

Vulnerability Assessment

For the project: *Intersectionality-Informed Framework for Implementation of Effective Gender Integration in WSH*

Vulnerability: The quality or state of being exposed to the possibility of being attacked or harmed, either physically or emotionally. There are many dimensions to vulnerability. Poverty could be the first characteristic. Other factors that contribute to a person being vulnerable are, lack of access to education, health, livelihood, age, denial of basic rights to live with dignity due to official apathy or ignorance and ignorance and socially imposed inequality measure and practices, social exclusion and the consequent loneliness. Vulnerability primarily focus on the social, political, gender, health, demographic dimensions and not on economic dimension.

Team has prepared a scientific approach towards measuring vulnerability in context of sanitation, in which two components were considered. One is social vulnerability and the other is infrastructure deficiency. For measuring each of the components various indicators were considered. The indicators used are as follows

Social	Infrastructure
Literacy level	Water supply & Frequency
Presence of disabled	Availability of roads & Access to roads for de-sludging
Percentage of Women headed HHs	Street lighting
Presence of marginalized Communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex workers • Transgender • Migrants • Minority • Elderly • Destitute • Manual Scavengers 	Fecal Sludge Management
	Solid waste collection and segregation
	Drainage system availability and its maintenance
	Status of IHHT, Presence of insanitary toilet
	No. of HHs practicing OD
	Availability and Maintenance of CT/PT
SHGs strength	People residing in High risk land use
Presence of MAS	Recurrence of Flooding

The Vulnerability assessment was done using community-led assessment method i.e., Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA). In this method various techniques were used to assess the slums such as Conversational interviews, Community meetings with representatives (RPs of SLF, TLF members), Semi structured interviews, Focus group interviews, Participant observation and scoring/ ranking the indicators.

Evidence, facts and figures needed for assessment was collected using the above mentioned techniques and it was cross validated for sample of 15-20% of slums in each town. Each of the indicator were scored between 1 to 3 where 1 is considered as good and 3 is considered as bad, the average score for each component was calculated and plotted on a graph and the results were converted into 3X3 matrix with social exclusion on vertical axis and infrastructure deficiency on horizontal axis as low, medium, high. The matrix for each town can be referred from Annexure -1, 2, 3.

Assessment was conducted in 114 notified slums across 3 towns, out of them 32 slums were relatively better serviced, 63 with basic/limited service and 19 with weak service. The weak and limited serviced slums need to be given higher priority. The marginalized groups identified across 3 towns are transgender persons, women-headed households, disabled, elderly, sex workers, SC, coolies, hamalis, shikaris, yerukulas, manual scavengers, sanitation workers, fisher folks, petty vendors, daily wage labor and minorities.

The results of assessments for each town are as follows:

In Narsapur, 8 slums were identified as highly vulnerable and weak served. Among these 8 slums, the HHs has less number and poor access to IHHT due to lack of tenure, space, and are habituated to practice OD. All these slums are located in high risk zone like encroachments, frequent recurrence of flooding. These slums have mix portion of all vulnerable communities out of which majority are Women headed families, Minorities, Elderly, Disabled, Destitute Migrants, and with a minor portion of Manual scavengers. 33 slums were identified to medium vulnerable, slums in this category are either less bothered or newly developing slums with limited access to infrastructure and having majority of them having IHHT but slippage is noticed in these slums. Remaining 7 slums are better serviced and have least social exclusion.

In Kovvur, only 1 slum was identified as highly vulnerable as this is located on an encroached land with households living there under risk of eviction and prone to flooding with minimum infrastructure available. High incidence of OD is also observed. 14 slums were identified to medium vulnerable, where they have basic infrastructure but poorly maintained due to lack of awareness. Migrants, destitute, manual scavengers, transgender and minorities account for 15% of the population. Many HHs are women headed and have both disabled, and elderly persons. Remaining 8 slums are better serviced and have least exclusion but still have minor issues due to lack awareness.

Similarly in Anantapur, 10 slums were identified as highly vulnerable due to presence of vulnerable groups, Stigma and discrimination within these communities and the society, administration has pulled these people more into social exclusion and also resulting in poor maintenance of infrastructure available in these slums. 90% of the people in these 10 slums have

IHHT, only 40% are in use, so it is not surprising that as high as 60% of the people practice O.D. 16 slums were identified as medium vulnerable as these have basic infrastructure but not maintained due lack of awareness and negligence of the municipal workers. The presence of insanitary toilets is also high in these slums. Remaining 17 slums are better serviced and well maintained slums.

Annexure – 1: Vulnerability assessment – Narsapur

Social Exclusion	High (3)		Madhavaipalem Peechupalem NTR Colony (New)	Arundhati Peta Ponnappalli
	Medium (2)	Kothapeta Chruchpeta Babullagunta Devangulapeta Kappalapeta Rustumbada II	Sri Haripeta Chalavapeta Yanadhula Colony Gantamma Temple Kondamma Temple Ankanivaripalem Mokavaripalem Gandhi Nagar II Jona Road Lankapeta N.T.R. Colony Palaparthivari Peta Weavers Colony Kollabathulavari Peta Manginavari Nagar Colony Meraka Gudem Paruvuvaripeta Rustumbada I Krishna Babu Colony Stationpeta Nagamma Cheruvu	Lockpeta Christianpeta Scavengers Colony
	Low (1)	Indira Nagar Colony Nandhamuri Colony Bonthuvari Doddi Park Road Mruthyum Jaya Nagar Yerukulavaripeta Salipeta	Gandhi Nagar I Singodianpeta Devunithota Harijana Wada Jangamvari Street Mandavari Garuvu Javadhalavaripeta	
		Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
		Infrastructure deficiency		

Annexure – 2: Vulnerability assessment – Kovvur

Social Exclusion	High (3)		Bridge Peta	
	Medium (2)	Vambay Colony Uta Lanka Old 10th Ward Old 11th ward Avula Vari Colony Old 4th Ward	New Bridge Peta Old Bridge Peta Yanadi Colony Vegri vari chavidi Old 7th and 8th wards	
	Low (1)	Christian Peta Rajeev colony Relli Peta Harijian Peta Aurangabad Old 13th and 14th Wards Old 12th and 13th Wards Old 3rd and 4th Wards Chakalimanyam	Sri Rama Nagar Atchayamma, Taxi drivers and Leprosay colony	
		Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
		Infrastructure deficiency		

Annexure – 3: Vulnerability assessment – Anantapur

Social Exclusion	High (3)		Ambedkar Nagar JanaShakthi Nagar	Naik Nagar
	Medium (2)	Indira Nagar Maruvakomma colony Maruthi Nagar NTR Colony Mangalwari Colony	Navodaya Colony Buddappa Nagar Indira Gadhi Nagar Laxmi Nagar Rangaswamy Nagar Neeruganti St-1 Neeruganti St-2 Erukavari colony Maruthi Nagar -Rly track Ashok Nagar Rehamath Nagar Krishnadevaraya nagar Nehru Poorman colony Srinivasa Nagar Khaja Nagar Yuvajana colony	Azad Nagar Rani Nagar- Ferror colony Rani Nagar(Harizanawada) Rani Nagar CD Hospital) Rajahmma colony Munna Nagar Vinayak Nagar Hamali colony
	Low (1)	Arunodaya Colony	MG Colony Ganga Nagar Tarakarama Nagar Krupananda Nagar Ammavari Cheruvu Kottalu Tharimela Nagireddy colony Nallapu Reddy colony Obuldeva Nagar Sunitha Nagar Rajaka nagar Roshana Nagar	
		Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
		Infrastructure deficiency		