At the start of Financial Year (FY) 2021-22, GoI allocated ₹73,932 crore to MoHFW Budget Estimates (BEs). Additional funds were allocated via the supplementary budgets passed in July 2021 and December 2021. This brings the total MoHFW allocations to ₹90,992 crore, or a 10 per cent increase from the previous year’s REs.

NHM is the largest scheme of the Ministry. For FY 2021-22, including supplementary budgets, NHM allocations stood at ₹48,783 crore, or 39 per cent more than the previous year’s REs.

For containing the COVID-19 pandemic, GoI announced the ‘India COVID-19 Emergency Response and Health System Preparedness Package’, or Emergency COVID-19 Response Plan (ECRP). In FY 2020-21, GoI released ₹8,147 crore, of which 96 per cent was spent. In FY 2021-22, GoI allocations stood at ₹12,185 crore. Till 24 November 2021, ₹6,076 crore had been released.

While expenditures for the ECRP have been high, they have been low for the remaining NHM components. In FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, 65 per cent and 69 per cent funds had been spent out of approved budgets, respectively.

As per the latest available data, health infrastructure was overburdened even prior to the pandemic. There were 9,702 people per government allopathic doctor and 1,666 people per government hospital bed in India.
Launched in May 2013, the National Health Mission (NHM) is Government of India’s (GoI’s) flagship Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) with an aim to achieve universal access to quality healthcare by strengthening health systems, institutions, and capabilities. NHM consists of two sub-missions: a) the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM), launched in 2005 to provide accessible, affordable, and quality healthcare in rural India; and b) the National Urban Health Mission (NUHM), a sub-mission launched in 2013 for urban health. The scheme is implemented by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW).

On 5 April 2020, to strengthen health systems and provide an immediate response to the COVID-19 pandemic, GoI announced the ‘India COVID-19 Emergency Response and Health System Preparedness Package’ (ERHSPP) with allocations of ₹15,000 crore. The ERHSPP, also known as the Emergency COVID-19 Response Plan (ECRP), is a Central Sector (CS) Scheme with an objective to build resilient health systems to address not only the current COVID-19 outbreak but also future disease outbreaks. NHM is the nodal body for the scheme’s implementation.

In July 2021, the Cabinet approved the second phase of the scheme, namely India COVID-19 ERHSPP: Phase 2, also known as ECRP-2. The total budget for Phase 2 is ₹23,123 crore and it runs from 1 July 2021 till 31 March 2022. Phase 2 of the Package has both CS and CSS components.

In March 2021, the Cabinet approved the Pradhan Mantri Swasthya Suraksha Nidhi (PMSSN) — a single non-lapsable reserve fund for share of health from the proceeds of the 4 per cent Health and Education Cess in place since FY 2018-19. PMSSN is to be used to fund NHM, Ayushman Bharat [including Health and Wellness Centres and Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana (PMJAY)], the Pradhan Mantri Swasthya Suraksha Yojana, emergency and disaster preparedness during health emergencies, and any future programme that aims to achieve progress towards SDGs and the targets set out in the National Health Policy (NHP) 2017.

The administration and maintenance of PMSSN is entrusted to MoHFW, and the expenditure for the schemes mentioned above are to be incurred initially from the PMSSN and thereafter from Gross Budgetary Support (GBS).

Budget 2021 announced the launch of a new CSS known as the Pradhan Mantri Atmanirbhar Swasth Bharat Yojana, with an aim to develop capacities of primary, secondary, and tertiary health systems. The scheme will supplement the NHM and has an outlay of about ₹64,180 crore over six years (till FY 2025-26).

The scheme includes interventions related to health systems and facilities, disease control, and information management. Details on year-wise allocations and utilisation of this scheme were not available in the public domain at the time of writing the brief.

This brief looks at the finances and service delivery under the new ERHSPP/ECRP, as well as the ongoing programmes conducted under NHM.

GoI allocations under Ministry of Ayurveda, Yoga and Naturopathy, Unani, Siddha and Homeopathy (AYUSH) for National AYUSH Mission (NAM), and allocations for the Senior Citizen Health Insurance Scheme (SCHIS) have not been included under NHM for comparability of analysis across allocations, approvals, and expenditures.

Allocations

In Budget 2021, GoI announced allocations for health and well-being to include expenditure under the Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Prime Minister’s Scheme for Holistic Nourishment (POSHAN) Abhiyaan, and Ministry of AYUSH, in addition to allocations for the Department of Health Research and Department of Health and Family Welfare. Further, it also included Finance Commission (FC) grants for water and sanitation and health. Accordingly, a total allocation of ₹2,23,846 crore was announced for Financial Year (FY) 2021-22. An additional ₹35,000 crore had also been allocated for vaccinations under the Ministry of Finance.

Specifically, for MoHFW, allocations stood at ₹73,932 crore. This was an 11 per cent decrease from the previous year’s Revised Estimates (REs) which stood at ₹82,928 crore. However, supplementary budgets for FY 2021-22 stood at ₹16,990 crore, bringing MoHFW allocations to ₹90,992 crore, or a 10 per cent increase from the previous year’s REs.
THE PROPORTION OF MOHFW ALLOCATIONS OUT OF PROJECTED DEMAND STOOD AT 73% IN 2021-22


Note: (1) Figures are in crores of Rupees and are Revised Estimates (REs), except for FY 2021-22 which are Budget Estimates (BEs). (2) Supplementary budgets have been added to FY 2021-22 BEs.

- NHM is the largest scheme within the MoHFW, comprising almost half of the Ministry's allocations. For FY 2021-22, GoI allocated ₹36,576 crore for NHM, a 4 per cent increase compared to the previous year’s REs. Including supplementary budgets, which stood at ₹12,207 crore, NHM allocations are ₹48,783 crore, or 39 per cent more than the previous year’s REs.

- Here too, however, allocations have remained below the projected demand. In FY 2021-22, the projected demand for NHM stood at ₹69,926 crore, which is ₹21,143 crore or 43 per cent more than allocations.

GOI ALLOCATIONS FOR NHM INCREASED BY 39% FROM 2020-21 TO 2021-22


Note: (1) Figures are in crores of Rupees and are Revised Estimates (REs), except for FY 2021-22 which are Budget Estimates (BEs). (2) Supplementary budgets have been added to FY 2021-22 BEs.

COVID-19 HEALTH FINANCES UNDER NHM

- In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, GoI released an advisory to states to use funds under NHM and the State Disaster Relief Fund (SDRF) to undertake all activities related to management of the pandemic. This was followed by the announcement of the ERHSPP with a commitment of ₹15,000 crore.

- The package is broadly aimed to be utilised for the following activities: emergency COVID-19 response to slow and limit the spread of the pandemic; strengthening national and state health systems to support prevention and preparation; strengthening disease surveillance systems, including laboratories and pandemic research; community engagement and risk communication; and capacity building, monitoring, and evaluation.
The second phase of the scheme, namely India COVID-19 ERHSPP: Phase 2 (also known as ECRP-2), was approved for the period from July 2021-March 2022. The total budget for it is ₹23,123 crore of which GoI’s share is ₹15,000 crore. The CSS component is through NHM.

The total period of the package is from 1 January 2020 to 31 March 2024, with expenditure prior to 3 April 2020 claimed retroactively. Funding for the same is through the reappropriation of existing NHM funds and through agreements with international agencies such as the World Bank (₹1 billion) and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (₹500 million).

For FY 2019–20 and FY 2021–22, funding is to be shared between GoI and states in a 60:40 ratio for all states except the North East Region (NER) and Hilly States. For FY 2020–21, i.e. ECRP-1, 100 per cent funding was by GoI.

In FY 2020–21 RES, a sum of ₹11,757 crore had been earmarked for COVID-19 under different components. These include: a) NRHM-COVID-19 ERHSPP; b) Central Procurement which includes procurement of N95 masks, PPE kits, Hydroxychloroquine tablets, ventilators, oxygen cylinders, etc., and incentives and capacity building for health staff on COVID-19 clinical management; and c) the National Centre for Disease Control.

As per the 126th Rajya Sabha Report on Demand for Grants for the MoHFW, dated 8 March 2021, ₹9,684 crore or 82 per cent had been spent for different COVID-19 related components till 10 February 2021 (latest information available). The highest expenditure was for NRHM-COVID-19 ERHSPP. Out of a total ₹6,938 allocated, 93 per cent or ₹6,458 had been spent as on 10 February 2021.

This was followed by expenditure undertaken under central procurement of supplies and materials for the COVID-19 pandemic. Out of a total allocation of ₹4,724 crore in FY 2020–21 RES, ₹3,179 crore was spent (67 per cent). In contrast, the lowest proportion of spending was for the National Centre for Disease Control, for which ₹95 crore was allocated out of which ₹46 crore or 48 per cent was spent.

The subsequent sections will look more closely into NRHM ECRP or NRHM-COVID-19 ERHSPP.

NRHM-COVID-19 ERHSPP

Approved Budgets

Release of funds under NHM are based on plans submitted by state governments, known as State Programme Implementation Plans (SPIPs). Once approved by GoI, they are called Records of Proceedings (ROPs) and comprise the total available resource envelope (which is calculated based on GoI’s own funds), the proportional share of state contributions, and unspent balances available with the states. States may also request additional funds through the submission of Supplementary Programme Implementation Plans. Their approvals are called Supplementary Records of Proceedings (SRoPs).

To understand how states prioritised ECRP funds, analysis of proposed and approved budgets was undertaken. Information on component-wise amounts proposed and approved were available for 25 states and UTs for FY 2020–21, and for all states and UTs for FY 2021–22.

In FY 2020–21, states and UTs proposed ₹4,451 crore and 94 per cent or ₹4,193 crore was approved. In FY 2021–22, the amount proposed and approved increased by over four times, as out of the proposed ₹21,460 crore, 83 per cent or ₹17,860 crore was approved.

Broadly, ECRP budgets were for the following categories: COVID-19 diagnostics and drugs; health facilities; human resources; incentives; Information Technology (IT) systems; monitoring; Information, Education, and Communication/Behaviour Change Communication (IEC/BCC); capacity building and training; and miscellaneous, which included untied funds for districts and items not covered by the other categories.

Of the total amount proposed in FY 2020–21, 54 per cent was proposed for COVID-19 diagnostics and drugs, 13 per cent for human resources, 12 per cent for health facilities, and 8 per cent for incentives.
The component-wise share of proposed amounts changed in FY 2021-22. The priority was on health facilities, with 72 per cent of proposals for this category followed by COVID-19 diagnostics and drugs (18 per cent), additional human resources (5 per cent), and IT systems (5 per cent).

There are some differences across states. In FY 2020-21, Andhra Pradesh prioritised COVID-19 diagnostics and drugs. This figure reduced to 9 per cent in FY 2021-22, as health facilities were prioritised. Similarly in FY 2020-21, Odisha prioritised human resources and Karnataka prioritised IEC/BCC. The priority shifted to health facilities for both states in FY 2021-22, with 71 and 73 per cent allocated, respectively.

FOR HEALTH FACILITIES, UTTAR PRADESH PROPOSED ONLY 5% OF ITS ECRP BUDGET IN 2020-21, BUT PROPOSED 63% IN 2021-22

For health facilities, Uttar Pradesh proposed only 5% of its ECRP budget in 2020-21, but proposed 63% in 2021-22.

The fund flow process for ERHSSP funds retains the usual NHM mechanism. Funds are transferred from MoHFW to State Treasuries, which are then transferred to State Health Societies (SHSs). To meet urgent COVID-19 related needs, State Treasuries are expected to transfer ERHSSP funds to SHSs within seven working days from the date of release by GoI. ERHSSP funds are released to states in multiple instalments.

In ECRP-1, since RoPs had already been submitted, and to ensure greater flexibility to states in responding to COVID-19, MoHFW had relaxed certain NHM norms including allowing for reappropriation of funds across flexipools and relaxation of the Conditionality Framework introduced by the MoHFW for 20 per cent of performance-based incentives. It had further provided flexibility in procurement norms established for World Bank funding to allow preference to be given to Micro and Small Enterprises (MSMEs), products developed under Make in India, start-ups, and Public Sector Units (PSUs).

In FY 2021-22, i.e. ECRP-2, separate ECRP proposed budgets were submitted along with the RoP. The guidelines note that states can use the funds approved only for the activities approved and monthly financial reporting should be submitted to MoHFW. For the remaining NHM components, the Conditionality Framework has been reintroduced, though with some modifications.

Release of funds for ECRP are only available for the Center share. In FY 2019-20, Center released ₹1,113 crore under ECRP-1.

GoI releases increased to ₹8,147 crore in FY 2020-21 and another ₹111 crore was released for health insurance for frontline workers. In FY 2021-22, the total Center share stood at ₹12,185 crore. Till 24 November 2021, ₹6,076 crore (50 per cent) had been released.

We analysed the proportionate share of releases out of total releases for FY 2020-21 in ECRP Phase 1 and for allocations for FY 2021-22. Since ECRP funds are for COVID-19 response and preparedness, a comparison was made with the share of COVID-19 cases. For FY 2020-21, the share of cases in a state till 30 September 2020 (mid-year) have been used. For FY 2021-22, cases till 31 March 2021 have been used, as allocations were made in the immediate months after March 2021.

There were differences across states and years. In FY 2020-21, Andhra Pradesh received 5 per cent of Center ECRP-1 releases but accounted for 11 per cent cases as on 30 September 2020. On the other hand, Maharashtra accounted for 15 per cent releases and 22 per cent cases. Interestingly, Delhi received 10 per cent ECRP-1 releases but accounted for 4 per cent of total COVID-19 cases as on 30 September 2020.

In FY 2021-22, Kerala accounted for 9 per cent of total cases and Delhi accounted for 5 per cent of total cases. However, the share of allocations were 1 per cent and less than 1 per cent, respectively. Maharashtra stood out with 23 per cent of the total COVID-19 cases but having received 7 per cent of the allocations.

In contrast, for states like Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh, the share of total ECRP-2 allocations exceeded the percentage of COVID-19 cases as on 31 March 2021. This could also be due to the relatively weaker health indicators and health facilities in these states, or unspent balances.

**MAHARASHTRA WAS ALLOCATED 23% OF TOTAL ECRP-2 ALLOCATIONS, BUT ACCOUNTED FOR 7% COVID-19 CASES AS ON 31 MARCH 2021**

![Graph showing the share of releases and allocations for COVID-19 cases and ECRP-2 allocations.]

Source: (1) Releases and allocations from RTI response from MoHFW dated 15 December 2021. (2) COVID-19 cases from MoHFW website. Last accessed on 31 December 2021.
Expenditures

- In the absence of information of state share, expenditure as a proportion of releases can only be undertaken for ECRP-1, which is 100 per cent centrally funded. Expenditure has been high. In FY 2020-21, ₹8,147 crore had been released by GoI to states. Of this, ₹7,802 crore or 96 per cent was spent. Twenty seven states and UTs had spent their entire fund received. Some exceptions were Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Telangana, and Rajasthan.

96% OF ECRP-1 FUNDS RELEASED WERE SPENT IN 2020-21

![Percentage of expenditure out of GoI ECRP-1 releases in 2020-21](image)


NHM APPROVED BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES

- Apart from the newly added COVID-19 funds and ECRP, NHM consists of the following six major financing components:
  - Reproductive and Child Health (RCH) Flexipool which funds maternal and child health, family planning, and the Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY). This now also includes the erstwhile Immunisation Flexipool for financing routine immunisation and pulse polio immunisation, and the Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme (NIDDCP).
  - HSS/NRHM Mission Flexipool (MFP) for untied funds, annual maintenance grants, and hospital strengthening.
  - NUHM Flexipool which addresses healthcare needs of the urban poor with a special focus on vulnerable sections.
  - Communicable Diseases (CD) Flexipool for financing the National Disease Control Programme (NDCP). This includes programmes such as the Revised National Tuberculosis Control Programme (RNTCP), National Vector Borne Disease Control Programme (NVBDCP), etc.
  - Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD) Flexipool for financing programmes such as the National Programme for Control of Blindness (NPCB), National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases and Stroke (NPCDCS), National Tobacco Control Programme (NTCP), etc.
  - Direction and Administration funds (formerly known as Infrastructure Maintenance) which are allotted across various programmatic divisions of NHM.

- With the exception of HSS, most other components within NHM have seen a stagnation or have decreased. For instance, after a 9 per cent increase in FY 2020-21 REs, GoI allocations for RCH Flexipool increased by only 1 per cent in FY 2021-22 BEs. Similarly, allocations for Direction and Administration also fell by 9 per cent from ₹6,993 crore in FY 2019-20 REs to ₹6,343 crore in FY 2021-22 BEs.

- In contrast, allocations for HSS increased by 10 per cent from ₹10,677 crore in FY 2019-20 REs to ₹11,748 crore in FY 2020-21 REs. A further increase of 9 per cent was seen for FY 2021-22 BEs.
State-wise Approvals and Expenditures

- Data on state-wise and component-wise allocations are available from Financial Management Reports (FMRs). Expenditures have been benchmarked against the total budget available with states. The total budget available includes SPIP approved budgets and the previous year’s committed liabilities. However, SPIP approvals have been treated as the total budget available for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, as data on committed liabilities are unavailable.

- As per FMRs, budgets available under NHM have been increasing. In FY 2019-20, SPIP approved budgets stood at ₹50,569 crore. They increased further to ₹58,692 crore in FY 2020-21.

- However, as per an RTI response from MoHFW as on 15 December 2021, SPIP approved budgets in FY 2020-21 stood at ₹65,031 crore, or 11 per cent higher than the amount as per FMRs. As per the same RTI response, SPIP approved budgets stood at ₹64,066 crore in FY 2021-22, or ₹965 crore lower than the previous year.

- A comparison of approved and available budgets using FMRs finds that expenditures have been low. In FY 2017-18, 60 per cent of the total NHM budget available was spent. This figure stood at 59 per cent in FY 2018-19. While available budgets aren’t available for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, utilisation shows some improvement as a proportion of approved budgets at 65 per cent and 69 per cent, respectively.

**LESS THAN 70% OF SPIP APPROVALS FOR NHM WERE SPENT IN 2019-20 AND 2020-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Data for Arunachal Pradesh and Dadra and Nagar Haveli are not available for FY 2018-19.

- There are state-wise variations. In FY 2019-20, the percentage of expenditures out of SPIP approvals were highest in Tamil Nadu (88 per cent), Odisha (87 per cent), and Manipur (86 per cent). In contrast, it was lowest in Arunachal Pradesh (35 per cent), Delhi (34 per cent), and Tripura (11 per cent).

**OVER 90% OF NHM SPIP APPROVALS SPENT IN 5 STATES IN 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunachal Pradesh</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** (1) FMR 2019-20 from RTI response dated 19 February 2021. (2) FMR 2020-21 from RTI response from MoHFW dated 3 December 2021.
In FY 2020-21, partly due to unspent balances, expenditures exceeded SPIP approvals in three states, namely Delhi (203 per cent), Kerala (125 per cent), and Andhra Pradesh (106 per cent). On the other hand, the proportion of expenditures out of SPIP approvals was below 50 per cent in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Manipur.

Component-wise Approvals, Releases, and Expenditures

In FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, the largest component under NHM was HSS/MFP, accounting for 66 per cent and 71 per cent of NHM SPIP approvals (which do not include unspent balance and committed liabilities). This was in contrast to earlier years when RCH was the largest component under NHM.

In FY 2019-20, HSS/MFP SPIP approvals stood at ₹33,177 crore, of which 66 per cent were spent. HSS/MFP SPIP approvals increased by 28 per cent to ₹41,783 crore in FY 2020-21, and 71 per cent was spent.

There were state-wise variations in spending. In FY 2019-20, spending as a proportion of SPIP approvals was highest in Tamil Nadu (95 per cent), Manipur (91 per cent), and Punjab (89 per cent). Spending was low in Kerala (47 per cent), Telangana (44 per cent), and Delhi (34 per cent).

Delhi and Kerala spent less than 50% HSS/MFP SPIP approvals in 2019-20, but over 100% in 2020-21

For Delhi and Kerala, this trend sharply reversed in FY 2020-21, partly due to unspent balances from the previous year. Expenditures exceeded SPIP approvals in six states, namely Delhi (366 per cent), Kerala (139 per cent), Andhra Pradesh (123 per cent), Punjab (111 per cent), Tamil Nadu (101 per cent), and Gujarat (100 per cent). In contrast, spending was low in Rajasthan (46 per cent) and Uttar Pradesh (43 per cent).

RESOURCES

Doctors and Beds

The population per government allopathic doctor and population per government hospital bed are an indication of the availability of public health services. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted a shortage of government hospitals and staff in the initial months. As per World Health Organisation norms, there should be at least one doctor for every 1,000 people and five hospital beds per 1,000 people.

Data for both are available from the National Health Profile (NHP) report for 2020. Data across states have different reference years, which range from 31 December 2018 to 31 August 2020. These have been matched with the estimated population using the Natural Growth Rate for each reference year to get year-on-year, state-wise population estimates.
A comparison of government doctors and hospital beds per person indicates significant shortages. There are 9,702 people per government allopathic doctor in India. This figure was exceeded in 11 states, including Bihar with 37,913 people per government allopathic doctor, followed by Telangana (31,103), Jharkhand (19,647), Uttar Pradesh (19,571), Madhya Pradesh (19,234), Chhattisgarh (16,980), Punjab (13,685), Karnataka (13,578), Odisha (11,792), Gujarat (11,412), and Haryana (10,184).

In contrast, among states, the fewest people per government allopathic doctor were in Goa (2,251) and Sikkim (2,070).

Similarly, there are 1,666 people per government hospital bed in India. The population per government hospital bed in Telangana was 7,596, more than three times the national average. This figure was also above the national average in Bihar (4,264), Maharashtra (3,729), Uttar Pradesh (3,562), Chhattisgarh (3,059), Madhya Pradesh (2,745), Jharkhand (2,594), Odisha (2,506), Gujarat (2,332), Haryana (2,299), and Rajasthan (1,730). On the other end of the spectrum, there were less than 1,000 people per government hospital bed in 19 states and UTs including Karnataka (958), Kerala (939), Tamil Nadu (782), Delhi (690), Andhra Pradesh (621), Himachal Pradesh (505), Goa (500), and Sikkim (300).

**Bihar had the highest population per government allopathic doctor and Telangana had the highest population per government hospital bed**


Note: (1) Natural Growth Rate for 2014 was unavailable, so it was estimated by averaging the Natural Growth Rate of previous year (2013) and the subsequent year (2015). Natural Growth Rate 2019 was used for 2020.

**Health Service Delivery – Non COVID-19**

The COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on service delivery of several health interventions. Some of these are discussed below:

**Maternal Healthcare Services**

Maternal healthcare services are essential for the health and well-being of mothers and children. GoI provides free institutional delivery and antenatal services through its network of health facilities to reduce maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality. Pregnant women are required to be registered for Antenatal Care (ANC), and receive 4 or more check-ups as per norms.

The number of pregnant women receiving 4 or more ANC check-ups declined during the COVID-19 pandemic. During April 2020, when the lockdown restrictions were at their peak, check-ups declined by 43 per cent compared to March 2020. From May 2020 onwards, this figure started increasing again. During the second wave of COVID-19 in April 2021, the number of pregnant women receiving 4 or more ANC check-ups declined from 20.33 lakh in March 2021 to 16.38 lakh in April 2021.
The number of pregnant women who received 4 or more ANC check-ups (in lakh)


Immunisation

- The Universal Immunisation Programme intends to reduce the under-five mortality rate by providing free-of-cost immunisations against vaccine-preventable diseases such as Hepatitis B, measles, polio, tetanus, and tuberculosis. The COVID-19 pandemic slowed down the progress on increasing immunisation coverage. During the first lockdown between March and April 2020, the number of immunisation sessions planned fell by 45 per cent from 10.58 lakh to 5.84 lakh.

- Over the same period, the number of immunisation sessions held out of sessions planned also fell. In March 2020, 93 per cent planned sessions were held, whereas in April 2020 only 70 per cent sessions were held.

- During the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, immunisation coverage was marginally hampered. The number of sessions planned and sessions held fell by 11 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively, in April 2021, compared to the previous month.

The number of immunisation sessions planned and held declined by 45% and 58% in April 2020


Communicable Diseases

- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, inpatient treatment of serious communicable diseases declined. For communicable diseases such as asthma, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), and respiratory infections, fewer patients were admitted for treatment during the COVID-19 pandemic. The number of inpatients per month more than halved from 1.38 lakh in March 2020 to 56,325 in April 2020.

- Throughout FY 2020-21, the number of patients admitted remained below the figure in March 2020. In May 2021, during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of inpatients doubled compared to August 2020.
The trend is also true for the number of major operations (general and spinal anaesthesia) conducted, which were significantly impacted by the nationwide lockdown in 2020. The number of major operations declined by more than two-thirds, from 3,83,818 in March 2020 to 1,21,313 in April 2020. Once the lockdown restrictions were lifted, numbers increased again to pre-pandemic levels and stood at 4,46,304 in March 2021. During the second wave in May 2021, however, operations once again dropped to 1,43,136.

### Outcomes

NHM’s emphasis on RCH is with the aim of reducing fertility, maternal mortality, and child mortality. Three indicators have been used to understand progress in outcomes:

- **Infant Mortality Rate (IMR)** refers to the number of deaths of children under the age of one per 1,000 live births each year, and the objective is to reduce IMR to 25 per 1,000 live births.

- **Total Fertility Rate (TFR)** is the average number of children that would be born to a woman during reproductive age, and the objective is to reduce it to 2.1.

- **Death Rate** is a measure of mortality and is described as the number of deaths per thousand population. There is no benchmark for it.

As per NFHS data, between 2005-06 and 2019-21, IMR in India fell from 57.0 to 35.2 and TFR fell from 2.7 to 2, thereby achieving the health outcome goal established in the 12th Five Year Plan. According to the Sample Registration System (SRS), the Death Rate in India also declined between 2006 and 2019, from 7.5 to 6.

### Across India, IMR, TFR, and Death Rates Declined Between 2005-06 and 2019-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fertility Rate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Rate</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per 1,000 population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>