrolment, expenditure or infrastructure.

2. HEALTH & NUTRITION

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
National Health Mission Health Management	Facility-based health services, maternal/child health, immunisation	Periodic facility/programme evidence	Facility → District → State/UT → National	Facility ↔ service delivery ↔ programme ↔ population evidence	SDG 3

Information System (HMIS)	and programme evidence				
Ayushman Arogya Mandir (AAM)	Facility status and comprehensive primary-health services	September 2026: about 1.87 lakh functional AAMs including about 1.35 lakh SHCs and 24,500 PHCs.	Facility → District → State/UT → National	Facility existence ↔ service availability ↔ utilisation	SDG 3
Saksham Anganwadi and Mission POSHAN 2.0 POSHAN Tracker	Beneficiaries, nutrition-service delivery, growth monitoring, stunting, wasting and underweight	Near-real-time monitoring; application available in 24 languages	Beneficiary/Anganwadi Centre upward	Nutrition service ↔ child growth ↔ health evidence	SDGs 2, 3
Pradhan Mantri Matru Vandana Yojana (PMMVY)	Beneficiary enrolment, payments and maternity-support evidence	September 2026 dashboard: 5.04 crore enrolled; 4.32 crore paid; ₹20,344 crore paid	Beneficiary → Local → State/UT → National	Pregnancy nutrition/health entitlement ↔ payment	SDGs 3, 5
National Family Health Survey (NFHS)	Population evidence on maternal/child health, nutrition, immunisation, fertility, sanitation and anaemia	Survey-period and geography-specific evidence	District → State/UT → National	Administrative/service evidence ↔ population/outcome evidence	SDGs 2, 3

SED observation: Health & Nutrition illustrates why evidence from administrative systems, beneficiary systems and population surveys must be triangulated rather than mechanically compared.

Facility Created → Facility Functional → Service Available → Service Utilised → Health/Nutrition Outcome

3. LIVELIHOODS & SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial /institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	------------

Skill India Digital Hub / Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana	Courses, skill centres, sectors, job roles, certification, jobs and apprenticeships	Platform integrates courses, centres, job exchange and National Career Service opportunities	Candidate/Centre → District → State → National	Training ↔ certification ↔ employment opportunity	SDGs 4, 8
Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana	Rural youth mobilisation, training, placement and implementation	Programme/project evidence	Training Centre/Project → District → State	Rural youth ↔ training ↔ placement	SDG 8
DAY–National Rural Livelihoods Mission	Self-Help Groups, household mobilisation, financial inclusion, enterprise and livelihood interventions	Village-to-national programme evidence	Household/SHG → Village → Block → District → State	SHG ↔ finance ↔ enterprise ↔ livelihood	SDGs 1, 5, 8
Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme	Employment demand/provision, person-days, expenditure, works and assets	Detailed Gram Panchayat-level MIS evidence	Household/Work → GP → Block → District → State	Employment ↔ expenditure ↔ assets ↔ livelihood security	SDGs 1, 8

SED observation:

Training Need → Training Access → Skill Acquisition → Certification → Employability → Employment → Sustainable Livelihood

Training or certification alone does not establish livelihood transformation.

4. WATER & SANITATION

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Jal Jeevan Mission (JJM)	Rural household tap connections, village status, schemes, functionality, water quality and laboratory evidence	Household/village-level quantitative evidence	Household → Village/GP → Block → District → State	Connection ↔ functionality ↔ quality ↔ service	SDG 6
Swachh Bharat Mission–	Open Defecation Free Plus status,	Village-level programme evidence	Village/GP → Block → District → State	Sanitation ↔ waste management ↔ health/environment	SDG 6

Grameen Phase II	solid/liquid waste, greywater and sanitation infrastructure				
Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban 2.0	Collection, segregation, processing, sanitation, dumpsite and used-water evidence	ULB/city-level physical and financial evidence	ULB → State/UT → National	Municipal intervention → service → environmental condition	↔ SDGs 6, 11, 12
Water-quality monitoring systems	Source/water-body/laboratory quality parameters	Monitoring-location evidence	Source/Location → District → State	Supply ↔ quality ↔ environmental/health evidence	SDG 6

SED observation:

Infrastructure Created → Household Connected → Water Available → Water Safe and Reliable → Service Utilised → Development Outcome

A connection is therefore evidence of an output—not by itself evidence of reliable water service or outcome.

5. ENERGY ACCESS

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Ministry of New and Renewable Energy — Renewable Energy Capacity	Solar, wind, biomass, small hydro and other installed capacity	31 August 2026: 295.55 GW total renewable capacity including large hydro; 168.04 GW solar	Project/State → National	Capacity ↔ geography ↔ energy system	↔ SDGs 7, 13
Pradhan Mantri Kisan Urja Suraksha evam Utthaan Mahabhiyaan (PM-KUSUM)	Solar plants, pumps and feeder solarisation — sanctioned versus installed	31 August 2026: Component B 13,07,190 sanctioned; 11,80,474 installed solar pumps	Beneficiary/Project State → National	Energy → irrigation agriculture livelihood	↔ SDGs 2, 7, 13

Electricity distribution evidence	Connections, infrastructure, supply and distribution information	Utility/State-specific evidence	Household/Feeder Utility/District → State	→ Connection reliability ↔ consumption	SDG 7
Decentralised renewable systems	Rooftop/off-grid/local renewable assets	Programme/project evidence	Household/Institution/Local Body upward	Asset utilisation ↔ productive/social benefit	SDGs 7, 13

SED observation:

Connection/Capacity Created → Reliable Energy Available → Energy Utilised → Productive/Social Benefit

Installed capacity and energy access are related but analytically distinct.

6. ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
National Clean Air Programme / PRANA	City Action Plans, interventions, implementation and financial evidence	City Action Plans for 130 cities recorded on PRANA	City → State → National	Intervention/expenditure ↔ implementation ↔ air quality	SDGs 3, 11, 13
Central Pollution Control Board monitoring systems	Ambient air and water-quality evidence	Monitoring-station/location evidence	Station/Water Body → City/District → State	Environmental condition ↔ interventions	SDGs 6, 11
Forest Survey of India / forest and fire monitoring	Forest/tree cover, fires, carbon and geospatial evidence	Periodic satellite/geospatial evidence	Geospatial → District → State → National	Intervention/restoration ↔ environmental condition	SDGs 13, 15
Green India Mission / CAMPA	Afforestation/restoration plans, expenditure and implementation	State/project-level physical and financial evidence	Project/Forest Area → State → National	Resources ↔ intervention ↔ ecological evidence	SDGs 13, 15
PARIVESH / environmental regulatory systems	Environmental, forest, wildlife and related clearances and project documents	Project/site-specific evidence	Project/Site → District → State → National	Development project ↔ environmental conditions ↔ geography	SDGs 9, 13, 15

SED observation: Environmental evidence is particularly spatial and multi-institutional. Geography can connect programme, regulatory, pollution and geospatial evidence.

Intervention Undertaken ≠ Environmental Condition Improved ≠ Ecological Outcome Sustained

7. GOVERNANCE & INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum / evidence	Spatial institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
eGramSwaraj	Panchayat profiles, plans, accounting, works and physical/financial progress	User base of more than 2.7 lakh PRIs across 28 States and 6 UTs	GP → Block → District → State	Institution ↔ plan ↔ finance ↔ implementation	SDG 16
Local Government Directory (LGD)	Authoritative local-government identity, hierarchy and codes	National institutional/geographic reference	Village/Ward/Local Body upward	Common institutional/spatial identifier across systems	SDG 16
AuditOnline	Audit processes, observations and follow-up evidence	PRI/local-government audit evidence	Local Body → State → National	Administrative/financial evidence ↔ accountability	SDG 16.6
ServicePlus	Citizen services, applications, processing and delivery	Current portal: 36 States adopted; 4,804 services launched	Citizen/Service → Institution → State	Service availability ↔ application ↔ disposal/delivery	SDG 16

SED observation:

Institution Digitally Represented → Function Operationally Exercised → Institutional Capability → Governance Effectiveness

Digital representation does not itself establish institutional capability or governance effectiveness.

8. SOCIAL PROTECTION

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
-----------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	-----

Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) Bharat	Schemes, ministries, transfers and transactions	DBT currently covers 320 schemes across 56 Ministries; cumulative transfers are about ₹53.46 lakh crore.	Beneficiary/Scheme → State → National	Eligibility sanction transfer ↔	SDG 1
National Food Security Act / Public Distribution System	Beneficiaries, ration cards and food entitlements	Around 80.60 crore persons covered , against maximum coverage of 81.35 crore	Household/Fair Price Shop → District → State	Entitlement access security ↔ food	SDGs 1, 2
National Social Assistance Programme	Old-age, widow, disability and related social-assistance evidence	Beneficiary/scheme-level information	Beneficiary → Local → State → National	Eligibility sanction payment ↔	SDGs 1, 10
Scheme-specific beneficiary systems	Maternity benefits, scholarships, pensions and other transfers	Scheme-specific evidence	Beneficiary upward	Cross-scheme access inclusion/exclusion ↔	SDGs 1, 5, 10

SED observation:

Entitlement → Awareness → Eligibility → Access/Application → Sanction → Benefit Receipt → Development Outcome

A successful electronic transfer establishes payment—not necessarily access, adequacy or outcome.

9. AGRICULTURE & FOOD SECURITY

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN)	Farmer registration, eligibility, electronic Know Your Customer verification, instalments and payment status	23rd instalment released 20 June 2026	Farmer → State → National	Farmer eligibility transfer livelihood ↔	SDGs 1, 2
National Agriculture Market (e-NAM)	Mandis, arrivals, trade, prices, quality and electronic transactions	1,473 mandis integrated; 23 States and 4	Farmer/Mandi → State → National	Production ↔ market ↔ price payment ↔	SDGs 2, 8

		UTs participating			
Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY)	Farmers, applications, crops, area insured, premiums, sum insured, claims and demographic categories	Dashboard provides district, crop, farmer-category and claim evidence	Farmer/Insurance Unit → District → State	Crop risk/loss ↔ insurance ↔ claim	SDGs 2, 13
Agricultural and geospatial systems	Crop, land, weather and related spatial/administrative evidence	Source-specific	Farm/Village → District → State	Production conditions ↔ intervention ↔ risk/market	SDGs 2, 13

SED observation:

Farmer → Land/Crop → Intervention → Production → Market → Price → Risk/Insurance → Income/Food Security

Beneficiary coverage or payment alone does not establish agricultural productivity or food-security outcome.

10. INDUSTRY & MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum / evidence	Spatial institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Udyam Registration / Udyam Assist Platform	Enterprise classification, registration and reported employment	As at 22 September 2026: 9,66,39,082 Udyam + UAP registrations; portal-reported employment 42,72,79,839.	Enterprise → District/State → National	Enterprise ↔ sector/location ↔ employment	SDGs 8, 9
Prime Minister's Employment Generation Programme	Assisted enterprises, subsidy and employment	Project/programme evidence	Enterprise/District → State	Finance ↔ enterprise creation ↔ employment	SDG 8
Urban trade/licensing systems	Establishments, trade licences, fees and regulatory transactions	ULB-level evidence	Enterprise → Ward/ULB	Enterprise activity ↔ local regulation ↔ geography	SDGs 8, 11
Public procurement / market-access systems	Supplier and procurement transactions	Transaction/programme evidence	Enterprise → Buyer/Geography	Enterprise participation ↔ market access	SDGs 8, 9

	where publicly available				
--	--------------------------	--	--	--	--

SED observation:

Enterprise Registered → Enterprise Operational → Enterprise Sustainable → Employment Sustained → Local Economic Transformation

Registration is an institutional starting point, not evidence of enterprise sustainability.

11. INFRASTRUCTURE & TRANSPORT

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana	Roads, habitations, sanctions, completion and expenditure	Detailed project/habitation evidence	Road/Habitation → District → State → National	Road ↔ settlement ↔ access services/markets	SDGs 9, 11
Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Urban (PMAY-U)	Houses sanctioned, grounded and completed; assistance and investment	Current portal: 124.93 lakh sanctioned; 118.36 lakh grounded; 100.26 lakh completed	Beneficiary/Project → City → State → National	Housing ↔ completion ↔ services ↔ habitation	SDG 11
Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Gramin	Beneficiaries, sanctions, construction stages, payments and geo-tagging	Household/village evidence	Household → Village → Block → District → State	Housing ↔ household ↔ water/sanitation/energy	SDGs 1, 11
GIS geo-tagged works asset systems	Location, physical progress and asset information	Work/project-specific evidence	Asset → Village/Ward → District	Infrastructure ↔ place ↔ population/service access	SDGs 9, 11

SED observation:

Asset/Work Created → Asset Functional → Service Accessible → Service Utilised → Development Outcome

Physical completion is therefore an important output, but not the end of the development chain.

12. CLIMATE ACTION & GENDER EQUITY

Evidence Stream	Public-domain evidence available	Illustrative quantum evidence	Spatial / institutional level	Potential linkage	SDG
State Action Plans on Climate Change	Climate risks, vulnerabilities, mitigation/adaptation priorities and sectoral actions	State/UT-specific plans	State/UT with varying sub-State granularity	Climate risk ↔ intervention ↔ sector/geography	SDG 13
SACHET National Disaster Alert Portal	Multi-hazard, near-real-time and targeted alerts	Pan-India Common Alerting Protocol system with multilingual dissemination	Geo-targeted location → State/National	Hazard ↔ geography ↔ exposure ↔ preparedness	SDGs 11, 13
Mission Shakti Women & Child Development systems	Women-support services, maternity support, One Stop Centres and helplines	Dashboard: 841 operational One Stop Centres and 11,94,826 women assisted at its stated update date	Service Centre/District → State → National	Gender vulnerability ↔ access ↔ institutional response	SDG 5
Gender-disaggregated sectoral evidence	Female participation/beneficiaries in education, health, skills, agriculture, enterprises and social protection	Source-specific	Beneficiary/local → National	Gender ↔ access ↔ participation ↔ outcome across sectors	SDG 5
Climate/environmental geospatial evidence	Weather, floods, forest fires, air/water and other hazard/environment information	Location/time-specific	Location → District → State → National	Hazard/condition ↔ population ↔ infrastructure ↔ response	SDGs 11, 13, 15

SED observation: Climate and gender are inherently cross-cutting. Their evidence may therefore enrich analysis in virtually every other sector rather than operate only as independent evidence streams.

Exposure/Vulnerability → Intervention/Access → Response → Resilience/Equity → Sustained Outcome

Cross-Sectoral Evidence Position

The twelve Sectoral Evidence Demonstrations indicate that substantial public-domain information relating to Local Governance and local development is already generated through systems designed for different administrative, programme, financial, regulatory, service-delivery, beneficiary and monitoring purposes.

The evidence is not located in a single system. It is distributed across sectors, institutions, applications and geographies.

Across the twelve sectors, recurring connecting coordinates include:

Institution / Implementing Agency → Mission / Scheme / Intervention → Geography → Period → Population / Beneficiary → Financial Input → Physical Output / Service → Sector-specific Evidence

The presence of these common coordinates provides opportunities for related evidence generated through different systems to be viewed together at appropriate institutional, functional, spatial and temporal levels.

Such availability does not, however, establish completeness, comparability, interoperability, data quality, effective utilisation or achievement of development outcomes.

Input ≠ Output ≠ Outcome ≠ Impact

Digital Presence ≠ Digital Use ≠ Institutional Capability ≠ Governance Improvement

The SED provides the illustrative evidence base supporting the Comparative Sectoral Evidence Profile at Annexure IV. It is an evidence demonstration and does not constitute an assessment, audit, assurance, rating or ranking of any sector, programme, institution, State/UT, Panchayati Raj Institution or Urban Local Body.

ANNEXURE VI

Principal Public-Domain Sources

Sources and Evidence Note

This study is based on public-domain evidence from official and other authoritative sources, including government websites, portals, dashboards, Management Information Systems, statutory and policy documents, published reports, datasets, accounts and audit-related information.

Quantitative and other evidence relates to the period, geography, definition and reporting universe of the respective source.

A. Sources for Annexure I — State/UT-wise Functional and Institutional Landscape of PRIs and ULBs

- Constitution of India — Part IX and Part IX-A; Eleventh and Twelfth Schedules
- Ministry of Panchayati Raj
- Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs
- State/UT Panchayat and Municipal legislation, rules, notifications and activity mappings
- State/UT Governments and concerned Panchayati Raj, Urban Development and Local Governance Departments
- Union and State Finance Commissions
- Comptroller and Auditor General of India and concerned Accountant General/Local Audit institutions

B. Sources for Annexures II & III — Digital Applications, Public-Domain Evidence Ecosystem and Information Generated

- Ministry of Panchayati Raj
- Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs
- National Informatics Centre
- State/UT Governments and concerned Local Governance Departments
- Relevant Central and State Government digital platforms and enabling systems
- State/UT- and ULB-specific official digital governance systems

C. Sources for Annexures IV & V — Sectoral Evidence

Sector	Principal Ministry / Department(s)
1. Education	Ministry of Education — Department of School Education & Literacy
2. Health & Nutrition	Ministry of Health & Family Welfare; Ministry of Women & Child Development
3. Livelihoods & Skill Development	Ministry of Rural Development; Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship
4. Water & Sanitation	Ministry of Jal Shakti — Department of Drinking Water & Sanitation; Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs
5. Energy Access	Ministry of Power; Ministry of New & Renewable Energy
6. Environment & Sustainability	Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change
7. Governance & Institutional Development	Ministry of Panchayati Raj; Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs; Department of Administrative Reforms & Public Grievances, as relevant
8. Social Protection	Ministry of Rural Development; Ministry of Women & Child Development; Department of Food & Public Distribution; other concerned social-sector Ministries/Departments
9. Agriculture & Food Security	Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare; Department of Food & Public Distribution
10. Industry & MSME Development	Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises; Ministry of Commerce & Industry, as relevant
11. Infrastructure & Transport	Ministry of Rural Development; Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs; Ministry of Road Transport & Highways; other concerned infrastructure Ministries/Departments
12. Climate Action & Gender Equity	Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change; Ministry of Women & Child Development; National Disaster Management Authority; concerned State/UT authorities