

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1980-81)

(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

FIFTH REPORT

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION

(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
AND EDUCATION)

Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fifth Report of Estimates Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agricultural Research and Education)—ICAR—Working Conditions of Agricultural Scientists.

Presented to Lok Sabha on



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT,
NEW DELHI

November, 1980/Kartika, 1902 (S)

Price : Rs. 1.70

LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS

ANDHRA PRADESH

1. Andhra University General Co-operative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam).

BIHAR

2. M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar).

GUJARAT

3. Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.

MADHYA PRADESH

4. Modern Book House, Shiv Vols Palace, Indore City.

MAHARASHTRA

5. M/s. Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, near Princess Street, Bombay-2.
6. The International Book House Pvt., 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1.
7. The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.
8. The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1.
9. M/s. Usha Book Depot, 585/A, Chira Bazar Khan House, Girgaum Road, Bombay-2.

10. M & J Services, Publishers, Representatives Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Bahri Road, Bombay-15.

11. Popular Book Depot, Dr. Bhadkamkar Road, Bombay-400001.

MYSORE

12. M/s. Peoples Book House, Opp. Jaganmohan Palace, Mysore-1.

UTTAR PRADESH

13. Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.
14. Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77, Allahabad—U.P.

WEST BENGAL

15. Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24-Parganas.
16. W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.
17. Mrs. Manimala, Buys & Sells, 128, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-12.

DELHI

18. Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place, New Delhi.
19. M/s. Sat Narain & Sons, 3141, Mohd. Ali Bazar, Mori Gate, Delhi.

C O R R I G E N D A

Corrigenda to 5th Report of the Estimates
Committee (Seventh Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
vii	19	Decommendations	Recommendations
vii	19	acceptued	accepted
1	15	delete "8"	
3	20	in	is
5	24	letter	letter
7	4	(Appendix)	(Appendix I)
14	25	The	they

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY GROUP 'H' OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1980-81)	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
CHAPTER I. Report.	1
CHAPTER II. Recommendations that have been accepted by Government.	6
CHAPTER III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies	17
CHAPTER IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government are still awaited	18
CHAPTER V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Governments are still awaited.	21
APPENDICES	
I. Form of letter issued by the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board to the Experts called for assisting Chairman, A.S.R.B. for assessment.	22
II. Copy of D.O. letter No. 10-15/79-per. IV, dated the 10th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors of the Institutes.	24
III. Copy of letter No. 10-20/79 per. IV, dated the 16th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Directors of the Research Institutes.	25
IV. Copy of letter No. 10-21/79-per. IV, dated the 13th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Directors of Research Institutes.	26
V. Copy of letter No. 10-23/79/-per. IV, dated the 18th October, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Director of Research Institutes.	27
VI. Copy of D.O. letter No. 7-23/79-IC. I, dated 28-9-79 from Shri S.S. Dhanoa, Secretary, ICAR, & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural Research and Education addressed to the Directors of all ICAR Institutes.	29
VII. Copy of D.O. letter No. 7-23/79-IC, I dated 28-9-79 from shri S.S. Dhanoa, Secretary, I.C.A.R. & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural Research and Education addressed to the Directors of all ICAR Institutes.	33
VIII. Copy of D.O. letter No. 7-23/79-I.C. I dated 28-9-79 from Shri S.S. Dhanoa, Secretary, I.C.A.R. & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural research and Education addressed to the Vice Chancellors of all Agricultural Universities.	34

(ii)

	PAGE
IX. Improvements in the procedure adopted by the ASRB for recruitment in pursuance of a review undertaken by Minister (Agriculture) and President, ICAR.	35
X. Office Order No. 8-6/80-per. IV, dated 13 May, 1980 issued by the Secretary, Indian Council of Agricultural Research New Delhi.	37
XI. Analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirtyfifth Report of the Estimates Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha).	38

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(1980-81)

Chairman

Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao

Members

2. Shri Kumbha Ram Arya
3. Shri Chitta Basu
4. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
5. Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev
6. Shri Ajitsinh Dhabhi
7. Shri Digambar Singh
8. Shri Era Mohan
9. Shri Jitendra Prasad
10. Shri K. T. Kosalram
11. Shri M. M. Lawrence
12. Shri Vilas Muttemwar
13. Shri B. R. Nahata
14. Shri P. Namgyal
15. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
16. Shri Janardhana Poojary
17. Shri K. Pradhani
18. Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara Reddy
19. Shri Ajit Kumar Saha
20. Shri Daya Ram Shakya
21. Shri Nawal Kishore Sharma
22. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
23. Shri Virbhadra Singh
24. Shri R. S. Sparrow
25. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy

(iii)

(iv)

26. Shri Tariq Anwar
27. Shri R. L. P. Verma
28. Shri D. P. Yadav
29. Dr. Golam Yazdani
30. Shri Zainul Basher

Secretariat

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Joint Secretary.*

Shri K. S. Bhalla—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*

Shri A. N. Bhatla—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

Shri H. C. Bahl—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

STUDY GROUP 'H'
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1980-81)

1. Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman*
2. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma—*Convener*
3. Shri Kumbha Ram Arya
4. Shri K. T. Kosalram
5. Shri B. R. Nahata
6. Shri Nawal Kishore Sharma
7. Shri Virbhadra Singh
8. Shri R. S. Sparrow
9. Shri D. P. Yadav

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Estimates Committee having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fifth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Fifth Report of Estimates Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Agriculture & Irrigation (Department of Agricultural Research and Education)—Indian Council of Agricultural Research—Working Conditions of Agricultural Scientists.

2. The Thirty Fifth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 27 April, 1979. Government furnished their replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in that Report by 27 September, 1980. The replies were examined by the Study Group 'H' of Estimates Committee (1980-81) at their sitting held on 5 November, 1980. The draft Report was adopted by the Committee on 24 November, 1980.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapters:—

I. Report.

II. Recommendations which have been accepted by Government.

III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies.

IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee.

V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited.

4. An analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fifth Report of the Estimates Committee is given in Appendix XI. It would be observed therefrom that out of 15 recommendations made in the Report 12 recommendations *i.e.* 80 per cent have been accepted by Government Replies of Government in respect of three recommendations, *i.e.* 20 per cent have not been accepted by the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
December 2, 1980

Agrahayana 11, 1902 (Saka)

S.B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1. This Report of the Estimates Committee deals with action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their 35th Report (6th Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Agricultural Research—ICAR) Working Conditions of Agricultural Scientists, which was presented to Lok Sabha on the 27 April, 1979.

1.2. Action taken notes have been received in respect of all the 15 recommendations contained in the Report.

1.3. The Action taken notes on the recommendations of the Committee have been categorised as follows:—

- (i) Recommendations|Observations which have been accepted by the Government:

Sl. Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

(Total 12) Chapter II

- (ii) Recommendations|Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government replies.

Nil Chapter III

- (iii) Recommendations|Observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee:

Sl. Nos. 1, 2 and 8.

(Total 3) Chapter IV

- (iv) Recommendations|Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited:—

Nil Chapter V

1.4. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations.

ORGANISATIONAL SET-UP

Recommendation Sl. No. 1 (Paragraph 1.7)

1.5. The Committee had noted that in spite of the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee (1973) to convert the ICAR into a Department of Agricultural Research and Education, the Government had allowed it to remain as a society. This, according to many scientists, had deprived the employees of ICAR their constitutional rights and safeguard of moving the courts of law in service matters which were available to employees of Government Departments. The Ministry had stated before the Committee that the basic objective of retaining ICAR as a society was to confer on it 'greater autonomy and flexibility in its operational and management procedures'. The Committee had noted the observation of the Enquiry Committee that, in actual practices the ICAR 'had more often than not sacrificed its autonomy in favour of Government rules and regulations' and 'calling it a society had been a myth' which had created 'considerable confusion and agitation in the minds of employees and also in the public mind'. The Estimates Committee agreed with the findings of the Enquiry Committee (1973) that the society format for ICAR had created considerable confusion in public mind. The Estimates Committee felt that "if the ICAR is converted into a commission or a statutory body, while it will not lose its autonomy and flexibility in actual working, the employees of ICAR will gain legal right in service matters (which they do not have at present)." The Committee desired that "the Government may give serious consideration to this matter and convert the ICAR into a Commission or a Statutory Body, as may be found to be most suitable for an organisation like ICAR."

1.6. The Government in their reply (27-9-1980) have stated that "after considering the various aspects of the question, it was decided by the Government not to convert the ICAR into a Commission or a statutory body but to continue the existing status and organisational structure of the ICAR which had been adopted in 1974 after considerable discussions and consideration at the highest level."

1.7. The Committee are not satisfied with the Ministry's reply. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation that the ICAR should be converted into a Commission or a Statutory Body as may be considered most suitable for an organisation like ICAR.

RECRUITING AGENCY

Recommendation Sl. No. 2 (Paragraph 2.10)

1.8. The Committee had noted that the setting up of one Member Board for recruitment of Agricultural Scientists was contrary to the

recommendation of the ICAR Enquiry Committee which did not favour the formation of a separate scientific body for recruitment of agricultural scientists. The Enquiry Committee had come to the conclusion that "such a body may not have enough work to do throughout the year and may ultimately concentrate power in the hands of full time Chairman and the Secretary." The Enquiry Committee had suggested that "taking into consideration the various pitfalls in different systems of recruitment and bearing in mind particularly the present dissatisfaction in the ICAR Institutes, the appointment of Agricultural Scientists should be made by the UPSC for five years at the end of which the position may be re-examined." The Ministry had expressed the view that the recruitment of scientists could not be entrusted to the UPSC, as the ICAR being a society, the posts under the Council were not civil posts coming within the purview of UPSC. The Ministry of Law had expressed the view that "a reasonable view can be taken that the ICAR is a public institution falling under Article 321 of the Constitution. The matter, however, cannot be considered as entirely free from doubt". The Committee felt that "If the large number of memoranda received from the scientists in any indication, the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board has not been able to win the confidence of the scientists of the ICAR and the dissatisfaction among scientists in regard to the system of recruitment, as mentioned in the Report of the Enquiry Committee is still persisting." The Committee also felt that "if the agricultural scientists working in the institutes, under the ICAR, have little confidence in the present recruitment set up the sooner it is replaced by another set up the better it would be for everyone." The Committee opined that, "what the Enquiry Committee had said in 1973 about recruitment system, holds good even today and that the ideal arrangement would be to entrust the task of recruitment of agricultural scientists to the UPSC." For this purpose, the Committee had suggested that "if it is necessary to pass a suitable legislation, it should be brought forward without any further delay."

1.9. The Government in their reply (27-9-1980) have stated that "after detailed consideration of the *pros and cons* of the various aspects of the question, it was decided by the Government not to entrust the recruitment in the ICAR to the UPSC but to continue the existing recruiting agency *viz.*, the ASRB with such modification as are considered necessary in the light of the past experience."

1.10. "The procedures adopted by the ASRB for recruitment has recently been reviewed in detail by the President of the Society (Minister for Agriculture). In pursuance of this, a number of

measures have been taken to improve its functioning in the areas such as (i) advertisement, (ii) screening of applications, (iii) Constitution of panel of advisers, (iv) procedures for functioning of Selection Committee, (v) representation and redressal mechanism."

1.11. The Committee note that some measures have been taken by the Department of Agricultural Research and Education to improve the functioning of ASRB. But the Department have not explained the reasons why, even when agricultural scientists are known to have little confidence in ASRB, the Department wish to persist in the present set up and why they are opposed to the recruitment of agricultural scientists being made through the UPSC—a specialised and constitutionally independent body of established standing in the field of recruitment. The Committee, therefore, cannot but reiterate their recommendation that, in the circumstances already explained, the ideal arrangement will be to entrust the task of recruitment of agricultural scientists to UPSC.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS OF SCIENTISTS

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Paragraph 3.26)

1.12. The Committee had noted with regret that in spite of the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee that the Director in consultation with the Executive Council should have a panel consisting of 3 Expert Members for each discipline from the Institute itself to assess the work of scientists and to take follow up action on the basis of such assessment, no such procedure had been introduced and the annual assessment of work of the scientists was being made by the Heads of the Divisions as before. The Committee suggested that instead of brushing aside the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee, Government should give careful thought to its implementation so as to ensure that there was fair and objective assessment of the work of scientists during the year and follow up action was taken on the basis of such assessment.

1.13. In their reply (April, 1980) the Department have stated:

"There are certain practical difficulties in adopting this recommendation for constituting a panel consisting of 3 experts for each discipline to assess the work of the scientists. There are likely to be a divergent opinion which will complicate the assessment procedures instead of simplifying them. The assessment report is written by the immediate superior, then reviewed by the reviewing

authority and then countersigned by a higher authority. Thus, the assessment report of a scientist is actually finalised by the 3 persons, viz., the reporting officer, reviewing officer and the countersigning officer. The scientist himself has to make a brief self assessment of his work done during the year before the assessment report is submitted to the reporting officer. This procedure is being followed in respect of all the services and provides adequate safeguards. Any departure from this procedure is likely to lead to various administrative difficulties and further complications.”

1.14. The Committee do not accept the Department's stand that the acceptance of this recommendation for constituting a 3-member panel of experts to assess the work of scientists will have practical difficulties or will complicate the assessment procedure. In fact, the assessment procedure recommended by the Committee would ensure a fair and objective assessment of the work of scientists during a year. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their recommendation.

1.15. The Committee would like to emphasise that they attach the greatest importance to the implementation of the recommendations accepted by Government. They would, therefore, urge that Government should keep a close watch so as to ensure expeditious implementation of the recommendations accepted by them. In cases where it is not possible to implement the recommendations in letter and spirit for any reason, the matter should be reported to the Committee in time with reasons for non-implementation.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para 2.22)

The Committee need hardly emphasise that in order to ensure fair and objective assessment of the scientists and to generate confidence among them that their promotions will be based on merit and not on extraneous considerations, it is essential that the scientists appointed on assessment committees are experts in specific fields of specialisation and that they are of reputed integrity. It also needs to be ensured that persons who have retired from ICAR and those who have lost touch with the academic activities for long are not made members of the assessment committees.

Reply of Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been accepted. Selections, assessments and promotions would be based strictly on merit and not on extraneous considerations. Specialists in the fields of specialisation and persons of high integrity would be co-opted on the Selection/Assessment Committees and Interview Boards. It would also be ensured that only those persons who have not lost touch with the academic activities would be associated with the Selection/Assessment Committees.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para 2.23)

The Committee also consider that the letter addressed to the scientists nominated to the assessment panels needs to be modified. Instead of merely drawing their attention to the convention that "a member of the Interview Board should not have any relation or any one else in whom he may be interested as a candidate appearing in the interview" they should be asked to furnish a written declaration that "none of the candidates being assessed for promotion is/has been his relation, student, ex-colleague or subordinate."

Reply of Government

The Chairman, ASRB has modified the letter to advisers as desired by the Committee. A copy of the modified letter is attached (Appendix).

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 4, Para No. 2.29)

The Committee find that the letter issued by the ICAR on 23 August, 1978 provides for disciplinary action being taken against employees who make "allegations and representations against the Board". This has created an impression in the minds of scientists that they have been prohibited from making any representation against selections, assessments etc. carried out by ASRB whereas according to the Ministry the intention of the management was that the scientists should "desist from making any observations or insinuation in their representations or otherwise against the functioning of the ASRB", and that there was no intention of preventing them from making any representations against the decisions of the Board. The Committee suggest that a letter clarifying the position may be issued by ICAR to allay the apprehensions in the minds of scientists on this account.

Reply of Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been accepted and a letter clarifying the intention of the Council has already been issued to all the Institutes *vide* letter No. 10-15/79-Per.IV dated 10-7-79 (Copy attached, Appendix II).

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 4, Para No. 2.30)

The Committee are not satisfied with the procedures followed by the ASRB for dealing with the representations received from the scientists. From the reply furnished by the Ministry it is apparent that no action is taken on such representations by the ASRB. The Committee suggest that all representations against the decisions of the Board in regard to induction of a scientist into the Agricultural Research Service or promotion of a scientist to the next higher grade should be considered by the President of the Council. If after going through the representation, it is found

that there are facts in the representation which *prima facie* justify a review of the decision arrived at by the ASRB the matter should be referred to the Board for reconsideration. The recommendation made in such cases by the Board should be recorded in writing along with the reasons therefor, and the scientist making the representation informed of the final decision in the matter.

Reply of Government

If the facts of the case justify and there is *prima facie* case for re-examination, the matter can be re-examined on the orders of the President of the ICAR Society and a decision taken in consultation with the ASRB. The decision will be communicated to the candidates concerned but the reasons for the decision will not be communicated to them. Subject to this modification this recommendation is accepted.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 5, Para No. 3.15)

The Committee find that it was in 1973 that the ICAR Enquiry Committee had made several recommendations to improve the working conditions of Agricultural Scientists. But even after six years many of these recommendations have either not been implemented at all or are still in the process of examination/implementation. The guidelines for appointment of the Heads of Divisions on rotation basis have been issued only on 23rd March, 1979. No action has been taken to appoint Divisional Committees having composition and functions as suggested by the Enquiry Committee. Similarly inspite of the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee that powers be delegated to the actual scientists, no financial powers have been delegated to them even to purchase small items needed for research work causing hindrance in their work. In the circumstances it is not surprising that the frustration and unrest among the agricultural scientists in regard to their working conditions is still persisting. Such a dilatory approach towards such simple but important recommendations of the Enquiry Committee which were intended to improve the working conditions of the agricultural scientists and to bring about their participation in administration cannot be too strongly deprecated. The Committee would urge that this matter should now receive immediate attention of the Council and recommendations of the Enquiry Committee implemented in letter and spirit without any further loss of time under intimation to this Committee.

Reply of Government

The rotation system of Heads of Divisions has already been brought into effect. Likewise, Divisional Committees have been formed at most of the Institutes. Delegation of powers to the Directors has already been done. Depending on the size of the Institute, powers have been delegated to the Heads of Divisions. While there is no intention, because of problems of audit and vigilance, to burden each scientist with administrative and financial matters, Directors have been advised to consider delegation of powers to the extent possible to ensure administrative efficiency. Institutes have also been advised to develop a good stores and labour supply system to facilitate the day-to-day working of the scientists.

The Indian Council of Agricultural Research has also under consideration the study report of the Indian Institute of Public Administration on the administration of Divisions in the Institutes with a view to further streamline administrative procedures.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 30-8-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 6, Para No. 3.17)

The Committee desire that the details of the scheme to have for major equipments a Centralised instrument section under the charge of a technical supervisor should be finalised and it may be introduced soon in all the Institutes of ICAR to solve the difficulties of the Scientists in regard to the equipment needed for their research work. Proper guidelines should also be laid down for making the instruments available to the scientists without giving any one of them any cause for complaint.

Reply of Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been accepted and the Directors of the Institutes have been requested to implement it. A few of the bigger Institutes have already established the Central Instrumentation facilities. The Directors of the Institutes have also been directed to streamline the procedures to ensure easy accessibility of scientists to costly precision instruments and to maximise utilisation.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 30-8-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 7, Para No. 3.25)

The Committee are not satisfied with the present system of annual assessment of the work of the scientists. A perusal of the headings in the annual assessment form in use at present shows that many of the headings under which a senior scientist is required to give his assessment of the work of a scientist working under him are vague, overlapping and have no relevance for assessing the professional competence of the scientist. Instead of an objective assessment of the achievements of the scientist during the year it leaves considerable scope for subjective judgement by reporting scientist. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the present assessment form may be reviewed with a view to simplifying it and only such columns should be kept in the form as are strictly relevant to assess the performance of the scientist during the year as an individual scientist and as a member of the team.

Reply of Government

The recommendation for simplification and revision of assessment proforma and procedures is accepted. As the process of assessment for the year 1978 is already underway on the basis of the current proforma, the revised proforma and procedure would be adopted for assessments for the year 1979 and onwards.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 9, Para No. 3.33)

The Committee have received complaints from scientists that senior scientists pressurise junior scientists to insert their names even in those research papers in which they (senior scientists) have not made any contribution. The Committee would expect the senior scientists to be generous enough to allow their juniors to claim sole credit for the research papers in which they (senior scientists) have made no contribution and thus establish a healthy climate of goodwill in their units.

Reply of Government

The recommendations of the Committee have been accepted. The observations of the Committee have already been communicated to all the Directors of the Research Institutes for immediate

compliance *vide* letter No. 10-20/79-Per. IV dated 16-7-79 (copy attached Appendix III).

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 10, Para No. 3.34)

As regards forwarding of research papers for publication, the Committee consider that normally it should not be difficult for the Head of the Division or the Director of the Institute to clear the manuscript of a scientific paper for publication within a month from the date of submission of the manuscript by a scientist and in fact as the Committee have been informed out of 2289 papers submitted by the scientists during 1978, 2117 papers were cleared within the prescribed period. In cases, however, where there is delay in their clearance by the Director/Head or where the Head of the Division/Director considers that the paper does not merit publication but the individual scientist does not agree with that view, the scientists concerned may be allowed to forward the paper for publication after making it explicit in the forwarding letter to the Editor of the Journal that "the views expressed in the paper are those of the author and not necessarily of the Institute."

Reply of Government

As desired by the Committee necessary modification has already been issued *vide* letter No. 10-21/79-per. IV dated 13-7-79 (Copy attached Appendix IV)

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 11, Para No. 3.39)

The Committee are not averse to the idea of posting scientists to backward areas or to other places where their services can be gainfully utilised. In fact the scientist themselves should welcome such an opportunity as a challenge to carry on research in the field in realistic conditions and help the cause of agriculture, in backward and hitherto neglected areas in national interest. The Committee would, however, like the ICAR to ensure that the scientists are not transferred to work on projects unrelated to their field of specialisation and that they are provided adequate facilities to carry on their work. The guidelines laid down for making such transfers should also be followed uniformly in all cases to avoid any cause of complaint.

Reply of Government

ICAR Research Stations have already been classified into categories A, B, C, D and E according to the degree of hardship and backwardness. Scientists posted in category 'C', 'D' and 'E' stations would get a special allowance of Rs. 100, Rs. 150, and Rs. 200 per month respectively. In addition, scientists posted to category 'E' station would be provided with free accommodation and those posted to category 'D' would be charged concessional rent of 5 per cent as House Rent if the accommodation is kutchha or thatched one.

Transfers are being made only in the areas of a scientist's own field of specialisation and according to the guidelines uniformly applicable to all scientists. Efforts are being made to develop the research stations in the backward areas to provide better facilities for the working scientists.

The Councils proposal to introduce a scheme to provide additional incentives to scientists working in difficult areas, such as merit certificate and a substantial financial award for successful completion of a project by a scientist, educational and medical allowances and facilities for family accommodation on lines similar to those followed by the Defence Services is still under consideration.

(Deptt. of Agricultural Research and Education O.M. No. 23-4/79-
Estt. dated 30-8-1980.)

Recommendation (Sr. No. 12, Para No. 3. 43)

The Committee desire that the membership of the Grievance Committees for agricultural scientists may be enlarged to include the elected representatives of the scientists. It should also be ensured that these committees are actually set up in all the Institutes of ICAR and are allowed to function effectively.

Reply of Government

As desired by the Committee the composition of the grievance committee at the Headquarters of the ICAR has been modified and the Institutes have been asked to constitute committees in accordance with the revised constitution immediately. A copy of the revised composition of the Committee issued vide letter No. 10-23/79 per. IV dated 18-10-79 (Appendix V).

(Department of Agricultural Research and Education O.M.No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80)

Recommendation (Sr. No. 13, Para No. 4.10)

The committee find that a large number of agricultural scientists (261 in 1978) are sent abroad for training|study tours and for participation in conferences|meeting|workshops|symposia etc. and they are mainly from ICAR Headquarters or from the institutes under the ICAR. The Committee, however, regret to note that the procedure followed for the selection of scientists for deputation abroad is not satisfactory. According to the scientists adequate time is not given to them for submitting their applications. As pointed out in a Memorandum submitted by an association of scientists "nominations are invited from the institutes most often when the last dates have already expired or are too close. The scientists who take all the trouble of preparing several copies of their bio-data for submission at considerable cost and labour do not later even get to know the fate they met." The ICAR has expressed its helplessness in giving adequate time for submitting applications on the ground that "occasionally very little time is available to the ICAR Headquarters in inviting the nominations and as such it is helpless in giving more time to the institutes or the universities, for submission of applications. The Committee suggests that in the case of training programmes, which are of regular nature, e.g. under the Colombo Plan and bilateral agreements etc. and even in the case of conferences which are held at regular intervals, it is desirable to invite names of qualified candidates periodically and maintain an up-to-date panel of eligible scientists to ensure that the scientists are not deprived of the chance of going abroad for training etc. because of late receipt of the proposals from the ICAR Headquarters or because of delay in processing and forwarding of applications by the Institutes/Agricultural Universities to the Headquarters of ICAR. In the case of *ad hoc* training courses and conferences|seminars it should be ensured that the circulars in this regard are sent to various research institutes and Agricultural Universities well before the last date for submission of applications and these are processed expeditiously by the Institutes/Universities and sent to the Headquarters of ICAR in time for final decision.

Reply of Government

The nodal Ministries|Departments who invite applications against circulars received from foreign agencies|organisations have

been requested to give sufficient time for inviting applications from Research Institutes and Agricultural Universities. The Vice Chancellors of Agricultural Universities and Directors of Research Institutes have also been requested to give high priority to circulate the vacancies amongst scientists. . Where sufficient time is not available, vacancies would not be circulated.

Detailed guidelines for processing foreign deputations and assignments have been laid down. (Appendices VI to VIII). In future, careful scrutiny of proposals will be made in each case in the light of the observations of the Committee.

It has been decided to discourage foreign agencies from inviting the Indian scientists by name and to develop international collaboration in the field of agricultural research and education largely on Government to Government basis. The recommendation for maintaining a panel of names in the case of training programmes of regular nature and conferences held at regular intervals is accepted.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education O.M.
No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 14, Para No. 4.11)

The Committee also suggest that all the scientists who apply for foreign assignments|deputations or training should be informed by the Institutes in which they are working as to whether or not their applications have been forwarded to ICAR; and the scientists whose applications are forwarded to ICAR should be informed in due course as to whether or not the figure in the final list of selected candidates so that they do not remain in dark about the fate of their applications. The Committee desire that suitable instructions should be issued by the ICAR to the Institutes under it.

Reply of Government

The recommendation is accepted. Necessary instructions have been issued to those concerned at the Headquarters and at the Institutes of ICAR to give effect to this recommendation forthwith.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education O.M.
No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

Recommendation (Sr. No. 15, Para Nos. 4.12 to 4.14)

Para No. 4.12

The Committee regret to note that there are no specific guidelines laid down for the preliminary selection of scientists for foreign assignments/deputation either at the Institute level or for final selection at the Headquarters level in ICAR. The selection of scientists, it appears, depends upon the Director of the Institute concerned and the subject matter specialist at the Headquarters of ICAR.

The Committee stress that the selection of scientists for foreign assignments/deputation/training should be fair and objective and it would be better if instead of leaving the judgement to the Head of an Institute, the selection is made by a Committee of scientists. It should also be ensured that only those scientists are sent abroad who have the requisite qualifications and experience and who on return from abroad will be able to serve the Government|Institute in the specialised field for a certain minimum period to be fixed by ICAR. Similarly, for participation in conferences, seminars/symposia the selection of scientists should be made keeping in view the subject for discussion and only the scientists working on those subjects should be sent. In case of any relaxation the reasons for it should be recorded in writing.

Para No. 4.13

The Committee desire that guidelines for selection of scientists for foreign visits should be formulated expeditiously and circulated to all institutes and other bodies for strict compliance. The guidelines should, among other things, lay down the number of times a scientist can go abroad for training, participation in conferences/seminars and the period in between two foreign visits so that the same person is not sent abroad time and again and others also can get a chance.

Para No. 4.14

The Ministry have stated "that the Directors of the Institutes have been advised to restrict their foreign visits as far as possible and to suggest names of suitable younger scientists for participation in international conferences, meetings etc. in their places." The Committee would like the detailed procedure in this regard to be finalised expeditiously and the Committee informed.

Reply of Government**Paras 4.12 to 4.14**

Necessary guidelines relating to foreign deputation/assignments have been laid down (Appendices VI to VIII). These guidelines provide sufficient checks and safeguards as recommended by the Committee.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education O.M.
No. 23-4/79-Estt. dated 21-4-80]

CHAPTER III

**RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT
DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S
REPLIES.**

NIL

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE.

Recommendation (Sr. No. 1, Para No. 1.7)

The Committee find that in spite of the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee (1973) to convert the ICAR into a Department of Agricultural Research and Education, the Government have allowed it to remain as a society. This, as many scientists have represented to the Committee, has deprived the employees of ICAR of constitutional rights and safeguard of moving the courts of law in service matters which are available to employees of Government Departments. The Ministry have stated that the basic objective of retaining ICAR as a society was to confer on it 'greater autonomy and flexibility in its operational and management procedures'. But as pointed out by the Enquiry Committee in actual practices the ICAR 'has more often than not sacrificed its autonomy in favour of Government rules and regulations' and 'calling it a society has been a myth' which has created 'considerable confusion and agitation in the minds of employees and also in the public mind'. The Committee agree with the findings of the Enquiry Committee that the society format for ICAR has created considerable confusion in public mind. They also feel that if the ICAR is converted into a commission or a statutory body, while it will not lose its autonomy and flexibility in actual working, the employees of ICAR will gain legal right in service matters (which they do not have at present). The Committee desire that the Government may give serious consideration to this matter and convert the ICAR into a Commission or a Statutory Body as may be found to be most suitable for an organisation like ICAR.

Reply of Government

After considering the various aspects of the question, it was decided by the Government not to convert the ICAR into a Commission or a statutory body but to continue the existing status and organisational structure of the ICAR which had been adopted in 1974 after considerable discussions and consideration at the highest level.

(Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt., dated 27-9-1980)

Comments of the Committee

Please see paragraph 1.7 of the Report—Chapter I

Recommendation (Sr. No. 2, Para No. 2.10)

The Committee find that the setting up of one Member Board for recruitment of Agricultural Scientists is contrary to the recommendation of the ICAR Enquiry Committee which did not favour the formation of a separate scientific body for recruitment of agricultural scientists. The Enquiry Committee had come to the conclusion that "such a body may not have enough work to do throughout the year and may ultimately concentrate power in the hands of full time Chairman and the Secretary". The Enquiry Committee had suggested that "taking into consideration the various pitfalls in different systems of recruitment and bearing in mind particularly the present dissatisfaction in the ICAR Institutes, the appointment of Agricultural Scientists should be made by the UPSC for five years at the end of which the position may be re-examined". According to the Ministry the recruitment of scientists could not be entrusted to the UPSC, as the ICAR being a Society, the posts under the Council were not civil posts coming within the purview of UPSC. The Ministry of Law expressed the view that 'a reasonable view can be taken that the ICAR is a public institution falling under Article 321 of the Constitution. The matter, however, cannot be considered as entirely free from doubt'. The Committee feel that if the large number of memoranda received from the scientists is any indication, the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board has not been able to win the confidence of the scientists of the ICAR and the dissatisfaction among scientists in regard to the system of recruitment, as mentioned in the Report of the Enquiry Committee, is still persisting. The Committee feel that if the agricultural scientists working in the institutes, under the ICAR, have little confidence in the present recruitment set up, the sooner it is replaced by another set up the better it would be for everyone. In the Committee's opinion what the Enquiry Committee said in 1973 about recruitment system holds good even today and that the ideal arrangement would be to entrust the task of recruitment of agricultural scientists to the UPSC. For this purpose, if it is necessary to pass a suitable legislation, it should be brought forward without any further delay.

Reply of Government

After detailed consideration of the pros and cons of the various aspects of the question, it was decided by the Government not to

entrust the recruitment in the ICAR to the UPSC but to continue the existing recruiting agency viz. the ASRB with such modifications as are considered necessary in the light of the past experience.

The procedures adopted by the ASRB for recruitment has recently been reviewed in detail by the President of the Society (Minister for Agriculture). In pursuance of this, a number of measures have been taken to improve its functioning in the areas such as (i) advertisement, (ii) screening of applications, (iii) Constitution of Panel of advisers, (iv) procedures for functioning of Selection Committee, (v) representation and redressal mechanism. A note on the measures recently adopted to improve the functioning of ASRB is at Appendix IX.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt., dated 27-9-1980]

Comments of the Committee

Please see paragraph 1.11 of the Report—Chapter I.

Recommendation (Sr. No. 8, Para No. 3.26)

The Committee also regret to note that in spite of the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee that the Director in consultation with the Executive Council should have a panel consisting of three expert members for each discipline from the institute itself to assess the work of the scientists and to take follow up action on the basis of such assessment, no such procedure has yet been introduced and the annual assessment of the work of the scientists is being made by Heads of Divisions as before. The Committee feel that instead of burshing aside the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee, the Government should give careful thought to its implementation so as to ensure that there is fair and objective assessment of the work of a scientist during the year and follow up action is taken on the basis of such assessment.

Reply of Government

There are certain practical difficulties in adopting this recommendation for constituting a panel consisting of 3 experts for each discipline to assess the work of the scientists. There are likely to be a divergent opinion which will complicate the assessment procedures instead of simplifying them. The assessment report is written by the immediate superior, then reviewed by the reviewing authority and then countersigned by a higher authority. Thus the

assessment report of a scientist is actually finalised by the 3 persons, viz., the reporting officer, reviewing officer and the countersigning officer. The scientist himself has to make a brief self assessment of his work done during the year before the assessment report is submitted to the reporting officer. This procedure is being followed in respect of all the services and provides adequate safeguards. Any departure from this procedure is likely to lead to various administrative difficulties and further complications.

[Department of Agricultural Research and Education
O.M. No. 23-4/79-Estt., dated 21-4-1980]

Comments of the Committee

Please see paragraph 1.14 of the Report—Chapter I

CHAPTER V

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL
REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

NIL

NEW DELHI;
December 2, 1980
Agrahayana 11, 1902 (Saka)

S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee.

APPENDIX I

FORM OF LETTER ISSUED BY THE AGRICULTURAL SCIENTISTS RECRUITMENT BOARD TO THE EXPERTS CALLED FOR ASSISTING CHAIRMAN, A.S.R.B. FOR ASSESSMENT.

I am desired to state that in accordance with Rules 19 and 12 of the Service Rules for Agricultural Research; Service of Indian Council of Agricultural Research Society, the extracts of which are attached for ready reference, the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board will conduct the five-yearly assessment and interview of the eligible Scientists of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research belonging to the different disciplines in accordance with the programme indicated below:—

<i>Name of discipline</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Place</i>
---------------------------	-------------	-------------	--------------

2. The Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board has been pleased to nominate you as a Member of the Assessment Committee for the purpose and you are requested to make it convenient to attend the meetings of the Committee as mentioned above and confirm your acceptance by return of post.

3. A note indicating briefly the criteria, method and procedure for five-yearly assessment is enclosed for your information.

4. You are probably aware of the convention that a Member of the Interview Board should not have any relation or any one else in whom he may be interested as a candidate appearing at the above mentioned interview. You are requested to forward a certificate to this effect while conveying your acceptance to attend the meeting of the above Committee.

5. I may also add for your information that the proceedings of the Interview Board have to be treated as "Top Secret".

6. T:A./Honorarium will be paid to you as per the Indian Council of Agricultural Research Rules. You may travel by Air if you so desire.

APPENDIX II

Copy of D.O. letter No. 10-15/79-Per. IV, dated the 10th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors of the Institutes regarding representations against the A.S.R.B. about the recruitment for Scientific posts.

Your attention is invited to D.G. ICAR's D.O. letter No. 12(37) |75-EE.I (2), dated 16-7-1975 and my d.o. letter No. 1-2|78-Per.IV dated 23-8-1978 wherein it was emphasised that A.S.R.B. being an independent authority to assist ICAR in recruitment for Scientific posts should be treated in the same way as the UPSC. No attempt should therefore be made to interfere with the functioning of the Board and that employees who make allegations and representations against the Board would attract disciplinary action.

The intention of the above instructions was not to prevent scientists from making any representations against the decision of the Board. They should however, desist from making any observations or insinuation in their representation or otherwise against the functioning of the ASRB. The representation, if any, against the decision of the Board will however be considered in the Council and not in the ASRB. The decision of the Council on such representations will be communicated to all concerned.

The contents of this letter may be brought to the notice of all the scientists in your Institute.

APPENDIX III

Copy of letter No. 10-20/79-Per. IV, dated the 16th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Directors of the Research Institutes—regarding Publication of research papers, observation of the Estimates Committee.

The Estimates Committee in their Thirty Fifth Report of the Lok Sabha, regarding working conditions of Agricultural Scientists in the ICAR have observed that it has been represented to them that the Senior Scientists in the ICAR Institutes pressurise Junior Scientists to insert their names even in those papers in which they (Senior Scientists) have not made any contribution. Some young Scientists complained that their research papers were not published because they did not want the name of the Head to be associated with the publication. The Committee, therefore, felt that such a tendency, if there is any, is not good. There should be full freedom for scientists to publish their research findings in scientific journals. The Committee would expect the Senior Scientists to be generous enough to allow their juniors to claim sole credit for the research papers in which they (Senior Scientists) have made no contribution and thus establish a healthy climate of goodwill in their units.

The above observation of the Estimates Committee may please be brought to the notice of Scientists at all levels in your Institute for information and compliance.

APPENDIX IV

Copy of letter No. 10-21/79-Per. IV, dated the 13th July, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Directors of Research Institutes—regarding Forwarding of Research papers to scientific journals.

In partial modification of the guidelines contained in the Council letter of even number dated 9th November, 1977 on the subject mentioned above, it has been decided that item No. (VI) appearing in para 2 of the above letter may be read as follows:—

(VI) Where the Head of a Division|Director considers that the paper does not merit publication, but the individual scientist does not agree with that view or where there is undue delay in offering comments, the scientist concerned could forward the paper for publication on his/her responsibility making it explicit in the forwarding letter to the Editor of the Journal that the views expressed in the paper are those of the author and not necessarily of the Institute.

2. Wide publicity may kindly be given to this modification in your Institute.

APPENDIX V

Copy of letter No. 10-23/79-Per. IV, dated the 18th October, 1979 from Secretary, ICAR to all the Directors/Project Directors of Research Institutes—regarding—Composition of the Grievance Committees, for looking into the grievances of officers in Class I and above at ICAR—Headquarters and its Institutes—*Vide* reference letter No. 5-7/77-Per. IV, dated 1-4-78.

The composition of the Grievance Committees to look into the grievances of officers in Class I and above at ICAR Headquarters and its Institute was circulated *vide* our letter quoted above. The constitution of the above committee was commented upon by the Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha in its 35th Report and desired that it should be modified to include two elected representatives of the Scientists in the committee. The Estimates Committee also observed that it should be ensured that these Committees are actually set up in all the Institutes of ICAR and are allowed to function effectively.

2. On the basis of the recommendations of the Estimates Committee, the Governing Body at its meeting held on 22-8-79 approved the following revised composition of the Committees:— ..

At the Institutes:

1. Director of the Institute Chairman
2. Two Heads of Divisions to be nominated by the Management Committees Members
3. Two elected representatives of the Scientists in Grades S-1 and S-2 Members
4. C.A.O/S.A.O/A.O. Member Secretary

At the ICAR Headquarters:

1. D.D.G. to be nominated by the Director-General Chairman
2. Secretary, ICAR Member
3. Director (Personnel) Member
4. One A.D.G. to be nominated by the Director-General Member
5. Director (P. b. & Information) or in his absence CP & PRO Member

6. One elected representative of Technical Personnel in T-6, T-7 & T-8 Member
7. One elected representative of the 'Administrative Personnel. Member
8. Dy. Director (A)/Under Secretary (A) Member Secretary.

3. The Grievance Committees for looking into the grievances of officers in Class I and above may be re-constituted accordingly.

The receipt of this letter may also please be acknowledged.

APPENDIX VI

Copy of D.O. letter No. 7-23/79-IC. I. dated 28-9-79 from Shri S. S. Dhanoa, Secretary, I.C.A.R. & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural Research and Education addressed to the Directors of all I.C.A.R. Institutes.

The Estimates Committee of the 6th Lok Sabha who looked into the working conditions of agricultural scientists has made certain recommendations on the deputation of agricultural scientists to foreign countries for training/study tours/to attend Seminars, Conferences etc. The recommendations made by the Estimates Committee on this have been carefully considered and it has been decided to follow certain guidelines/procedures so as to ensure that a fair and equitable chance is given to every eligible agricultural scientists to be deputed abroad for such purposes.

Constitution of a Selection Committee

In view of the need to ensure that selection of scientists for foreign assignments/deputations/training abroad is fair and objective, it has been decided that you may constitute a Selection Committee consisting of three to five senior scientists for your Institute for selection of scientists for foreign assignments/deputation for participation in meetings/conferences/or training abroad. A letter may be sent indicating the constitution of the Selection Committee and its composition.

Deputation abroad for training

In order to regulate the number of times a scientist can be deputed abroad for training/fellowships for participation in conferences/seminars etc. as well as the periods between the two visits, the Government of India Instructions which are being followed by the ICAR reproduced below should be carefully followed in selection of scientists for training:—

- (i) Normally the principle of seniority should be followed subject to the condition that the scientist nominated should not have been abroad on any training/fellowship/

course/workshop/seminar/study tour etc. during the last five years from the date of commencement of the course. If he had gone abroad on any previous occasion, the details of the same may be furnished;

- (ii) An undertaking is required to be given by the sponsoring authority i.e., Director of the Institute that they would be responsible for getting the selected officers to furnish the report of training undergone by him/her within one month of his/her return from abroad;
- (iii) In case a nominee is likely to be reverted either before or immediately after the training programme to a lower or equivalent post where training will not be of direct use to the work to be done by the scientists, this fact should be indicated by the sponsoring authority;
- (iv) The claims of the scientists belonging to SC/ST may be kept in view while making nominations; and
- (v) No scientist who is over 50 years of age should be recommended for training abroad unless there are specific reasons justifying relaxation. The specific reasons justifying relaxation should be clearly spelt out.

Necessary modifications/additions have been made in the check list.

Deputation for participation in Meetings/Conferences/seminars abroad:

For participation in meetings/conferences/seminars etc. it is not possible to lay down any specific periods that may lapse between the two visits because of various factors like suitability and eminence of a scientist in a particular field, personal invitations and non-availability of any other suitable scientists. However, it is possible to ensure that fair and equitable chances are given to other scientists who might not have been deputed abroad. It has, therefore, been decided that you may clearly indicate while recommending a scientist who had earlier been deputed abroad that no other suitable scientist can be sent for participation in the meeting/conference/seminar etc. The details about other suitable scientists who had not been deputed abroad earlier may be given in such cases. Even in cases where an invitation is received by name by a scientist who might have gone abroad earlier and if any other suitable scientist is available who might not have gone abroad, the organisers can

be requested to accept the participation of other suitable scientist/scientists who might not have gone abroad. This would be generally done by the ICAR/DARE on getting recommendations from you and details about other suitable scientists. Necessary modification/addition has been made in the check list.

Intimation to individuals concerned about the outcome of their applications:

The scientists concerned whose applications are not accepted should be informed of the decisions. In case of applications received by the ICAR/DARE for foreign assignments, Institutes are already being informed about the outcome of the applications received. The Directors of the ICAR Institutes have already been requested to convey the decisions of the Council/DARE to the scientists concerned when these are received by them. Similarly you are also requested to inform the scientists concerned about the rejection of their applications at the Institute level in cases where you decide not to forward their applications.

In case of nominations received for training/fellowships Institutes are only informed about scientists selected for training/award of fellowships. If within the stipulated time for the training courses you do not hear from ICAR/DARE, it should be presumed that your nominees were not recommended by the Council/DARE for training.

Adequate time for submitting applications/nominations:

It has been noted there is need for giving adequate time to scientists for submitting applications for foreign assignments and for deputation in conferences/meetings abroad.

In case of the applications for foreign assignments nominations are invited by other nodal Departments/Ministries and if they do not give sufficient time to ICAR/DARE, it is not possible, in turn, to give sufficient time to the Institutes to send applications of suitable/eligible scientists. The nodal Departments/Ministries are being requested to give more time for receiving such applications.

As regards invitations for participation in Conferences/Meetings etc. abroad at times sufficient time is not given to the Council/DARE to get nominations. In some cases invitations are received by the Institutes directly and cases are referred to the ICAR/DARE for processing. It has been decided that if sufficient time is not given either to ICAR/DARE or to the Institutes for sending nominations for participation in conferences/meetings etc. abroad these cases

should not be processed. ICAR/DARE normally require at least 4 to 5 weeks time to get a deputation proposal approved after completing certain formalities and obtaining the necessary clearances.

As already mentioned above the existing check list has been modified and additional items added to cover the points mentioned in para 2 above. A copy of the modified check list is enclosed.* A copy of the d.o. letter No. 26-25/75-IC.I dated August 25, 1975 from former Director-General is also enclosed for facility of reference. Kindly keep all the points mentioned in this d.o. letter in mind while processing proposals for deputation abroad. The modified check list may please be sent in all the cases in the first instance and as early as possible to enable us to process the proposals quickly.

APPENDIX VII

Copy of D.O. letter No. 7-23/79-IC.I dated 28.9.79 from Shri S. S. Dhanoa, Secretary, I.C.A.R. & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural Research and Education addressed to the Directors of all I.C.A.R. Institutes.

On a number of occasions earlier we had brought to your attention the observations of the former Minister (A&I) that the Directors of all the Institutes should not go abroad too often for participation in meetings/conferences/seminars etc. Efforts should be made to expose younger scientists in the Institutes to such international gatherings. This point was also considered by the Estimates Committee of the 6th Lok Sabha. You are, therefore, requested once again to carefully consider these points while forwarding your deputation proposals. It will be helpful if you indicate in such cases specifically that it is unavoidable for you to attend a particular meeting/seminar etc. and it is not possible for another younger and a suitable scientist to be deputed in your place.

APPENDIX VII

.. Copy of D.O. Letter No. 7-23/79-IC.I dated 28.9.79 from Shri S. S. Dhanoa, Secretary, I.C.A.R. & Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Agricultural Research and Education addressed to the Vice Chancellors of all Agricultural Universities.

As you must be aware that the Estimates Committee of the Sixth Lok Sabha looked into the working conditions of agricultural scientists and has submitted its Report. In the Chapter on deputation abroad of agricultural scientists, the Estimates Committee emphasized the need for giving adequate time to scientists for submitting their applications for foreign assignments or deputation abroad for conferences|meetings|training etc.

In most of the cases applications are invited by other nodal Ministries/Departments of the Government of India who have separately been requested to give more time for inviting applications. However, it will be desirable to make efforts at your end also to process such cases on very urgent basis within the limited time that is made available to you as well as us so that it is possible to consider applications of as many suitable persons as possible.

APPENDIX IX

Improvements in the procedure adopted by the ASRB for recruitment in pursuance of a review undertaken by Minister (Agriculture) and President, ICAR.

1. Advertisements and applications:

At present, the ASRB calls for applications through all India advertisement against duties and qualifications laid-down by ICAR. Past experience indicates that in a number of cases the duties and qualifications need to be more specific and precise to match the requirements of the job. However, care would have to be taken to ensure that the required qualifications are not too narrow or restrictive and should attract sufficiently wide range of talent from which to select a suitable candidate. This review would be done by the ICAR and ASRB from time to time according to need. President, ICAR has set up a Committee to review qualifications and duties for various grades in Agricultural Research Service and also the Research Management Positions.

2. Screening of Applications:

The first screening would be done, as hitherto, by the ICAR, using the *pro forma* for this purpose. Further screening will however, be done by ASRB and where there is difference of opinion it would be settled by Chairman, ASRB in consultation with Director-General, ICAR. All candidates meeting the essential qualifications would be called for interview.

3. Panel of Advisers:

Chairman, ASRB would draw up a list of competent Advisers subject-wise. For posts in the scale Rs. 2000—2500 and above, the Selection Committee will consist of 2 experts nominated by Chairman, ASRB and 2 experts nominated by President, ICAR from a panel of eminent and appropriate experts submitted by Director-General, ICAR. In addition, each Selection Board would have a ICAR representative as provided in the rules. The President of ICAR has accordingly modified the composition of the Selection Committee for Scientific posts in Research Management Positions carrying the scale of Pay of Rs. 2000—2500 *vide* D.O. No. 8-6/80-Per. IV dated 13-5-1980 (Appendix X).

4. Selections:

In departure from the present procedure, ASRB would maintain written minutes of the Interview Board's decisions with signatures of all Board members. In case the selection is not unanimous, the dissenting member/members would record the reasons for his/their disagreement. In such cases the recommendations of the ASRB would be placed before the President, ICAR along with the dissenting note.

Only one name would be communicated to the ICAR in respect of any one post. In case the recommendation of the ASRB is not accepted by the President, ICAR the post would be re-advertised.

5. Assessment:

The President, ICAR has set up a Committee to examine the present procedures adopted for assessment and promotion of scientists in the Research Management posts and to suggest revisions/improvement in procedures and in the assessment pro forma. The Committee has already submitted its report which is under consideration of the ICAR.

6. Representations and redressal mechanism:

Minister (A) desired that there would be some mechanism of review and redressal of representations with regard to ASRB selections and assessment. In cases where based on facts a *prima facie* case existed the President could ask for the review of the interview proceedings and/or discuss with Chairman, ASRB and Director-General, ICAR, and give his final decision. While agreeing to the need for redressal mechanism it was fully appreciated that once it is known that such a mechanism exists there would be a spate of representations on various counts both in respect of selections and assessments. It would, therefore, be necessary to take all possible steps to discourage such representations without of course denying the opportunity for appeal to the President of the ICAR Society in genuine cases.

APPENDIX X

INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH KRISHI BHAVAN: NEW DELHI

No. 8-6/80-Per. IV

Dated the 13th May, 1980

OFFICE ORDER

Under the provisions of By-law 24 of the ICAR Society, the President, ICAR has approved the composition of the Selection Committee as indicated below for conducting interview and making selections for scientific posts in Research Management Positions carrying the scale of pay of Rs. 2000—2500 and above:—

1. Chairman, A.S.R.B., New Delhi—*Chairman.*
2. Director-General, ICAR or his nominee—*Member.*
3. Two Advisers to be nominated by the President, ICAR—*Member.*
4. Two Advisers to be nominated by the Chairman, ASRB—*Member.*

The quorum for the meeting of the Selection Committee/Interview Board shall be four members including the Chairman.

Sd/-

(S. S. DHANOA),
Secretary, I.C.A.R.

Distribution:

1. Chairman, A.S.R.B., New Delhi.
 2. Secretary, A.S.R.B., New Delhi.
 3. P.S. to D.G., I.C.A.R.
 4. All D.D.G's.
 5. P.S. to Secretary, ICAR.
-

APPENDIX XI

Analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the 35th report of Estimates Committee (6th Lok Sabha)

I. Total number of recommendations	15
II. Recommendations which have been accepted by Government Nos. (3 to 7, 9 to 15)	
Number	12
Percentage of total	80%
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies :	
Number	Nil
Percentage of total	
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee (No. 1, 2 and 8) :	
Number	3
Percentage of total	20%
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited :	
Number	Nil
Percentage of total	