

FOURTH REPORT

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(2009-2010)**

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF CULTURE

(Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in Sixteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Culture - 'Maintenance of Monuments by Archaeological Survey of India')



Presented to Lok Sabha on 27th April, 2010

**Lok Sabha Secretariat
New Delhi**

April, 2010/ Vaisakha, 1932(S)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE(2009-2010)...	(iii)
INTRODUCTION.....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report.....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government.....	27
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies.....	46
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee.....	52
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited.....	67

APPENDICES

I. Minutes of Sitting of the Estimates Committee held on 30.03.2010.....	78
II. Analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Sixteenth Report of Estimates Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha).....	80

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES
(2009-2010)

Shri Francisco Sardinha – Chairman

MEMBERS

2	Smt. Harsimrat Kaur Badal
3	Shri Sanjay Singh Chauhan
4	Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury
5	Shri Bhakta Charan Das
6	Shri Milind Deora
7	Shri T.K.S. Elangovan
8	Dr. Sanjay Jaiswal
9	Shri Ramesh Jigajinagi
10	Shri P. Karunakaran
11	Shri Mohinder Singh Kaypee
12	Shri Chandrakant Khaire
13	Shri M. Krishnaswamy
14	Shri Vikrambhai Arjanbhai Madam
15	Smt. Raneer Narah
16	Shri Prabodh Panda
17	Shri Ravindra Kumar Pandey
18	Shri Kabindra Purkayastha
19	Shri C. Rajendran
20	Shri Jagdish Singh Rana
21	Shri K. Jaya Surya Prakash Reddy
22	Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
23	Shri S. Semmalai
24	Shri Madan Lal Sharma
25	Shri Brij Bhushan Sharan Singh
26	Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh
27	Shri Sushil Kumar Singh
28	Shri Lalji Tandon
29	Shri Manish Tewari
30	Shri K.C. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1.	Shri U.S. Saxena	-	Joint Secretary
2.	Shri Bhupesh Kumar	-	Director
3.	Smt. Juby Amar	-	Under Secretary
4.	Shri Amit Ankit	-	Executive Assistant

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Estimates Committee, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report of Estimates Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Culture – ‘Maintenance of monuments by Archaeological Survey of India.’

2. The Sixteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) was presented to Lok Sabha on 5th March, 2008. The Government furnished their replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in that Report on 1st December, 2008 and 12th January, 2009. The Draft Report was considered and adopted by the Estimates Committee (2009-2010) at their sitting held on 30th March, 2010.

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

- I. Report;
- II. Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government;
- III. Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Governments replies;
- IV. Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee; and
- V. Recommendations/Observations 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 Sixteenth Report of Estimates Committee (14th Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix II. It would be observed therefrom that out of 28 observations/recommendations made in the Report, 11 recommendations i.e. 39.29% have been accepted by Government and the Committee do not desire to pursue 3 recommendations i.e. 10.71% in view of Government’s reply. Replies of Government in respect of 8 recommendations i.e. 28.57% have not been accepted by the Committee and final replies in respect of 6 recommendations i.e. 21.43% are still awaited.

New Delhi;
April 23rd, 2010
Vaisakha 3, 1932 (Saka)

FRANCISCO SARDINHA
Chairman,
Committee on Estimates

CHAPTER - I

REPORT

1.1 This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Culture – ‘Maintenance of Monuments by Archaeological Survey of India’.

1.2 The Committee’s Sixteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) was presented to Lok Sabha on 5th March, 2008. It contained 28 observations/recommendations. Action Taken Notes on all these observations/recommendations have been received from the Ministry of Culture.

1.3 Replies to the observations and recommendations contained in the Report have broadly been categorized as under:-

- (i) Recommendations/observations which have been accepted by the Government
Sl. Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28
(Total 11, Chapter II)
- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government’s reply
Sl. No. 6, 13, 14
(Total 3, Chapter III)
- (iii) Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government’s replies have not been accepted by the Committee
Sl. Nos. 2, 8, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25 (Total 8, Chapter IV)
- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited.
Sl. Nos. 4, 10, 11, 12, 19, 22 (Total 6, Chapter V)

1.4 The Committee desire that the final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim reply has been given by the Government should be furnished to them expeditiously.

1.5 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of the recommendations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee.

Regular Reporting System

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para. No. 2)

1.6 On realizing the need to establish a close liaison between State Archaeology Departments and ASI, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee note that there is no institutional mechanism for State Archaeology Departments to keep the ASI apprised about the activities of State Archaeology Departments except periodical meetings with Secretaries of State Culture Departments. No regular reporting system is maintained. DG, ASI during oral evidence informed the Committee that there is an informal relation between State Archaeology Departments and the ASI. But the Committee is of the view that there should be a formal arrangement between ASI and State Archaeology Departments. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry of Culture should devise an institutional mechanism to be followed by ASI and State Archaeology Departments so that ASI can get the information regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments on regular basis. It is essential that regular reporting system should also be followed so that ASI is apprised of the activities of State Archaeology Departments.”

1.7 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“Archaeological sites and remains other than those declared by or under law made by Parliament to be of national Importance’ is a subject listed as Concurrent under the Seventh Schedule List III(Entry no. 40) of the Constitution of India. The ASI maintains and preserves centrally protected monuments in accordance with a central law viz. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (AM&ASR) Act, 1958 while the States have their own protection lists as per their respective legislations.

With regard to excavation and explorations, the AM&ASR Act, 1958 provides that 'No State Government shall undertake or authorize any person to undertake any excavation without the previous approval of the Central Government'. Co-ordination between the State Government and Central Government does become necessary as the ASI is the only agency to control excavation and exploration activities in the entire country.

In accordance with the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act 1972, certain types of antiquities are required to be registered for while Registering Officers have been appointed in various States of India. Apart from those working within the ASI, some of the Registering Officers are presently working under the State Archaeology Departments. ASI provides annual funding for meeting the salaries of these Registering Officers, who also report directly to ASI about their progress of work and send copies of the Registration Certificates for maintenance in the Data Bank of the ASI. Further, the movement of antiquities from one place to another can be done with the written permission of the Director General, ASI.

These existing mechanisms provide avenues to ASI for getting information regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments. However, the interaction is limited as the Ministry of Culture/ASI do not have any centrally sponsored or central sector schemes for assistance to State Archaeology Departments. Hence, the State Government's accountability to the Central Government is difficult to enforce. While a closer coordination between ASI and the State Archaeology Departments is required, working out its mechanism and modalities will need consultation with the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice."

1.8 Observing that there was no formal arrangement between ASI and State Archaeology Departments to keep ASI apprised of the activities of State Archaeology Departments, the Committee in their Report had recommended that the Ministry of Culture should devise an institutional mechanism so that ASI could get the information

regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments on regular basis.

The Committee note that the Ministry in their action taken reply have also admitted that under the existing mechanism State Government's accountability to Central Government is difficult to enforce and there is a need for closer coordination between ASI and State Archaeology Departments. However it was distressing to note that despite realizing the need for the same, the Ministry have expressed their unwillingness by stating "working out its mechanism and modalities will need consultation with the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice". The Committee express surprise as to why the Ministry of Culture have not initiated any expeditious action in this matter so far, when reports of untraceable monuments as well as illegal constructions/encroachments are prevalent. This indicates that the Ministry is not serious towards the importance of the Committee's recommendations. The Committee deprecate this tendency of the Ministry.

The Committee, therefore, while reiterating their earlier recommendation, strongly urge the Ministry of Culture to give due importance to this matter and evolve a suitable mechanism in consultation with Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice for establishing formal and regular mechanism for interaction between ASI and State Archaeology Departments. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Ministry in this regard.

Higher revenue generation

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para. No. 8)

1.9 Taking note of the fact that economic potential of monuments/heritage structures has not been realised either by ASI or by the Ministry of Culture, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee are perturbed to note that ASI could generate only Rs.43.59, Rs.52.89 and Rs.58.07 crore as revenue during the years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 respectively. It is too meager in comparison to the number of monuments. It seems ASI as well as Ministry of Culture are not making efforts to increase their revenue. The Committee are of the view that economic potential of this sector has not been realized either by ASI or by the Ministry of Culture. If monuments have something different in the manner of presentation of its history as well as its indoor activities, it will not only attract domestic tourists but will definitely attract international tourists. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry of Culture as well as ASI should take concrete steps for increasing their revenue by publicizing more effectively through electronic media or by organizing more cultural programmes, light and sound programme, puppet shows, screening documentaries, etc. at these sites with a lead taken by Ministry of Tourism and State Tourism Departments. In this way, two purposes will be served, revenue generation will be more and our invaluable culture will also get a boost.”

1.10 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows:-

“Regarding higher revenue generation as well as to give a boost to our invaluable heritage, all the ASI field offices have been directed to take concrete steps for increasing their revenue by publicizing more effectively through electronic media or by organizing cultural programmes, Sound and Light programmes, puppet shows,

screening documentaries, etc. at centrally protected monuments in consultation with the Ministry of Tourism and State Tourism Departments.”

1.11 In order to achieve higher revenue generation as well as to provide a boost to our invaluable heritage, the Committee in their Report had recommended that Ministry of Culture as well as ASI should take concrete steps to increase their revenue in consultation with the Ministry of Tourism and State Tourism Departments.

The Committee are however constrained to note that instead of taking any concrete action/step, Ministry of Culture have merely directed all the ASI field offices to take concrete steps in this regard. The Committee are of the view that instead of just directing the field offices, the Ministry should formulate a workable action plan, take necessary steps to implement the plan and then make a concerted effort through all field offices to actually reap the economic potential of monuments/heritage structures. Moreover, since the Committee were informed that ASI has formulated a proposal for creation of ‘Non-Lapsable fund’ for National Monuments of ASI by earmarking part of the income generated by sale of entry tickets for a separate fund for conservation & preservation as well as for development of tourist amenities in those monuments, it is even more imperative to augment the revenue generation, so that monuments and heritage structures could be made financially sustainable.

The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and urge the Ministry to take appropriate action in this regard. The

Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

A provision to be incorporated in AM & ASR, Act, 1958

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 15, Para. No. 15)

1.12 Noting that no provision exists in Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958, for consulting State Governments and other local bodies before declaring a monument existing in that State as centrally protected, the Committee had recommended as follows :-

“The Committee note that according to Section 4 of Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remain Act, 1958, whenever an ancient monument or archaeological site and remain is found worthy of central protection keeping in view its historical, archaeological and artistic importance, two months notice is issued through an official gazette notification expressing its intention to declare the monuments, archaeological site to be of national importance. Any private individual, State Governments, voluntary organizations having any objection, can file it. After disposing of all the objections, ASI declare the particular monument/archaeological site as a monument/site of national importance. The Committee note that in all this process, there is no role of State Government where the particular archaeological/monument site exists. Though DG, ASI during oral evidence admitted that ASI generally consult State Government before declaration of monument/site as a monument/site of national importance. But there is no such provision in the Act. Moreover DG, ASI himself agreed with the view of the Committee that it is better to consult the State Governments before a decision is taken to declare a monument as centrally protected. Cooperation of the State Governments should also be sought in acquisition of land for declaring a monument/archaeological site to be of national importance. Local bodies such as municipalities etc. may also be involved in the process. In view of this, the Committee recommend that a provision should be included in the Act accordingly and State Governments should invariably be consulted before taking a decision to declare a monument as centrally protected.”

1.13 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“All the field offices of the ASI have been directed to ensure that before initiating any action to declare a monument/site as of national importance, the State Department of Archaeology, District Administration of the respective State as well as the local Municipality of the area should also be consulted and their comments obtained thereon. “

1.14 The Committee appreciate that Ministry of Culture have directed all the field offices of ASI to consult the State Department of Archaeology, District administration as well as local municipality of the area before initiating any action to declare a monument/site as of national importance. They however regret to note that no action has been taken on their recommendation regarding making a provision in the Act for invariably consulting State Government before taking a decision to declare a monument centrally protected. Even the ‘Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 2010, which has been passed by the Parliament recently, is silent in this regard. While reiterating their earlier recommendation the Committee strongly recommend that the Ministry should take steps with due promptitude to incorporate a provision in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remain Act, 1958 accordingly, to make it a statutory obligation on the part of the ASI.

Use of latest technologies in exploration & excavation work

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Para. No. 16)

1.15 On realizing the need to employ modern and latest technologies in the field of exploration and excavation, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee appreciate that ASI has done a lot in the field of excavation and exploration. But there are still many sites which need to be explored. Exploration and excavation are very important to fill up the gap in the cultural sequence of Indian Archaeology, throwing more light on lesser-known cultures and protecting an area which is threatened by submergence owing to construction of dams, being destroyed or damaged due to absolutely necessary developmental works, natural calamities, etc. So the onus lies with the ASI and Ministry to take concrete steps in this direction. The Committee recommend that since it is a computer era, ASI should employ modern technologies such as GIS (Geographical Information System), GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar System) etc. for accurate documentation of site features and their quick analysis.

The Ministry should also review the methods or systems adopted by other countries for exploration and excavation work for bringing ASI's existing methodology for excavation and exploration at par with international standards.”

1.16 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows:-

“The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) tries to employ the latest techniques in exploration, excavation and documentation wherever possible. Since some of the sophisticated equipments such as the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) are

not with ASI, the department makes concrete efforts in the areas of scientific collaboration with institutions like Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Kanpur in this direction. IIT, Kanpur has also recently set up a Center for Archaeological Sciences and Technology (CAST) which will be equipped with all the latest technologies that can be employed in archaeology. Under this collaborative initiative, ASI and IIT, Kanpur have recently employed latest techniques like GPS, Total Station Survey, GPR Survey in the areas of site documentation and surface survey.”

1.17 The Committee appreciate that in collaboration of Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Kanpur, ASI have recently employed latest techniques like Global Positioning System (GPS), Total Station Survey, GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar System) Survey in the areas of site documentation and surface survey. The Committee, however, note with regret that the reply furnished by the Ministry is silent on their specific recommendation that the Ministry should review the methods or systems adopted by other countries for exploration and excavation work for bringing ASI’s existing methodology at par with international standards.

The Committee are of the view that only through the usage of ‘State-of-the-art’ technologies in the exploration & excavation work, cultural sequence of Indian Archaeology can be completed and lesser known areas/cultures with rich heritage could come to the forefront.

The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and urge the Ministry to undertake a comprehensive study of methods or systems adopted by different countries, who are scientifically advanced, for exploration & excavation work, so that a

qualitative improvement in ASI's existing methodology for exploration & excavation could be brought up.

Pending Excavation Reports

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 18, Para. No. 18)

1.18 On noting the pendency of so many excavation reports with ASI for a long period, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee are astonished to note that there are so many excavation reports pending for the last ten to fifteen years and even PMO has taken note of the lacuna. DG, ASI during oral evidence stated that the main problem for not submitting these reports is transfer or retirement of concerned officials. The Committee views this seriously and recommend that the official concerned with the excavation report should not be transferred during the period of preparing the report and a time frame for submitting the excavation reports should be fixed. On non-submission of report in the prescribed time, strict action should be taken against all concerned. The Committee also strongly recommend that the Ministry should take expeditious steps to get all pending reports completed and no fresh licence for excavation be considered in favour of the defaulter in the absence of previous excavation report. For completion of such reports services of retired officials can also be obtained. The Committee also desire that the steps taken in this regard and status of pending reports may be communicated to the Committee within 6 months after the presentation of the Report.

1.19 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“Out of the 56 pending reports with ASI, 23 excavation reports viz., (i) Udaigiri, (ii) Gudlyam, (iii) Hamri, (iv) Hathab, (v) Satdhara, (vi) Kanganhalli, (vii) Bekal Fort, (viii) Lachhura, (ix) Besnagar, (x) Lal Kot, (xi) Bhita, (xii) Mamallapuram, (xiii) Birchabilli Tila, (xiv) Ojiyana, (xv) Boxanagar, (xvi) Shyamsundar Tila, (xvii) Chandore, (xviii) Tamluk, (xix) Golbai Sasan, (xx) Thakurani Tila, (xxi) Khajuraho, (xxii) Dholavira (Part Report), (xxiii) Sravasti (Part Report) have been received. The report on Ayodhya is sub-judice.

The ASI has also effected necessary changes in the format for inviting future proposals for exploration and excavation, to incorporate specific clauses to prevent pendency in excavation reports in the future. All necessary facilities have been extended to both the in service and retired officers of ASI to complete the pending excavation reports. Further, the Universities, State Governments and other Research Institutions have been specifically instructed to clear their pendency in excavation reports.”

1.20 The Committee are distressed to note that out of 56 pending excavation reports only 23 have been received. Even after the lapse of nine months of the presentation of the report, 33 excavation reports are still pending.

The Committee also note that the Universities, State Governments and other Research Institutions have been instructed by Ministry to clear their pendency in excavation reports. The Committee are of the view that instead of just giving instructions to the Universities, State Governments and other Research Institutes, a time frame should be fixed for completing these excavation reports. Moreover, the Ministry are also silent on the view expressed by the Committee that no fresh licence for excavation be considered in favour of the defaulters.

The Committee while reiterating their earlier recommendation strongly urge that the Ministry should fix a time period for all the concerned Universities, State Governments, Research Institutes, to complete the pending excavation reports and licence for excavation should not be considered in favour of the defaulters. Status of the

remaining excavation reports may also be intimated to the Committee within six months of presentation of this report.

Strengthening of ASI's Watch & Ward Staff

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 20, Para. No. 20)

1.21 Taking note of the expenditure incurred by ASI on different security agencies, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee note that due to present phenomenon of terrorism it has become very necessary to provide stringent security to our national heritage. ASI is having a tremendous shortfall of monument attendants. An expert group on archaeology constituted in 1984 by the Government of India under the Chairmanship of Shri R.N. Mirdha, MP recommended that ASI should have atleast 9000 monument attendants to provide security to all important monuments in the country. But ASI has 4000 monument attendants. In order to cope with this shortfall, ASI which has engaged State Police, CISF, private security guards and temporary staff, is incurring a huge financial burden on this account. CISF alone is incurring Rs.9.25 crore expenditure per year on ASI. The Committee is not averse to engaging other security agencies for security of monuments but is of the opinion and recommend that instead of investing so much money on other agencies, ASI should strengthen its own watch & ward staff. It should give more stress on appointing its own monument attendants. Their watch & ward staff should be given training periodically in order to bring them at par with other national level security guards. They should be laced with new gadgets and scanners, CCTV should be installed at the sites of national importance and surprise checks should be conducted in order to ensure the promptness of security staff deputed there.

1.22 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“Regarding strengthening of ASI's watch & ward staff and giving them training in order to bring them at par with other national level security guards, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to furnish detailed proposals regarding implementation of this recommendations of the Estimates Committee.”

1.23 In their earlier report Committee had noted that ASI was short of 5000 monument attendants and to cope with the shortfall, ASI was engaging police, para military forces, private security guards, temporary staff and in turn spending funds to the tune of crores of rupees. To avoid huge expenditure on this account, the Committee had recommended for strengthening of ASI's watch & ward staff, appointing its own monument attendants and providing periodical training to them in order to bring them at par with other national level security guards.

From the action taken reply the Committee note that the Ministry of Culture have directed all the field offices of ASI to furnish detailed proposals regarding implementation of this recommendation. It is highly regrettable that even after a lapse of nine months, detailed proposals have not been furnished by the field offices of ASI and Ministry have thus not taken any concrete action in this regard.

The Committee take a serious note of the inaction on the part of the Ministry and desire that the Ministry of Culture should remind all the field offices of ASI to furnish their detailed proposals urgently. While reiterating their earlier recommendation, the Committee desire that the Ministry should take expeditious steps to augment and strengthen the watch & ward staff of the ASI. The Committee would like to emphasize that in this endeavour, ex-servicemen can also play a pivotal role, who are already trained and would require only additional orientation for the specific job. The Committee stress that necessary co-ordination may be there with the Ministry of Defence/ DG Resettlement in this regard.

The Committee also reiterate that watch & ward staff should be equipped with latest security gadgets and a training programme at par with other national level security agencies should be chalked out and implemented without further delay. Scanners and CCTVs should also be installed at the sites of national importance and surprise checks should be conducted to ensure the promptness of deputed security staff. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

Illegal construction/Encroachment

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 23, Para. No. 23)

1.24 Expressing concern over the illegal construction and encroachment taking place nearby the areas of monuments, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee take serious note of illegal construction/encroachment taking place near most of the historical monuments. Such encroachments/illegal constructions lend a bad view to the monuments and it also affects tourism potentiality of the monuments. Encroachment should be removed from the vicinity of heritage sites as it creates an adverse image in the mind of visitors. ASI should deal with this problem firmly. The Committee also note that in Delhi, a Committee was constituted and periodical evictions are carried out in Delhi. The Committee appreciate the action taken by ASI and Delhi Government and recommend that such type of Committees should be constituted in other States also for getting the encroachment in nearby areas of monuments evicted. The Committee are of the view that ASI should be vigilant so that encroachment does not take place. Once there is encroachment, it becomes very difficult to remove it. ASI is involved in legal actions for eviction, which is a very lengthy process. Therefore, the Committee suggest that Ministry should take stringent steps in this regard such as fencing of all the monuments, tightening the security, stringent punishment to guilty, fixing the responsibility of concerned authority to take care, so that no new case of illegal construction/encroachment occurs in near future. The Committee also note that under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments Act, no construction is allowed in the first 100 metres from the protected limits of a monument and they recommend that construction should not be allowed in the first 200 metres from the protected limit of a monument instead of 100 metres. Effective provisions should be incorporated in the Ancient Monuments Act to safeguard the monuments from encroachment. The provisions should include stringent punishment and eviction by law enforcing agencies in case of encroachment. The Committee also suggest that a Notice Board should be placed near the monuments

giving a warning to people that illegal construction and encroachment is not permitted nearby monuments and the guilty will be liable to stringent punishment.

1.25 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“As regards encroachments at centrally protected monuments, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to make all possible efforts under the provisions of AM&ASR Act 1958 and Rules 1959, to adhere to the recommendations of the Estimates Committee. SA’s of the Circles are being advised to be more vigilant to ensure prevention of encroachments within the centrally protected monuments. District Administration/Chief Secretary of the State have been addressed by DG/Secretary (Culture) to issue directions to the District/Revenue/Police authorities to provide police assistance to ASI as and when they are approached.”

1.26 In view of rampant encroachment and illegal construction prevailing near most of historical monuments, the Committee in their Report had recommended for formation of Committee as constituted in Delhi for carrying out periodical evictions, fencing of all the monuments, tightening the security, fixing the responsibility, not allowing any construction in the first 200 metres from the protected limit of a monument and making provisions in the Ancient monuments Act for stringent punishment and eviction by law enforcing agencies in case of encroachment.

The Committee note with satisfaction that in the ‘Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 2010, provision of stringent punishment has been incorporated for any construction in the prohibited area and also in the regulated area, if carried out without the prior permission of competent authority. The Committee also appreciate that detailed

provisions for prohibited area (100 metres from protected monument/area) as well as regulated area (200 metres from prohibited area) have been provided in the Bill. However, the Committee are constrained to note that in respect of other recommendations, Ministry of Culture have merely directed all the field offices of ASI to make all efforts under the provisions of AM&ASR Act, 1958 and Rule 1959 to adhere to the recommendations of Estimates Committee.

The Committee note with concern that the Ministry have taken no concrete action on their specific recommendation regarding constitution of Committee on the pattern of Delhi for carrying out periodical inspections.

The Committee further note with concern that even after the presentation of this report in which the Committee have suggested so many measures to curtail encroachment/illegal construction near the historical monuments, many cases of encroachment in and around the historical monuments are taking place and the same must be in the notice of the concerned authorities. This shows the Ministry's casual approach towards Committee's recommendations.

The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation and strongly urge the Ministry to implement the same in its entirety and apprise them of the action taken in this regard at the earliest.

Untraceable Monuments

Observation/Recommendation (Sl. No. 25, Para. No. 25)

1.27 Noting that a large number of Centrally protected monuments in the country were untraced, the Committee had recommended as follows:-

“The Committee are aggrieved to note that 35 centrally protected monuments/sites in the country are untraceable. The major causes for the disappearance of the ancient monuments and sites are rapid urbanization, construction of multistoried residential and commercial buildings, implementation of development projects, etc. The Committee was informed by ASI that as on date, it may not be possible to fix responsibility. The Committee view this as casual approach of ASI in this regard. It is highly deplorable on the part of ASI as well as Ministry of Culture that no expeditious steps have been taken to trace the centrally protected monuments. Only instructions were issued to circle offices to personally verify the status of such monuments/sites, falling under their respective jurisdiction. No other State except Delhi has bothered to sent a detailed report in this regard. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry should pursue vigorously with all the concerned circle offices to give detailed report within a specified time period and expeditious and concrete action should be initiated to trace out the missing monuments. The Ministry should also fix the responsibility in this regard. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry of Culture in consultation with other authorities should devise such a mechanism that before starting any new developmental work, it should be ascertained that in that particular area, there are no hidden remains.

1.28 The Ministry of Culture in their action taken reply stated as follows :-

“Regarding untraceable monuments, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to make all possible efforts to trace out the missing monuments, and furnish detailed report/action initiated in this regard immediately. A Committee under the Chairmanship of the Jt.D.G, ASI has also been constituted to look into the matter. The Committee has met twice to consider the information furnished by the Circles into account. In its last meeting held on 25.09.2008, it was

observed that three monuments reported as untraceable in Jammu & Kashmir and one monument in Karnataka have, in fact, got submerged in the reservoirs of dams. In respect of some monuments, which are reported to be damaged/destroyed because of development/urbanization, the Committee has to ascertain the facts. In regard to other untraceable monuments, the concerned Circles have been directed to locate the relevant documents in the Circle archives and make available the same to the Directorate General urgently.”

1.29 The Committee regret to note that the reply furnished by the Ministry is silent on their specific recommendation that they devise a mechanism in consultation with other authorities to ascertain that there are no hidden remains in a particular area before starting any new developmental work. The Committee would like to emphasize that unregulated developmental projects often lead to destruction of hidden remains of historic structures/ancient monuments particularly in those areas where there are possibilities of monumental structures etc. buried in the earth. The Committee note that the reply furnished by the Ministry is also silent about the recommendation of 'fixing the responsibility' in case of untraceable monuments. The Committee find it highly deplorable that the field offices of ASI as well as respective Circles have not been made accountable for this debacle. The Committee view this as casual approach on part of ASI & Ministry and completely deprecate this tendency.

The Committee would like to emphasize that since, out of 35 untraceable centrally protected monuments, twelve are in the National Capital (Delhi), the Ministry must understand the gravity of the problem and should take expeditious steps to fix the responsibility in this regard as well as ensure the non-occurrence of the same in future.

The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and expect that the Ministry would take appropriate action and also intimate about the same to the Committee within six months.

Implementation of Recommendations

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

1.31 The Committee desire that replies in respect of the recommendations contained in Chapter V of the Report may be finalized and the final replies of the Government furnished to the Committee without any delay.

CHAPTER II

Recommendations/observations which have been accepted by the Government

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1, Para No. 1)

The Committee took up the subject 'Maintenance of Monuments by ASI' for examination and had detailed interactions with the representatives of Ministry of Culture and ASI. The Committee note that ASI was set up in 1861 with the objectives of conserving and preserving the monuments of the country, taking up archeological excavations, epigraphical survey, maintenance of sites, museums and imparting training in archeology. ASI regulates all archaeological activities in the country as per the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958. It also implements Antiquities and Art Treasure Act, 1972. There are 24 Circles, 6 Excavation Branches, 2 Temple Survey Projects, 1 Building Survey Project, 1 Pre-history Branch, 1 Science Branch, 2 Epigraphy Branch and 1 Horticulture Branch through which ASI performs its functions. As on date ASI is maintaining 3667 monuments. After going into activities of ASI, the Committee are of the view that there is sufficient scope for improvement in several spheres of functioning of ASI in regard to maintenance of monuments and archaeological sites and remains of national importance. These aspects have been dealt with in detail by the Committee in the succeeding paragraphs.

Reply of the Government

Archaeological sites and remains other than those declared by or under law made by Parliament to be of national Importance' is a subject listed as Concurrent under the Seventh Schedule List III(Entry no. 40) of

the Constitution of India. The ASI maintains and preserves centrally protected monuments in accordance with a central law viz. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (AMASR) Act, 1958 while the State have their own protection lists as per their respective legislations.

With regard to excavation and explorations, the AMASR Act, 1958 provides that 'No State Government shall undertake or authorize any person to undertake any excavation without the previous approval of the Central Government'. Co-ordination between the State Government and Central Government does become necessary as the ASI is the only agency to control excavation and exploration activities in the entire country.

In accordance with the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act 1972, certain types of antiquities are required to be registered for while Registering Officers have been appointed in various States of India. Apart from those working within the ASI, some of the Registering Officers are presently working under the State Archaeology Departments. ASI provides annual funding for meeting the salaries of these Registering Officers, who also report directly to ASI about their progress of work and send copies of the Registration Certificates for maintenance in the Data Bank of the ASI. Further, the movement of antiquities from one place to another can be done with the written permission of the Director General, ASI.

These existing mechanisms provide avenues to ASI for getting information regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments. However, the interaction is limited as the Ministry of Culture/ASI do not have any centrally sponsored or central sector schemes for assistance to State Archaeology Departments. Hence, the State Government's accountability to the Central Government is difficult to enforce. While a closer coordination between ASI and the State Archaeology Departments is required, working out its mechanism and modalities will need consultation with the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1.12.2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para No. 3)

ASI operates Antiquities and Art Treasure Act, 1972 and Rules 1973. This Act provides (i) compulsory registration of notified categories of antiquities; (ii) regulating the export trade in antiquities and art treasures; (iii) prevention of smuggling and fraudulent dealings in antiquities; (iv) compulsory acquisition of antiquities and art treasures for preservation in public places; and (v) certain other matters connected therewith or incidental or ancillary thereof. The Committee note that in the present scenario, Antiquities and Art Treasure Act, 1972 is not being effectively implemented and has certain lacunae such as there is no provision for verification of registered antiquities, assessing the damage or loss on account of defacement, the movement of the antiquity in the country, its documentation, etc. The entire responsibility for investigating the theft or prevention of theft is that of the law enforcing agency.

The Committee note that Cabinet Note and Draft Bill are being finalized and therefore recommend that amendments should be proposed for strengthening the Act further with a view to effectively checking the illegal trade and smuggling of the antiquities and conferring greater powers on the enforcing authorities and making punishment deterrent by enhancing the limit of imprisonment on violation of the provisions of the Act. The Committee also recommend that local panchayats, patwaris and municipalities should also be involved in taking care of the heritage.

Reply of the Government

A mechanism for regulation of the movement of registered antiquities within the country and their documentation already exist in Sections 14 and 17 of the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act, 1972. The other concerns expressed by the Committee (proper verification of registered antiquities, assessment of the damage/loss on account of defacement etc., and

deterrence of illegal trade and smuggling) have been addressed in the amendments proposed to the AAT Act. However, the proposed amendments have now been seen to require revision to take into account the global scenario in respect of trade in antiquities. This exercise has been undertaken.

Under the cultural awareness programmes implemented by the ASI, local authorities, general public, school/college students are involved, and adequate publicity is given through print and other media. Brochures and booklets highlighting the implementation of the protection and preservation of heritage are freely distributed on the occasions of World Heritage Day, World Heritage Week, Museums day, Republic Day and Independence Day.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5, Para No. 5)

The Committee note that a project on National Mission on Monument and Antiquities has been prepared and launched for a period of five years i.e. 2007-2012 with the objective to prepare National Register and set up State level data base of Built Heritage sites and antiquities; promote awareness programme concerning the benefits of preserving built heritage sites and antiquities; extend training facility and capacity building to the concerned State Departments, local bodies, NGO's, universities, etc. help in developing synergy between institutions like ASI, State Governments, concerned institutions and NGO's for ensuring close interaction. The Committee desire that Ministry of Culture should plan the project properly and ensure strict compliance in the fixed term of five years i.e. 2007-2012.

The Committee further recommend that personnel who are to be hired for the Mission should be professional and should have sufficient experience in archaeology. These personnel can also be retired efficient personnel of ASI.

Reply of the Government

The National Mission on Monuments and Antiquities has devised detailed plans for successful implementation of its mandate within the stipulated time frame of five years i.e. 2007-2012.

The technical staff presently working with the National Mission on Monuments and Antiquities are well qualified professional archaeologists from Archaeological Survey of India having sufficient knowledge and experience in their respective fields. Besides, qualified archaeologists outside the ambit of Archaeological Survey of India are also engaged to collect and process the data that are being collected by the National

Mission on Monuments and Antiquities. Further the National Mission also plans to engage qualified archaeologists on contractual basis.

Keeping in view the need for effective implementation of the mandate of the National Mission on Monuments and Antiquities at the State level, a State Level Implementation Committee (SLIC) is being formed in all States/UTs with members from ASI and State Department of Archaeology and Museums, professional archaeologists, historians etc. Secretary(Culture) of the respective State will function as the Chairman of the Committee. So far SLICs have been formed in 18 States. The nominated professionals, both by respective State Governments and Government of India, include retired archaeologists from Archaeological Survey of India, retired archaeologists from concerned State departments, archaeologists and historians from Universities, research organizations etc.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 7)

India is an active member of World Heritage from 1977. UNESCO has declared 27 sites as World Heritage Sites in India. UNESCO provide no direct financial support to these world heritage sites, though it helps ASI in the form of capacity building i.e. for training. It provides a marginal financial support only to a site which is declared as a World Heritage Site in danger. During evidence the Committee were informed that a special provision is made in the budget allocation of ASI for World Heritage Sites. The Committee note that there are two world heritage sites in danger in India namely Hampi in Karnataka and Manas in Assam and only limited funds are available under the UNESCO for these sites. The Committee are of the view that protection of these sites which are of exceptional interest and universal value is the concern of the nation and therefore recommend that sufficient budget allocation should be made in ASI budget and all efforts should be made to invite national and international organisations for providing financial support for the protection/conservation of World Heritage Sites at Hampi and Manas.

Reply of the Government

The total allotment under Special Repairs(Plan) for the year 2008-2009 for Hampi World Heritage Site is Rs.65 Lakhs and allotment and expenditure for the last three years are as under:-

Year	Budget Allotted	Expenditure
2005-06	90,94,121	90,94,121
2006-07	96,53,167	96,53,167
2007-08	1,52,68,807	1,52,68,807
Land Acquisition in 2007-08 under head Capital Outlay	6,72,74,690	

The Hampi Foundation has entered into MoU with Karnataka State Government for restoration of Chandramouleshwara temple, a State protected monument at Anegondi. The work is in progress.

Hampi Foundation has entered into MoU with ASI and National Culture Fund for taking up restoration of Krishna Temple, Hampi, a centrally protected monument. Work is yet to commence.

ASI has entered into MoU with Janssen Pharmaceutica, Belgium in 2005 for studying bio-deterioration of monuments at Hampi and Dariya Daulat Bagh, Srirangapatna. After collecting the samples, the Janssen Pharmaceutica has supplied chemical formulation for testing. The Chemistry Branch, ASI, Mysore is carrying out the testing.

The details of financial assistance received from UNESCO from 2004-05 to 2007-08 are given below:-

Sl.No.	Year	Amount Allotted	Head of Account
1.	2004-05	12,16,770	OE(NP)
2.	2005-06	6,82,224	8443 Civil Deposit
3.	2006-07	3,25,000	Advt. & Pub.(Plan)
4.	2007-08	7,35,975	8443 Civil Deposit

Manas

UNESCO provided some funding support to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in the 1990s for improvement of infrastructure. Details of funds provided are not available in the Ministry of Environment and Forests as UNESCO directly provided the funds to the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary/State Government.

The budget allocation for Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in the last three years by the Ministry of Environment & Forest under the scheme of Project Tiger is as follows:

Sl.No.	Year	Release (Rupees in lakhs)
1.	2005-06	80.00
2.	2006-07	30.00
3.	2007-08	60.00

As per the information available with Ministry of Environment & Forest, no other financial support has been provided to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in the past except by UNESCO and Government of India as indicated above. However, a UNESCO funded project covering four National Heritage Sites namely Kaziranga National Park & Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Assam, Keoladev National Park in Rajasthan and Nanda Devi National Park in Uttarakhand, has been launched on 25.7.2007. The total budget for the project is only US \$ 1.829 million out of which about US\$ 874080 (60% of the total budget) is earmarked for Manas and Kaziranga National Parks in Assam in the ratio of 60 and 40 percent respectively.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Para No. 9)

The Committee note that all the revenue earned by ASI is remitted to the Consolidated Fund of India and ASI do not get any share of this revenue. The Committee were informed that ASI has formulated a proposal for creation of "Non-Lapsable fund for National Monuments of ASI by earmarking part of the income generated by sale of entry tickets for a separate fund for conservation and preservation as well as for development of tourist amenities in those monuments. Moreover, the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission has also agreed in principle with the proposal.

The Committee are of the view that if ASI gets some percentage from the revenue, definitely they will make earnest efforts to increase their revenue. Moreover, they will spend it on maintaining the monuments, which will automatically curtail ASI's budget. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter should be pursued vigorously at the highest level with the Ministry of Finance with a request that a part of the ticketed revenue should accrue to ASI.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry of Culture has been pursuing with the Ministry of Finance for creation of a non-lapsable fund that will permit ASI to plough back the revenue generated by the ASI through entrance fee levied on visitors to centrally protected monuments and to use the same for the maintenance of the monuments.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 17, Para No. 17)

The Committee feel that there is a great need to update the old maps. It is very distressing to note that neither ASI nor Ministry of Culture has felt the need to update the maps which are 20 to 30 year old. As every year, many sites are excavated and explored, it has become imperative to update the old maps. The Committee also note that a scheme was started to have an Atlas of 50 years in which the situation of India, at a given point of time, was to be depicted. But it could not materialize. The Committee recommend that for carrying out updation of maps of ASI, Ministry should fix a time limit and earnest efforts should be made to start the scheme to have an Atlas of 50 years and ensure its earliest completion.

Reply of the Government

The Government of India has recently launched the National Mission for Monuments and Antiquities. One of the aims of this Mission is to create thematic maps of various periods and cultures.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 21, Para No. 21)

The Committee note that museums play a pivotal role in representing the history as small and movable antiquities recovered from ancient sites are kept here with the remains to which they belong so that they may be studied amid their natural surroundings. ASI is maintaining 41 site museums and is initiating steps for upgradation/modernization of the selected site museums in a phased manner. ASI in collaboration with the National Museum of India has empanelled architects and designers after inviting applications through Expression of Interest and due screening. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should provide sufficient funds to enable ASI to upgrade/modernize the site museums as they are an integral part of monuments. ASI should take expeditious efforts to upgrade and modernize all site museums in collaboration with National Museum of India in time bound manner to attract more visitors/tourists.

The brochures/pamphlets are distributed free of cost to the visitors. The Committee note that very few copies of brochures/pamphlets are being distributed to visitors. The level of cultural consciousness in India has risen tremendously and common man wants to know more about the history. Therefore, the Committee recommend that adequate copies of literature in the form of brochures/pamphlets and guide books should be made available at these museums to keep the visitors apprised of the relevant facts of antiquities, etc.

Reply of the Government

The Archaeological Survey of India has taken up holistic upgradation and modernization of the museums under its control in a phased manner. The following museums have been identified for phased upgradation and modernization during the current fiscal year 2008-09.

Archaeological Museums at Red Fort (Mumtaj Mahal), Delhi

The conservation work of the selected colonial building No.B-1 identified for shifting the Archaeological Museum Red Fort is in progress.

Indian War Memorial Museum, Red Fort, Delhi

The conservation work of the selected colonial building No.B-2 identified for shifting the Indian War Memorial Museum, Red Fort is in progress.

Archaeological Museum, Kamlapur Hampi

The modernization/upgradation is undertaken in the said museum such as the ramp for physically handicapped, toilets are improved at the level of international standard and museum shops etc.

Archaeological Museum, Nagarjunakonda (A.P)

The work pertaining improvement of lighting in the display system and electrification work, improvement of cafeteria, construction of new reserve collection storage for antiquities are being taken up in the Archaeological Museum at Nagarjunakonda.

Distribution of brochures/pamphlets to the visitors and sale of guide books at monuments/museums is arranged on the sale counters by the respective Circles.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 24, Para No. 24)

The Committee are perturbed to note that only 14 cases out of 44 cases of the theft of idols, statues which have been reported are solved during last five years. The Committee note that ASI has huge shortage of monument attendants. To cope with this shortage, ASI has deployed private security guards, CISF and local police at centrally protected monuments, archaeological sites and museums. To keep a check on theft and smuggling, an Act was brought into force (Antiquities and Treasures Act, 1972) but this Act has many lacunae and amendments are required to be proposed in this regard to make it more stringent. A Draft Bill has been finalized. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Culture should take concrete steps to get the Act amended to curb the cases of rampant theft and smuggling and provision for stringent punishment for the culprit be included in the amending Bill.

The Committee are also of the view that as in India we have a very powerful Panchayati Raj system, the Ministry should avail benefit of it. The Ministry should devise such a mechanism in which Gram Panchayat, Patwaris, etc. could be involved to take care of heritage, in the process of checking illicit trafficking of antiquities, etc. The Committee recommend that Ministry of Culture should also take immediate steps to get back the idols, statues recovered by police or security agencies in their possession.

Reply of the Government

A mechanism for regulation of the movement of registered antiquities within the country and their documentation already exist in Sections 14 and 17 of the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act, 1972.

The other concerns expressed by the Committee (proper verification of registered antiquities, assessment of the damage/loss on account of defacement etc., and deterrence of illegal trade and smuggling) have been addressed in the amendments proposed to the AAT Act. However, the proposed amendments have now been seen to require revision to take into account the global scenario in respect of trade in antiquities. This exercise has been undertaken.

The ASI involves local authorities, general public, school/college students by giving adequate publicity through print and other media. Brochures and booklets highlighting the implementation of the protection and preservation of heritage are freely distributed on the occasions of World Heritage Day, World Heritage Week, Museums day, Republic day and Independence day.

As per the law the property recovered by the law enforcing agencies remain in their custody till such time the relevant case is disposed off by the Court of Law, hence the delay. However, as and when the litigations are concluded as per the directions of the Hon'ble Court stolen properties are taken into possession by the ASI.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 26, Para No. 26)

The Committee note that India's rich culture and historic heritage is embodied in its ancient monuments and this priceless heritage is being preserved with limited resources. It is neither wise nor prudent to get ASI alone to shoulder the responsibility of conservation, excavation of all the monuments and they therefore strongly recommend that the Ministry of Culture and ASI should make all sincere efforts to bring public and private sectors to come forward to perform their rightful role in promoting and preserving India's cultural heritage. ASI should periodically bring out a publication detailing the monuments where such projects can be taken up. The Committee are also informed that in order to facilitate the infusion of private and public sector funds into the field of heritage presentation, National culture fund was established in 1996. The Committee recommend that modalities of NCF should be discussed with FICCI, CII and other corporate houses. Benefits of the contribution made in NCF for promotion of public private partnership and salient features of MOU i.e. NCF will be accountable to each donor in respect of funds donated and donors can appoint and monitor the executive agencies etc. should invariably be advertised. The Committee are also of the opinion that public/private partnership should be accepted and availed without any undue benefits for private partners..

Reply of the Government

A publication on ASI & NCF has been printed in English. Its Hindi version is in the Press. To invite participation under the NCF, ASI has listed 100 selected monuments in this publication. However, the list of 100 monuments is not exclusive and a donor could select any monument which is protected by the Archaeological Survey of India for funding a project

through the NCF. The publication also gives details about the NCF Scheme.

ASI is in consultation with the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) right from 2006. In 2007, ASI formally informed FICCI about the possibility of public-private partnership and the need for attracting more corporate bodies to partner with National Culture Fund (NCF) in heritage conservation. ASI has also supplied them the list of monuments identified by ASI for public-private partnership.

Similarly, Confederation of Indian Industries (CII) has also set up a task force on public-private partnership in management of public utilities in and around monuments (listed by the ASI) under the aegis of CII National Committee on Tourism and Heritage and invited ASI to join the task force.

Director General, ASI has also invited corporate bodies to enter into a MoU with the Archaeological Survey of India for financing conservation of monuments and/or for creation of visitor facilities. Besides, DG, ASI has also written to the Presidents of CII on 29.5.2007 and the Associated Chamber of Commerce and Industry of India (ASSOCHAM).

No undue benefits are given to private partners. However, any project covered under the NCF is entitled to the following:

- 100% tax rebate under Section 80G of the Income Tax Act.
- Due acknowledgement of the contributions at the monument site and also in the publications of the ASI.
- The donor can choose a variety of activities for financing.
- Flexibility in project management through a mutually agreed MoU.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 27&28, Para No. 27&28)

The Committee note that most of the monuments do not have basic tourist facilities/amenities like drinking water, toilet, kiosks etc. Even they do not have the proper approach road connecting the monument to the nearest airport/railway station. The Committee are also constrained to note that even after the lapse of many decades, Ministry is still planning to give instructions to its officers to prepare plans for providing such amenities. The Committee deprecate the attitude of the Ministry/ASI and very strongly recommend that they should make available to visitors all the basic facilities like drinking water, toilets, kiosks approach pathways, signage's, ramps for disabled persons, visitor benches etc. Ministry of Culture and ASI should approach and co-ordinate with respective State Governments, tourism Departments and local Governments. The Ministry of Culture/ASI should also give incentives to the private sector to construct hotels etc near the monument in order to attract more and more tourists/visitors.

The Committee note that follow up action on complaints/suggestions received at the circle offices as well as headquarters of ASI and recorded in the visitors/suggestion book is taken by ASI. The Committee recommend that redressal system should further be strengthened and visitors suggestions book/complaint box should be kept at all historical monuments of national importance. One higher official should be made responsible for attending and taking the remedial steps on the complaints/suggestions received from the visitors of monuments under his circle/branch.

Reply of the Government (27&28)

The field offices of the ASI have been directed to make all efforts for providing basic tourist amenities i.e. drinking water, toilets, approach pathways, signages, ramps for disabled persons, visitor benches, etc. at centrally protected monuments. They have also been asked to ensure that visitor suggestion book/complaint box are provided at all the centrally protected monuments. All SA(s) have also been requested to either check the visitors/complaint book personally or through their authorized representatives at regular intervals and authenticate the entries made therein.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

CHAPTER III

Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para No. 6)

The Committee note that the Ministry have tentatively estimated in the context of preparation of the Eleventh Five Year Plan proposals that the annual allocation for conservation of all monuments should be Rs.300 crores. The estimation was not vetted technically before its projection. The reasons put forth in support of the estimation was that Rs.100 crore are being spent on 1000 monuments so the estimation for 3667 monuments was Rs.300 crore. The Committee consider this projection hypothetical and abysmally low because the cost of maintenance of monument will definitely vary depending on the size and condition of the monument and therefore recommend that Ministry should ensure that the estimates of projects are based on realistic assessment of requirement of funds and all technical aspects should be considered before projection of estimates. A separate fund should be allocated for excavation work.

Reply of the Government

The funds are requisitioned on the basis of requirement of conservation, preservation, restoration and maintenance work to be taken up as well as the capacity of the Circle offices to undertake the works. The conservation work of the monuments is a complicated process which cannot be assessed only by the quantum of the money spent as sometimes a policy of least intervention in the protected structure may be more appropriate as per international guidelines to maintain the authenticity and integrity of the monument. The future requirements of funds are projected on the basis of utilization of allocated funds and availability of other resources. As the conservation work of the monuments is a continuous

process with much inherent uncertainty, it is difficult to give definite estimates. Separate funds are allocated for excavation works.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, Para No. 13)

The Committee note that there are various institutes like National Museum Institute, training institute in the archives, institute of archaeology. The review Committee headed by RN Mirdha, MP have suggested that it may grow as the seat of higher learning and research, it may be upgraded as National Institute of Archaeology and art history with the status of a deemed university with five major schools of Indian Archaeology, World Archaeology, History of Art, Conservation and Heritage Management and Archaeological Science. The Committee are also of the opinion and have recommended that Ministry of Culture should take all sincere efforts to take a decision to declare it National Institute of Archaeology and Art History.

As regards in-take of students, the Committee are informed that at present 300 students have applied but after written test and interview only 15 students are taken. The Committee are of the view that number of seats in the institute should be increased and recommend that the curriculum should be made more attractive, job oriented so as to compete with international standard so that bright students get themselves enrolled to study archaeology and subsequently get an avenue to serve and in turn ASI and State Archaeology Departments may also get trained personnel.

Reply of the Government

The Archaeological Survey of India proposes to develop a new campus of the Institute of Archaeology at Greater Noida, where 25 acres of land had been acquired some years back. The work for the preparation of master plan for the new campus has been assigned to Educational Consultants India Ltd. (a Govt. of India Enterprise), Noida. The work is in progress. The number of seats for admission to the Post Graduate Diploma will be increased once the required infrastructure is in place.

However for the present, upto two in-service officials sponsored by a State Government/Museum, who qualify in the entrance test are admitted to the Post Graduate Diploma Course in addition to fifteen students. We already have a National Institute of Museology, Art History and Conservation, already declared a deemed university. As such there may be no need to set up a similar institute.

An institutional mechanism has been introduced to review the curriculum through a Board of Studies comprising eminent professionals – educationists/ academicians drawn from different disciplines such as archaeology, conservation, museology, art & iconography, architecture, etc. In the meeting of the Board of Studies for the Department of Archaeology held on 27.06.2008, the Papers/Courses were reviewed and updated (Paper 1-Principles and Methods of Archaeology; Paper II Application of Science in Archaeology; Paper III Prehistoric Archaeology; Paper IV Protohistoric Archaeology).

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 14, Para No. 14)

Conservation and Preservation is the prime task of ASI and the policy of conservation should primarily be aimed at ensuring structural stability of the monuments without affecting any change in original features of monuments. The Committee note that ASI is giving emphasis on just renovating the monuments rather than conserving and preserving the monuments with original characteristics and they are of the view that ASI should not betray the nation by tampering with the monuments of national importance. ASI should not do just cosmetic work. By this, the very purpose of constituting ASI will be defeated. The Committee, therefore, recommend that ASI with the collaboration of other Ministries, agencies, institutes, etc. should devise new methods/techniques for conserving and preserving the monuments without losing their originality. ASI should also seek advice of experts of international agencies in this regard. The Committee find that ASI takes a considerable amount of time to repair and renovate a monument. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a definite time frame should be fixed for conservation and preservation of monuments.

Reply of the Government

Every care is taken to maintain authenticity and integrity of the monuments while undertaking repairs. As a policy, emphasis is not given on the renovation of the monuments. The thrust of the conservation work is to ensure the structural stability of the monuments. To achieve this, sometimes restoration work becomes essential which is attended to after proper documentation of the existing fabric and on the basis of known facts and not on any conjecture. No cosmetic work is undertaken for the monuments as in the majority of cases finishes are not applied while doing the conservation work. Wherever necessary advice is sought from other Governmental institutions like Central Building Research Institute, Survey

of India, Geological Survey of India, Indian Institute of Technology, National Institute of Technology, Structural Engineering Research Centre etc. as well as from international experts. Conservation work of monuments is a slow and continuous process as it involves proper research, documentation, location of appropriate skilled workers, materials etc. Hence it is difficult to fix a definite time frame for accomplishment of the task.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

CHAPTER IV

Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para No. 2)

The Committee note that there is no institutional mechanism for State Archaeology Departments to keep the ASI apprised about the activities of State Archaeology Departments except periodical meetings with Secretaries of State Culture Departments. No regular reporting system is maintained. DG, ASI during oral evidence informed the Committee that there is an informal relation between State Archaeology Departments and the ASI. But the Committee are of the view that there should be a formal arrangement between ASI and State Archaeology Departments. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry of Culture should devise an institutional mechanism to be followed by ASI and State Archaeology Departments so that ASI can get the information regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments on regular basis. It is essential that regular reporting system should also be followed so that ASI is apprised of the activities of State Archaeology Departments.

Reply of the Government

Archaeological sites and remains other than those declared by or under law made by Parliament to be of national Importance' is a subject listed as Concurrent under the Seventh Schedule List III(Entry no. 40) of the Constitution of India. The ASI maintains and preserves centrally protected monuments in accordance with a central law viz. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (AMASR) Act, 1958 while the State have their own protection lists as per their respective legislations.

With regard to excavation and explorations, the AMASR Act, 1958 provides that 'No State Government shall undertake or authorize any person to undertake any excavation without the previous approval of the Central Government'. Co-ordination between the State Government and Central Government does become necessary as the ASI is the only agency to control excavation and exploration activities in the entire country.

In accordance with the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act 1972, certain types of antiquities are required to be registered for while Registering Officers have been appointed in various States of India. Apart from those working within the ASI, some of the Registering Officers are presently working under the State Archaeology Departments. ASI provides annual funding for meeting the salaries of these Registering Officers, who also report directly to ASI about their progress of work and send copies of the Registration Certificates for maintenance in the Data Bank of the ASI. Further, the movement of antiquities from one place to another can be done with the written permission of the Director General, ASI.

These existing mechanisms provide avenues to ASI for getting information regarding the activities of State Archaeology Departments. However, the interaction is limited as the Ministry of Culture/ASI do not have any centrally sponsored or central sector schemes for assistance to State Archaeology Departments. Hence, the State Government's accountability to the Central Government is difficult to enforce. While a closer coordination between ASI and the State Archaeology Departments is required, working out its mechanism and modalities will need consultation with the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para. No. 8)

The Committee are perturbed to note that ASI could generate only Rs.43.59, Rs.52.89 and Rs.58.07 crore as revenue during the years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 respectively. It is too meager in comparison to the number of monuments. It seems ASI as well as Ministry of Culture are not making efforts to increase their revenue. The Committee are of the view that economic potential of this sector has not been realized either by ASI or by the Ministry of Culture. If monuments have something different in the manner of presentation of its history as well as its indoor activities, it will not only attract domestic tourists but will definitely attract international tourists. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry of Culture as well as ASI should take concrete steps for increasing their revenue by publicizing more effectively through electronic media or by organizing more cultural programmes, light and sound programme, puppet shows, screening documentaries, etc. at these sites with a lead taken by Ministry of Tourism and State Tourism Departments. In this way, two purposes will be served, revenue generation will be more and our invaluable culture will also get a boost.

Reply of the Government

Regarding higher revenue generation as well as to give a boost to our invaluable heritage, all the ASI field offices have been directed to take concrete steps for increasing their revenue by publicizing more effectively through electronic media or by organizing cultural programmes, Sound and Light programmes, puppet shows, screening documentaries, etc. at centrally protected monuments in consultation with the Ministry of Tourism and State Tourism Departments.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 15, Para No. 15)

The Committee note that according to Section 4 of Ancient Monuments and Archaeology Sites and Remains Act, 1958, whenever an ancient monument or archaeological site and remain is found worthy of central protection keeping in view its historical, archaeological and artistic importance, two months notice is issued through an official gazette notification expressing its intention to declare the monuments, archaeological site to be of national importance. Any private individual, State Governments, voluntary organizations having any objection, can file it. After disposing of all the objections, ASI declare the particular monument/archaeological site as a monument/site of national importance. The Committee note that in all this process, there is no role of State Government where the particular archaeological/monument site exists. Though DG, ASI during oral evidence admitted that ASI generally consult State Government before declaration of monument/site as a monument/site of national importance. But there is no such provision in the Act. Moreover DG, ASI himself agreed with the view of the Committee that it is better to consult the State Governments before a decision is taken to declare a monument as centrally protected. Cooperation of the State Governments should also be sought in acquisition of land for declaring a monument/archaeological site to be of national importance. Local bodies such as municipalities etc. may also be involved in the process. In view of this, the Committee recommend that a provision should be included in the Act accordingly and State Governments should invariably be consulted before taking a decision to declare a monument as centrally protected.

Reply of the Government

All the field offices of the ASI have been directed to ensure that before initiating any action to declare a monument/site as of national importance, the State Department of Archaeology, District Administration of the respective State as well as the local Municipality of the area should also be consulted and their comments obtained thereon.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Para No. 16)

The Committee appreciate that ASI has done a lot in the field of excavation and exploration. But there are still many sites which need to be explored. Exploration and excavation are very important to fill up the gap in the cultural sequence of Indian Archaeology, throwing more light on lesser-known cultures and protecting an area which is threatened by submergence owing to construction of dams, being destroyed or damaged due to absolutely necessary developmental works, natural calamities, etc. So the onus lies with the ASI and Ministry to take concrete steps in this direction. The Committee recommend that since it is a computer era, ASI should employ modern technologies such as GIS (Geographical Information System), GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar System) etc. for accurate documentation of site features and their quick analysis.

The Ministry should also review the methods or systems adopted by other countries for exploration and excavation work for bringing ASI's existing methodology for excavation and exploration at par with international standards.

Reply of the Government

The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) tries to employ the latest techniques in exploration, excavation and documentation wherever possible. Since some of the sophisticated equipments such as the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) are not with ASI, the department makes concrete efforts in the areas of scientific collaboration with institutions like Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Kanpur in this direction. IIT, Kanpur has also recently set up a Center for Archaeological Sciences and Technology (CAST) which will be equipped with all the latest technologies that can be employed in archaeology. Under this collaborative initiative, ASI and IIT, Kanpur have recently employed latest techniques like GPS, Total Station

Survey, GPR Survey in the areas of site documentation and surface survey.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 18, Para No. 18)

The Committee are astonished to note that there are so many excavation reports pending for the last ten to fifteen years and even PMO has taken note of the lacuna. DG, ASI during oral evidence stated that the main problem for not submitting these reports is transfer or retirement of concerned officials. The Committee views this seriously and recommend that the official concerned with the excavation report should not be transferred during the period of preparing the report and a time frame for submitting the excavation reports should be fixed. On non-submission of report in the prescribed time, strict action should be taken against all concerned. The Committee also strongly recommend that the Ministry should take expeditious steps to get all pending reports completed and no fresh licence for excavation be considered in favour of the defaulter in the absence of previous excavation report. For completion of such reports services of retired officials can also be obtained. The Committee also desire that the steps taken in this regard and status of pending reports may be communicated to the Committee within 6 months after the presentation of the Report.

Reply of the Government

Out of the 56 pending reports with ASI, 23 excavation reports viz., (i) Udaigiri, (ii) Gudiyam, (iii) Hamri, (iv) Hathab,(v) Satdhara, (vi) Kanganhalli, (vii) Bekal Fort, (viii) Lachhura, (ix) Besnagar, (x) Lal Kot, (xi) Bhita, (xii) Mamallapuram, (xiii) Birchabilli Tila, (xiv) Ojiyana, (xv) Boxanagar, (xvi) Shyamsundar Tila, (xvii) Chandore, (xviii) Tamluk, (xix) Golbai Sasan, (xx) Thakurani Tila, (xxi) Khajuraho, (xxii) Dholavira (Part Report), (xxiii) Sravasti (Part Report) have been received. The report on Ayodhya is *sub-judice*.

The ASI has also effected necessary changes in the format for inviting future proposals for exploration and excavation, to incorporate specific clauses to prevent pendency in excavation reports in the future. All necessary facilities have been extended to both the in service and retired officers of ASI to complete the pending excavation reports. Further, the Universities, State Governments and other Research Institutions have been specifically instructed to clear their pendency in excavation reports.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 20, Para No. 20)

The Committee note that due to present phenomenon of terrorism it has become very necessary to provide stringent security to our national heritage. ASI is having a tremendous shortfall of monument attendants. An expert group on archaeology constituted in 1984 by the Government of India under the Chairmanship of Shri R.N. Mirdha, MP recommended that ASI should have atleast 9000 monument attendants to provide security to all important monuments in the country. But ASI has 4000 monument attendants. In order to cope with this shortfall, ASI which has engaged State Police, CISF, private security guards and temporary staff, is incurring a huge financial burden on this account. CISF alone is incurring Rs.9.25 crore expenditure per year on ASI. The Committee is not averse to engaging other security agencies for security of monuments but is of the opinion and recommend that instead of investing so much money on other agencies, ASI should strengthen its own watch and ward staff. It should give more stress on appointing its own monument attendants. Their watch and ward staff should be given training periodically in order to bring them at par with other national level security guards. They should be laced with new gadgets and scanners, CCTV should be installed at the sites of national importance and surprise checks should be conducted in order to ensure the promptness of security staff deputed there.

Reply of the Government

Regarding strengthening of ASI's watch & ward staff and giving them training in order to bring them at par with other national level security guards, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to furnish detailed proposals regarding implementation of this recommendations of the Estimates Committee.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 23, Para No. 23)

The Committee take serious note of illegal construction/encroachment taking place near most of the historical monuments. Such encroachments/illegal constructions lend a bad view to the monuments and it also affects tourism potentiality of the monuments. Encroachment should be removed from the vicinity of heritage sites as it creates an adverse image in the mind of visitors. ASI should deal with this problem firmly. The Committee also note that in Delhi, a Committee was constituted and periodical evictions are carried out in Delhi. The Committee appreciate the action taken by ASI and Delhi Government and recommend that such type of Committees should be constituted in other States also for getting the encroachment in nearby areas of monuments evicted. The Committee are of the view that ASI should be vigilant so that encroachment does not take place. Once there is encroachment, it becomes very difficult to remove it. ASI is involved in legal actions for eviction, which is a very lengthy process. Therefore, the Committee suggest that Ministry should take stringent steps in this regard such as fencing of all the monuments, tightening the security, stringent punishment to guilty, fixing the responsibility of concerned authority to take care, so that no new case of illegal construction/encroachment occurs in near future.

The Committee also note that under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments Act, no construction is allowed in the first 100 metres from the protected limits of a monument and they recommend that construction should not be allowed in the first 200 metres from the protected limit of a monument instead of 100 metres. Effective provisions should be incorporated in the Ancient Monuments Act to safeguard the monuments from encroachment. The provisions should include stringent punishment

and eviction by law enforcing agencies in case of encroachment. The Committee also suggest that a Notice Board should be placed near the monuments giving a warning to people that illegal construction and encroachment is not permitted nearby monuments and the guilty will be liable to stringent punishment.

Reply of the Government

As regards encroachments at centrally protected monuments, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to make all possible efforts under the provisions of AM&ASR Act 1958 and Rules 1959, to adhere to the recommendations of the Estimates Committee. SA's of the Circles are being advised to be more vigilant to ensure prevention of encroachments within the centrally protected monuments. District Administration/Chief Secretary of the States have been addressed by DG/Secretary(Culture) to issue directions to the District / Revenue/Police authorities to provide police assistance to ASI as and when they are approached.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 25, Para No. 25)

The Committee are aggrieved to note that 35 centrally protected monuments/sites in the country are untraceable. The major causes for the disappearance of the ancient monuments and sites are rapid urbanization, construction of multistoried residential and commercial buildings, implementation of development projects, etc. The Committee was informed by ASI that as on date, it may not be possible to fix responsibility. The Committee view this as casual approach of ASI in this regard. It is highly deplorable on the part of ASI as well as Ministry of Culture that no expeditious steps have been taken to trace the centrally protected monuments. Only instructions were issued to circle offices to personally verify the status of such monuments/sites, falling under their respective jurisdiction. No other State except Delhi has bothered to sent a detailed report in this regard. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Ministry should pursue vigorously with all the concerned circle offices to give detailed report within a specified time period and expeditious and concrete action should be initiated to trace out the missing monuments. The Ministry should also fix the responsibility in this regard.

The Committee also recommend that the Ministry of Culture in consultation with other authorities should devise such a mechanism that before starting any new developmental work, it should be ascertained that in that particular area, there are no hidden remains.

Reply of the Government

Regarding untraceable monuments, all the field offices of the ASI have been directed to make all possible efforts to trace out the missing monuments, and furnish detailed report/action initiated in this regard immediately. A Committee under the Chairmanship of the Jt.D.G., ASI has also been constituted to look into the matter. The Committee has met twice to consider the information furnished by the Circles into account. In its last meeting held on 25.09.2008, it was observed that three monuments reported as untraceable in Jammu & Kashmir and one monument in Karnataka have, in fact, have got submerged in the reservoirs of dams. In respect of some monuments, which are reported to be damaged/destroyed because of development/urbanization, the Committee has directed that all such places be inspected by the respective heads of the Circles to ascertain the facts. In regard to other untraceable monuments, the concerned Circles have been directed to locate the relevant documents in the Circle archives and make available the same to the Directorate General urgently.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Sl. No. 4, Para No. 4)

The Committee note that with such a rich cultural heritage and a large number of built monuments all over the country, it may not be possible for any single organization, like ASI to take care of the entire built heritage. Many monuments which are under State List are in a bad shape. State Governments neither have technically qualified staff nor have financial resources. The Committee, therefore, very strongly recommend that National Heritage Site Commission should be constituted as early as possible with statutory powers to issue directions to all State Governments. The Committee are also of the view that the process of 'listing the buildings as list 'A', list 'B' and list 'C' which has been adopted in almost all the countries in the world should also be adopted in our country. The Committee were informed that the cities like Mumbai, Hyderabad and Chennai have already initiated the process on these lines. The Committee also recommend that all over the country, Government must list the heritage buildings, classify them and put restrictions on any one tampering with these built heritage buildings/sites.

Reply of the Government

There is no provision at present under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 under which such listing of buildings under A, B and C categories could be undertaken. A provision to this effect will be proposed for incorporation in the draft National Heritage Sites Commission Bill.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 10, Para No. 10)

The Committee is distressed to note that the post of DG, ASI is being occupied by an administrative officer and not by a professional archaeologist since 1993. As per recruitment rules, if there are eligible archaeologists, they could be posted as DG. In the absence of eligible archaeologist, Government can post anyone from the administrative services as DG of ASI. The Committee is not satisfied with Ministry's view, that this does not hamper the functioning of ASI, because ASI has so many archaeologists, scientists, historians, engineers and architects. It is very strange that on the one hand Ministry is of the view that ASI is a multidisciplinary agency consisting of archaeologists, scientists, historians, engineers, etc. and on the other hand, Ministry could not find one eligible person amongst them to post him as DG, ASI since 1993. It is very strange that Ministry compromises to appoint a person, who does not have any experience in archaeology but has not sought to amend recruitment rules to appoint a suitable professional to the post of DG. It seems the Government is not serious about maintaining country's valuable heritage. No doubt, administrative officers are qualified and competent, but their appointment is for a short period i.e. two-three years. ASI, which deals with scientific and technical aspects needs a professional who understands the technicalities of the archaeology. The Committee is not convinced by the argument put forth by the representatives of the Ministry that since 1993 there have been no eligible officers available in the organization. The Committee also find that recruitment rules of the ASI were notified in the year 2002 and amendments could have been made accordingly before issuing the notification.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that DG, ASI should be a professional and not just an administrative officer, so that ASI can work efficiently and effectively with inspired leadership. If need arises, necessary amendment in the Recruitment Rules can be made accordingly because a person heading ASI with some experience in archaeology is better than a person who does not have any experience in archaeology.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry is currently in the process of amending the recruitment rules for heads of all attached and subordinate offices under the Ministry of Culture (which includes ASI). This amendment will enable the institution to adopt search-cum-selection procedures to select the head of ASI and will enable selection of professionals to the post.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 11, Para No. 11)

The Committee are surprised to note that the post of ADG (Arch) remained vacant since 1991 because at that time, none of the Archaeological Survey of India's officer fulfilled the criteria as laid down in the recruitment rules for the post of ADG. DG, Archaeological Survey of India during oral evidence stated that according to Ministry of Finance's guidelines, if a post remains vacant for one year, it is deemed to have been abolished. Accordingly, the Ministry of Finance abolished the post of ADG. The Committee are of the view that Archaeological Survey of India should have reconsidered the qualification for the post of ADG, as they were very well aware of the guidelines issued by Ministry of Finance. The Committee are further informed that only in 2006 the post of ADG (Arch.) has been revived after a lot of correspondence at the highest level. The Committee is astonished to note that the post of ADG was abolished in the absence of having any officer fulfilling the criteria. In the present circumstances as DG, ASI is an administrative officer, it was imperative to have the post of ADG (Arch.). The Ministry of Finance should have preferred to reconsider the qualification for filling up the post of ADG instead of abolishing the post. In view of this the Committee recommend that Ministry of Finance should be considerate if such a situation arises in future and they should reconsider the recruitment rules instead of abolishing a technical post. The Ministry of Culture should also take expeditious steps and apprise the Ministry of Finance about the facts in time.

Reply of the Government

The post of ADG(Arch.) fell vacant on 7th October, 1991 on promotion of its incumbent to the higher post of Director General in ASI. The matter relating to revival of the posts of ADG was taken up with the Ministry of Finance and that Ministry approved the proposal for revival of the post vide ID No. F. 1190/E. Coord.I/2006 dated 1st September, 2006 with the prospective effect. Accordingly, the sanction for the revival of the post of ADG was issued by ASI vide letter dated 11th September, 2006. The post was advertised in the Employment News dated 7-13th July, 2007. In response to the said advertisement, 11 applications have been received which include applications of the officers in the feeder grade of Joint Director in ASI. After completing all formalities, the proposal to fill up the post has been sent to UPSC vide our letter No. F. 3-20/2006-ASI dated 16th September, 2008.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 12, Para No. 12)

The Committee note that ASI is not able to keep pace with the changing requirements due to shortage of manpower. ASI was primarily formed for survey and conservation of monuments but now they are looking after the maintenance of monuments also. DG, ASI during oral evidence informed the Committee that ASI do not have any engineering unit, conservation architects etc. and due to shortage of staff, they are unable to take up more monuments which are of outstanding universal value and importance. The Committee is astonished to note that on one hand ASI is facing shortage of staff and on the other hand, 49 posts in Gr A, 87 posts in Gr B and 93 post in Gr C are lying vacant for many years.

Moreover, ASI has not sent any proposal to the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Finance for increase in manpower. The Committee therefore, stress that appropriate steps should be immediately taken to strengthen the staff position, especially at technical levels viz. architect, engineers etc. and all the posts which are lying vacant for many years should be filled up expeditiously.

Reply of the Government

Sincere efforts have been made to fill the vacant posts at different levels. DPCs have been conducted from time to time to fill the vacant posts falling in the promotion quota. Screening Committee meeting for Group 'B', 'C' and 'D' direct recruitment vacancies, took place in the Ministry of Culture on 11th August, 2008. Orders have been issued by the Ministry to fill up 240 vacant direct recruitment posts in the ASI, in Group B, C and D categories. Action is also underway for obtaining the approval of

the Screening Committee, headed by the Cabinet Secretary, to fill up 108 vacant posts in the Ministry in Group 'A' category. Of these 108 posts, 21 are in the ASI.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 19, Para No. 19)

The Committee note that use of relevant and appropriate technology for the presentation and maintenance of monuments and rare artifacts is important to achieve good and lasting results. Though ASI has a full fledged laboratory in Dehradun and small laboratories in various places, yet ASI take support from CSIR, SRI Chennai, IIT Kanpur, Central Building Research Institute at Roorkee and they are unable to create full in-house laboratories. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that ASI should strengthen their own laboratories and all efforts should be made to establish full in house laboratories so that research and development activities may not hamper. The Committee also note that ASI is not having facility of Carbon Dating Machine. ASI sends its samples for carbon dating to Birbal Research Sahani Institute, Lucknow and Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad. Dating is not being maintained and ascertained properly. For dating, ASI has to depend on other institutes and these institutes are more interested in dealing with geological samples not archaeological samples. These institutes do not give much importance to determine the time. It is very astonishing to note that in PRL, the samples of ASI are pending for results for more than two decades.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Culture should provide Carbon Dating Machine to ASI as dating is very important aspect. If date is not properly ascertained or maintained, it will be very difficult to frame up the history in terms of culture or archaeology of sites. Moreover, this will also cater to the requirements of the State Departments of Archaeology and universities which are also in the state of uncertainty about the agency to approach for time determination.

Reply of the Government

At present the ASI does not have in-house facilities for carrying out dating of archaeological samples. Through its recent collaboration with IIT, Kanpur, ASI envisages that dating labs will be established under the Center for Archaeological Sciences and Technology. As a first step, the IIT, Kanpur has planned to establish Thermoluminescence (TL) and Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) laboratories in this Center for dating the ancient sediments. As this Center will be a dedicated centre for archaeology, samples from other archaeological institutions can also be dated here.

The Science Branch of the ASI has specialised labs to cater to various needs and necessities of analysis related to archaeological samples.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 22, Para No. 22)

The Committee are informed that regular inspections of monuments are carried out by Circle/Branch officers/officials and officers from DG's office. Though the ASI has upgraded three mini-circles to full fledged circles for effective monitoring and supervisions of the monuments and sites. But Committee are not satisfied with this arrangement and in view of this, they recommend that instead of having circles for large number of monuments, small circles should be formed so that effective monitoring of monuments can be done. The Committee also suggest that middle level supervision should also be strengthened. The Committee may be apprised of the action taken in this regard at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

The concerned field offices of the ASI have been directed to furnish detailed comments and suggestions for ensuring more effective monitoring. Also, a proposal for strengthening of middle level supervision and creating smaller Sub-Circles is being formulated for consideration of the Ministry of Culture.

(Ministry of Culture O.M. 1-6/2008 ASI Dated 1/12/2008)

New Delhi;
April 23rd 2010
Vaisakha 3, 1932 (Saka)

FRANCISCO SARDINHA
Chairman,
Committee on Estimates

APPENDIX- I

MINUTES OF THE TWENTIETH SITTING OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (2009-2010)

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 30th March, 2010 from 1500 hrs. to 1800 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Francisco Sardinha – Chairman

MEMBERS

- 2 Shri Sanjay Singh Chauhan
- 3 Shri T.K.S. Elangovan
- 4 Dr. Sanjay Jaiswal
- 5 Shri Ramesh Jigajinagi
- 6 Shri P. Karunakaran
- 7 Shri Mohinder Singh Kaypee
- 8 Shri M. Krishnaswamy
- 9 Shri Prabodh Panda
- 10 Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
- 11 Shri Madan Lal Sharma
- 12 Shri Brij Bhushan Sharan Singh
- 13 Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Sigh
- 14 Shri Sushil Kumar Singh
- 15 Shri Lalji Tandon
- 16 Shri Manish Tewari
- 17 Shri K.C. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Shri U.S. Saxena | Joint Secretary |
| 2 | Shri Bhupesh Kumar | Director |

WITNESSES

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members of the Committee. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the following draft Reports and adopted the same with some modifications/additions:

(i) Report on action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in Sixteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Culture – ‘Maintenance of Monuments by Archaeological Survey of India’.

(ii) *** *** *** ***

3. The Committee, authorized the Chairman to finalize the Draft Reports in the light of the modifications and also to make verbal and other consequential changes, if any, arising out of factual verification by the concerned Ministries and present the same to the House.

4. *** *** *** ***

5. *** *** *** ***

6. *** *** *** ***

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX -II

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

(i)	Total number of recommendations/observations	28
(ii)	Recommendations/observation which have been accepted by the Government (Sl. Nos. 1,3,5,7,9,17,21,24,26,27,28) Percentage	11 39.29%
(iii)	Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply (Sl. No. 6,13,14) Percentage	03 10.71%
(iv)	Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee (Sl. Nos. 2,8,15,16,18,20,23,25) Percentage	08 28.57%
(v)	Recommendation/Observation in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited. (Sl. Nos. 4,10,11,12,19,22) Percentage	06 21.43%