

**Annexure-I****Major Suggestions/Feedback received from States/UTs****1. Bihar**

- i. The State informed that it is ready to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State requested a revision of the wage rate from ₹255 to ₹413 in line with prevailing local market wage rates.
- iii. The State suggested that normative allocation criteria may be clearly defined and made transparent by incorporating appropriate socio-economic parameters.
- iv. The State proposed reconsideration of the existing 60:40 labour-material ratio under the proposed framework.
- v. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- vi. The State requested flexibility for the inclusion of additional permissible works based on local conditions and requirements.

**2. Madhya Pradesh**

- i. The State informed that it is ready to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State requested early release of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- iii. The State suggested reconsideration of the labour-material ratio (60:40) prior to implementation of the framework.
- iv. The State proposed review of the Centre–State sharing pattern before rollout of the framework.

**3. Jharkhand**

- i. The State expressed willingness to migrate to DBT SPARSH.
- ii. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities, including approximately ₹950 crore under the material component and ₹56 crore under the administrative component.
- iii. The State informed that due to technical glitches and operational constraints, it has faced challenges in providing 100 days of employment under MGNREGS.
- iv. The State informed that continuation of MGNREGS instead of transition to VB–G RAM G had been recommended through the State Legislative Assembly.
- v. The State requested that its suggestions and concerns may be duly considered during policy formulation and operationalisation of the framework.
- vi. The State highlighted that bearing the proposed 40% State share may be difficult, considering the present financial position of the State.
- vii. The State requested enhancement of wage rates and employment days in accordance with prevailing local market conditions.
- viii. The State expressed reservations regarding the provision of 60 non-working days under the proposed framework.

**4. Uttar Pradesh**

- i. The State appreciated VB–G RAM G as a progressive initiative

contributing towards strengthening Gram Panchayats and achieving the vision of Viksit Gramin Bharat.

- ii. The State requested reconsideration of the existing four-hour gap requirement between first and second photographs in the NMMS face authentication system.
- iii. The State requested the timely release of pending liabilities from the previous financial year, along with current wage payments.
- iv. The State emphasised that payments should be released in a time-bound manner.

#### 5. Punjab

- i. The State observed that the average employment generation under MGNREGS is approximately 40–50 days per household and sought clarification regarding the enhancement of entitlement from 100 to 125 days.
- ii. The State expressed reservations regarding the provision of 60 non-working days under the framework.
- iii. The State suggested a suitable enhancement of wage rates for skilled labour.
- iv. The State proposed strengthening/modification of vendor payment systems for payment in four instalments.

#### 6. Chhattisgarh

- i. The State informed that it is ready to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State highlighted constraints in taking up rural infrastructure works due to prescribed percentage limits relating to NRM and Agriculture & Allied activities, and requested a review of these provisions.
- iii. The State suggested that PMAY-G housing works may not be considered while calculating NRM/Agriculture percentages.
- iv. The State proposed inclusion of “Tanka” and “12 Masi Sadak” works under permissible works.
- v. The State suggested detailed operational-level discussions prior to rollout of the framework.

#### 7. Sikkim

- i. The State informed that it is willing and prepared to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State emphasised the need for enhanced IEC and awareness activities regarding provisions and entitlements under the framework.
- iii. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- iv. The State requested reconsideration of the Centre–State sharing pattern, considering the small-State context.
- v. The State suggested detailed brainstorming and consultation sessions before implementation.

#### 8. Karnataka

- i. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- ii. The State informed that it is facing operational issues relating to NMMS attendance and requested system improvements.
- iii. The State requested review/relaxation of restrictions imposed on taking

up new works.

- iv. The State emphasised the need for consultations with States prior to implementation and requested due consideration of State suggestions.
- v. The State sought clarification regarding normative allocation criteria and related parameters.
- vi. The State requested clarification regarding coverage of Gram Panchayats under the framework.
- vii. The State suggested reconsideration of the provision relating to 60 non-working days.

#### 9. Odisha

- i. The State informed that it is ready to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State requested the release of wage and material payments within fifteen days of FTO generation.
- iii. The State emphasised the timely release of payments for skilled and semi-skilled workers, particularly for Rozgar Sevaks and Mates.
- iv. The State suggested prescribing a clear timeline for the completion of the e-KYC updation of workers.
- v. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.

#### 10. Jammu & Kashmir

- i. The UT requested a revision of the notified wage rate from ₹272 to ₹311, considering prevailing market wage rates and hilly terrain conditions.
- ii. The UT requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- iii. The UT suggested a reduction of the wage payment timeline from fifteen days to ten days.
- iv. The UT sought clarification regarding the identification of the proposed 60-day pause period.

#### 11. Uttarakhand

- i. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- ii. The State requested enhancement of wage rates in accordance with prevailing local conditions.
- iii. The State requested consideration for 100% Central funding towards the wage component, considering geographical and connectivity challenges.
- iv. The State highlighted connectivity-related challenges affecting NMMS attendance and requested suitable relaxation/exemptions.

#### 12. Maharashtra

- i. The State informed that it is ready to implement VB–G RAM G upon notification by the Government of India.
- ii. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components.
- iii. The State suggested removal/relaxation of the cap on the number of works per Gram Panchayat to enhance employment opportunities.
- iv. The State reported issues relating to NMMS uploads/counting mechanisms and requested necessary system improvements.

- v. The State suggested the organisation of a face-to-face Minister-level meeting with States for detailed discussion regarding implementation.

### 13. **Telangana**

- i. The State requested early clearance of pending liabilities under wage, material and administrative components under MGNREGS.
- ii. The State suggested reconsideration of the provision relating to 60 non-working days under the proposed framework.

The State emphasised that excessive software/system-based restrictions may be avoided to facilitate smoother field-level implementation.

Digitally signed by  
P.Sivasankar  
Date: 05-06-2026  
17:52:22