

Title – 'Smart Cities - Indicators'

Name of the Commentator/ Organization: SRINIVAS KODALI, DATAMEET

Clause/ Para/ Table/ Figure No. commented	Comments/Modified Wordings	Justification of Proposed Change
Section 4 Economic indicators	<p>The indicators has missing sections from the equivalent ISO standard 37120</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of city population below poverty line</li> <li>2. Percentage of Youth Unemployment Rate</li> </ol> <p>are missing from the BIS standard apart from others. It is proposed to include these as part of the standard.</p> <p>Apart from these it is proposed to include several other supporting indicators which do not measure areas of important and creating data gaps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Percentage of household income generated by women's co operatives and households</li> <li>4. Percentage of Informal economy</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The future of the city is based on the youth of the city and thus one needs to be aware of the numbers.</li> <li>2.The people living below poverty line indicates the issues surrounding a city and cannot be ignored from the indian standard.</li> <li>3. Cooperatives and household income generators are recognized in the formal economy and do not receive any benefits from the city to improve unlike formal business. It is important to recognize this sector.</li> <li>4. The informal economy of a city is important and is often ignored from the books. City slum areas like dharavi contribute to \$10 million per year to that of Mumbai. But these are rarely considered to provide services to slums.</li> </ol>
Section 5 Education	<p>The section has the same indicators as that of the equivalent ISO and has no localization to indian conditions. It is proposed to add the following</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The dropout rates in schools will mean nothing unless other issues like infrastructure in schools, incentives offered by schools like free food, violence in schools is</li> </ol>

<p>Section 6 Energy</p>	<p>1. Schools infrastructure like toilets, playgrounds.</p> <p>2. Sexual abuse of children and other forms of violence</p> <p>3. Percentage of self schooling, industry training institutes.</p> <p>It is proposed to add the following indicators</p> <p>1. Backup Energy infrastructure.</p>	<p>measured.</p> <p>2. Education is not always formal and the informal education needs to be recognized.</p> <p>Energy is important in the events of crisis. Backup energy stored by cities is important.</p>
<p>Section 8 Governance</p>	<p>The governance indicators are all measuring citizens involving in the governance process but not the response times and efforts of city officials in governance. These indicators do not help the citizens. The indicators doesn't even recognize how much time it takes to get a citizen service delivery done right.</p>	
<p>Section 12 Recreation</p>	<p>It is proposed to convert the supporting indicators to core indicators.</p>	<p>Public spaces are the core of public life in the city and are important.</p>
<p>Section 13 Safety</p>	<p>The standard only looks into the safety of the citizens but not of the city officials and contract workers. Several sanitation workers die cleaning the drainage system and NCRB doesn't even record it.</p>	
<p>Section 16 Telecommunications</p>	<p>The definition of cyber security readiness is not concrete and thus needs to be scrapped.</p>	<p>The cyber security readiness of a city cannot be measured when that of the nation is not defined.</p>

<p>Section 17 Transportation</p>	<p>No indicators on walkability. Proposing to add the following indicators.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of Signals in the city.</li> <li>2. Number of Zebra crossing in the city.</li> <li>3. Percentage of Sidewalk length in the city</li> </ol>	<p>Cyber security is an important factor for cities. But this indicator will simply make cities think they are secure when they are not. This is a defense matter and local bodies should not be involved.</p> <p>The entire section ignores the walkability conditions of a city and thus favours motorized transporta infrastructure. Walking is the most used form of transportation in India followed by any other modes. In some cities jaywalking is already illegal and thus undermines walking.</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

In all the standard ignores several important issues of a city and cannot be approved to be used by the authorities in its current form. It undermines several citizen rights and lets authorities move away from core citizen services to un-necessary services not so important to the citizens directly.