

TENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
(2001)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF PLANNING

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the Fifth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing
Committee on Finance on Demands for Grants
(2000-2001) of Ministry of Planning]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 18 April, 2001

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19 April, 2001



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2001/Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE...	
INTRODUCTION.....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report.....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government.....	11
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	19
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee.....	25
CHAPTER V Recommendation/Observation in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited.....	33
Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 19 March, 2001.....	34
APPENDIX	
Analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Finance (Thirteenth Lok Sabha).....	36

COMPOSITION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE (2001)

Shri Shivraj V. Patil—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Raashid Alvi
3. Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay
4. Shri Ajoy Chakraborty
5. Smt. Renuka Chowdhury
6. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
7. Shri Rattan Lal Kataria
8. Shri Brahmanand Mandal
9. Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara Murthy
10. Shri M.V.V.S. Murthy
11. Shri Kamal Nath
12. Shri Rupchand Pal
13. Shri M. Padmanabham
14. Shri Prakash Paranjpe
15. Shri Raj Narain Passi
16. Dr. Sanjay Paswan
17. Shri Annasaheb M.K. Patil
18. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan
19. Shri Pravin Rashtrapal
20. Shri Ram Singh Rathwa
21. Shri S. Jaipal Reddy
22. Shri T.M. Selvaganpathi

(iv)

23. Mohammad Shahabuddin
24. Shri Ajit Singh
25. Shri C.N. Singh
26. Shri Kirit Somaiya
27. Shri Kodikunnil Suresh
28. Shri Kharabela Swain
29. Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari
30. Vacant

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
32. Shri Krishna Kumar Birla
33. Shri Vijay Darda
34. Dr. Biplab Dasgupta
35. Shri K. Rahman Khan
36. Shri Suresh A. Keshwani
37. Dr. Manmohan Singh
38. Shri Narendra Mohan
39. Shri Praful Patel
40. Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy
41. Shri N.K.P. Salve
42. Prof. M. Sankaralingam
43. Shri Amar Singh
44. Shri Ranjan Prasad Yadav
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Dr. (Smt.) P.K. Sandhu | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri P.K. Grover | | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri S.B. Arora | | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri D.R. Shekhar | | <i>Committee Officer</i> |

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf present this Tenth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifth Report of the Committee (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning.

2. The Fifth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 25 April, 2000. The Government furnished the written replies indicating action taken on all the recommendations on 2 August, 2000. The updated replies were furnished by the Government on 5 December, 2000. The draft action taken report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 19 March, 2001.

3. An analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in the Appendix.

4. For facility of reference observations/recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

NEW DELHI;
11 April, 2001

21 Chairra, 1923 (Saka)

SHIVRAJ V. PATIL
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1 This Report of the Standing Committee on Finance deals with action taken by Government on the recommendations/observations contained in their Fifth Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning which was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 25 April, 2000.

1.2 The Report contained eight recommendations. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the recommendations contained in the Report. These have been analysed and categorised as follows :

- (i) Recommendations/observations that have been accepted by the Government :
Sl. Nos. 4, 5, & 8
(Total 3) (Chapter II)
- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies :
Sl. No. 1 & 6
(Total 2) (Chapter III)
- (iii) Recommendations/observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee :
Sl. Nos. 2, 3, & 7
(Total 3) (Chapter IV)
- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited :
Nil (Chapter V)

1.3 The Committee desire that replies in respect of the recommendations contained in Chapter I of the Report may be furnished to them expeditiously.

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

Demand No. 68
Planning Commission
Island Development Authority

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para No. 13)

1.5 The Committee had noted that Island Development Authority was set up in August 1986 to formulate policies and programmes for an ecologically sound, sustainable and integrated development of the Andaman & Nicobar and Lakshadweep Group of Islands and to review progress of implementation and impact of the programmes of development. A Standing Committee had also been constituted to suggest ways and means to tackle the special requirements of these Islands. The Island Development Authority is supposed to meet once in every year and its standing committee twice in a year.

The Committee had, however, found that the last meeting of IDA was held as far back as on 22.1.1996, after which no meeting had been convened. They had opined that in the absence of any deliberations which ought to have taken place periodically in the meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee, any worthwhile policy or programme for bringing about the improvement in the overall integrated development of the islands could hardly be expected.

In view of the fact that the Authority and its Standing Committee were reconstituted in January, 2000, the Committee had desired that the meetings should be held more often with a view to suggesting policies and programmes which would help these islands to overcome their developmental problems. The Committee had also desired that the Authority should conduct review meetings in order to assess the progress of implementation and impact of the programmes undertaken.

In their action taken reply, the Ministry of Planning have stated as under

"Due to various reasons, meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee could not be held as frequently as desired. However, as the Authority and its Standing Committee have now been reconstituted in January, 2000, efforts are being made to organise the meetings at the earliest. Draft Agenda for the next meeting of the Standing Committee of IDA has been prepared and after reviewing it in a meeting held with concerned Ministries under the chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission, the date for the next meeting of the Standing Committee of IDA was fixed for 30th August 2000. However, on the request of the A&N Administration the meeting was postponed. Now, the efforts are being made to organise the meeting at the earliest.

1.6 The Ministry of Planning have all along been saying that efforts would be made to hold the meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee at the earliest and at regular intervals. It is, however, distressing to note that the meeting of IDA/Standing Committee which were re-constituted in January, 2000 could not be held for one reason or the other. The last meeting of IDA was held way back in January, 1996.

1.7 The Committee are unable to understand as to why the ecological and strategic importance of Andaman & Nicobar and Lakshadweep Group of Islands has not been recognised and meetings of IDA/Standing Committee are not being held regularly with a view to formulate policies and programmes for their sustained and integrated development.

1.8 The Committee, therefore, once again emphasise that meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee should be held more often with a view to suggesting policies and programmes which would help these groups of Islands to overcome their developmental problems.

Demand No. 68
Ministry of Planning
Grant-in-Aid

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para No. 17)

1.9 The Committee were concerned to note that there had always been under-utilisation of the budgetary allocations (Plan) since 1995-96. Even when the budget estimates were reduced drastically at the Revised Estimates stage except in 1997-98, the actual expenditure was nowhere near the Revised Estimates.

Expressing their displeasure over the injudicious selection of institutions for sanction of grants-in-aid and adopting unrealistic approach while projecting demands for scheme(s), the Committee had commented as under :

"It has been stated that a sum of Rs. 200 lakh meant for the Institute of Economic Growth as grants-in-aid could not be released on account of the inability of the Institute to meet the requirement of grants. The Committee are at a loss to understand that when the detailed guidelines have already been prescribed for identification of the eligible Institutions, how an Institute could be selected which failed to meet the eligibility criteria laid down under such guidelines with the result the amount remained unutilised. The Committee are also unable to understand as to why it took about five years to get the plan for building a new Campus of Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR) at Narela, approved by DDA which resulted in surrender of allocated funds year after year. The matter should have been taken up at an appropriate high level to get the plan approved well in time and construction work started in order to avoid the under-utilisation of funds."

In view of the foregoing, the Committee had concluded that no serious efforts were being made by the Ministry of Planning (Planning Commission) either in projecting a realistic demand or in making a judicious selection of Institutes for providing grants. The Committee, therefore, had desired that realistic approach should invariably be adopted by the Ministry while projecting a demand. The actual utilisation should

be as near the budgetary allocation as possible. It was all the more important that only those Institutes should be selected for the grants which fitted in within the framework of the guidelines already prescribed.

1.10 In their action taken reply, the Ministry of Planning have stated as under :

"The land was handed over to IAMR by DDA on 31st January, 1996. Thereafter, the Chairman, Executive Council, IAMR constituted a Building & Campus Development Committee (BCDC) under the Chairmanship of Special Secretary, Planning Commission, BCDC, after deliberation in its meetings, finally decided to entrust the construction work to CPWD and to utilise the services of private architects for planning, designing etc. The modalities of selection of architect through competition by a panel of jury under the chairmanship of Shri M.N. Buch, IAS, took some time upto May, 97. Based upon the proceedings of these exercises, BCDC decided to entrust the work of planning, designing etc. also to CPWD. The lay out plans and conceptual designs of the buildings prepared by CPWD were approved by BCDC by November, 1997. Thereafter Delhi Urban Arts Commission accorded its approval in March, 1998. Detailed plan drawings were then prepared and submitted to DDA in July, 1998. Then, these drawings were circulated by DDA to Delhi Urban Arts Commission and other local authorities such as Delhi Fire Service, Delhi Vidyut Board and National Airport Authority for according their approvals from the respective angles. Finally, DDA approved the plans in April, 1999.

All along the process, IAMR has deputed a senior officer to liaison with various authorities involved in the process of getting the approval, IAMR has claimed that it is due to untiring effort of the senior officers that they could get the approval of the plan in much shorter time as compared to the other Government departments in general. Further, the process was also being monitored by the BCDC at regular intervals.

Due to the extraordinary efforts taken up, every time IAMR expected that the work of approval of plan would be completed immediately and as such steps were taken for providing the funds so that just for

want of funds the work may not stop after taking the approval. But, the expectations inspite of the best efforts and good monitoring could not materialise resulting in under-utilisation of funds."

1.11 The Committee are not inclined to accept the view point of the Planning Commission (PC) that due to extraordinary and untiring efforts made by them they could get the plan for building the new campus of IAMR at Narela approved in a much shorter time. Had this been the case, they need not have made the provision of funds in earlier five years. On the contrary, since they were expecting that the project would start in 1996-97, as admitted by themselves, the Ministry of Planning had made allocation in 1996-97 itself and in the following years as well.

1.12 The Committee, therefore reiterate their earlier recommendation and expect that the Ministry of Planning (PC) would adopt a practical approach while projecting demands. The Committee would also like to point out that the Ministry of Planning have not furnished the reply as to how the Institute of Economic Growth for which a sum of Rs. 200 lakh as grants-in-aid was sanctioned, subsequently failed to meet the eligibility criteria if the sanction had been approved on the basis of detailed guidelines for sanction of grants-in-aid already prescribed. The Committee would like to be apprised in this regard.

Demand No. 68
Planning Commission
Ninth Five Year Plan

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para Nos. 42.1, 42.2, 42.3 and 42.4)

1.13 The Committee were pained to note that although the Ninth Plan had commenced from 1st April, 1997, the Plan document was accorded final approval only on 19th February, 1999 with the delay of almost two years. The Committee had also expressed their displeasure over the fact that after the formation of the new government in March 1998, the Ministry almost took one year in redrafting the Ninth Five Year Plan and getting the same approved from NDC. Besides, even though it was finally approved in the month of February, 1999 the same was not placed in the Parliament till December, 1999. The Committee were, therefore, not inclined to accept the explanation adduced by the Ministry that the

delay took place on account of the change in the Government. It was distressing to note that neither the approach Paper to Ninth Five Year Plan nor the Plan itself was discussed in Parliament.

The Committee had been informed that the Planning Commission had already completed mid-term appraisal of the Ninth Five Year with the objective to assess the performance of the Plan for the years it had been under implementation and the document was expected to be ready shortly.

The Committee had strongly emphasised that the Approach Paper should be ready well before the start of the Plan and placed before Parliament so that a full fledged discussion could be held thereon. Based on the discussion, the final Plan document might be prepared reflecting the popular wishes and aspirations. The Committee had recommended that the final Plan document as well as the mid-term appraisal report should be placed before the Parliament well in time. All efforts should be made to see that these documents were discussed in the Parliament.

The Committee were also constrained to note that due to the abnormal delay in getting the Ninth Plan approved the growth target had to be revised downwards from 7% to 6.5%. During the evidence, the Secretary was candid enough to admit that in order to achieve even the growth rate 6.5%, the percentage of growth during the remaining two years would have to be 7.4%. He had also expressed an apprehension that since three vital years of the Plan had already passed during which the GDP had grown by 5%, 6.8% and 5.9% only, it might be difficult even to achieve a growth rate of 6.5%. In view of the fact that valuable time had already been lost, the Committee recommended that concerted efforts were needed to be made at all levels to achieve at least the revised targets then fixed in the Ninth Five Year Plan.

1.14 In their action taken reply, the Ministry of Planning stated as under :

"The Planning Commission initiated the Ninth Plan on 1.4.1997 as per schedule. The preparatory work for the Plan culminated in the finalisation of the 'Approach Paper to the Ninth Plan (1997-2002)', giving broad guidelines for the preparation of the detailed Plan. The Approach Paper was approved unanimously by the National Development Council (NDC) on 16th January, 1997. Thereafter, a

detailed draft Ninth Five Year Plan was prepared, discussed and approved in the Internal Meetings of the Planning Commission. The meeting of the Full Planning Commission could, however, not be convened to discuss this draft and place it before the Union Cabinet and the NDC because of the dissolution of Lok Sabha and the announcement of the General Elections. Subsequently, with the approval of Prime Minister, this draft was released to the public by the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission on 1.3.1998.

Due to the change of the government at Centre after General Elections in March, 1998, the draft was reviewed so as to suitably reflect the altered priorities as enunciated in the National Agenda for Governance and also the directions of the Prime Minister setting out goals of the government. The revised Ninth Five Year Plan Document was endorsed by the NDC on 19.2.1999. Before this Document could be printed and tabled in the Parliament, Twelfth Lok Sabha was dissolved. Five copies of the Document were, however, placed in the Parliament library on 29.05.1999. On the constitution of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, the Ninth Plan Document was tabled on 1st and 9th December, 1999 in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha respectively."

1.15 The Ministry of Planning have further stated as under

"The draft Mid-Term Appraisal (MTA) Document of the Ninth Five Year Plan has been prepared and was discussed in the Full Planning Commission Meeting held on 30th September, 2000 under the Chairmanship of the Hon'ble Prime Minister and Chairman, Full Planning Commission. In pursuance of the decision taken in the said meeting, the Planning Commission is initiating steps to circulate the MTA Document of the Ninth Plan to all Central Ministries/ Departments as also the State/UT Governments with a request to look into important aspects and conclusions reached in the MTA, particularly in the context of the balance period of the Ninth Five Year Plan. And more so, as a part of the preparatory work for the Ninth Five Year Plan. The Document will be placed in the Parliament after it is printed. Copies of the Highlights of the MTA have already been placed in the Parliament Library."

The Ministry have also stated that the direction of the Committee regarding placing of the final Plan Document as well as the Mid-Term Appraisal Report before the Parliament well in time had been noted for compliance and it was being kept in view while framing the schedule for preparation of the Tenth Plan.

1.16 In regard to the growth rate, it has been stated as under :

"The Ninth Plan has projected an average growth rate of 6.5 per cent per annum in GDP as against the growth rate of 7 per cent envisaged in the approach Paper approved by the NDC. The scaling down of the target was necessitated by the changes in the national as well as global economy situation. In the first two years of the Plan, there was a slow down in the growth rate of Indian economy, a sharp decline in the export growth, a significant revenue shortfall and significant deterioration in the State Government's finances. Taking these developments into account, it was decided to recommend to the NDC that the growth target be scaled down to 6.5 per cent per annum. Implicit in this target is an average growth rate of more than 7 per cent over the last three years (1999-2002) of the Ninth Plan. In this regard, the primary objective of the MTA of the Ninth Plan has been to assess the possibility of reaching the targets of the Ninth Plan, identify the areas of significant shortfall and the reasons therefor, so as to arrive at a basis for evolving appropriate Policy Package/Plan Strategies for mid-term corrections in the implementation of the Plan."

1.17 The Mid Term Appraisal (MTA) exercise for a plan is initiated primarily (i) to assess the performance of a plan for the years it has been under implementation with a view to take corrective actions in order to achieve the objectives laid down for the plan as a whole; and (ii) to serve as a part of the preparatory work for the next plan.

1.18 The Committee are, however, distressed to find that the MTA document for the Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) was placed before the Full Planning Commission for discussion only on 30 September, 2000. The final MTA document is yet to be placed before the Parliament. In view of the fact that just about one year is left for the completion of the Ninth Five Year Plan, the Committee apprehend, it might not be possible

to take corrective measures to achieve the average growth rate which had already been scaled down from 7% to 6.5% due to delay of about two years in the finalisation of plan document.

1.19 Furthermore, since the Mid Term Appraisal is the basis for the next plan, any delay in the preparation of Mid Term Appraisal document is likely to delay the finalisation of Approach Paper and ultimately the Plan document for the next plan. In the circumstances, the Committee deprecate the delay in finalising the plan documents and strongly emphasis that all the three documents *viz.* Approach Paper, the Plan Document and Mid Term Appraisal (MTA) document may be prepared well in time and placed before the Parliament for full fledged discussion so that the final document(s) may reflect the popular wishes.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. Nos. 4, 5 & 8, Para Nos. 23, 27 & 48)

The Committee note that about Rs. 200 crore to 400 crore are being spent on Non-Government Organisations (NGOs). They express their anxiety over the mushroom growth of NGOs in the recent past, many of them they apprehend may not be genuine entities. This stand further corroborated from the experience of CAPART, which had spent money through thousands of NGOs, some of which, as admitted by the Government, were found to be bogus.

The Committee note with satisfaction that the Planning Commission has been declared nodal agency for all the voluntary organisations and it has started working on establishing a data ban in this regard.

The Committee desire that the selection of NGOs should be made in a very objective and judicious manner and those NGOs who are doing commendable work should be helped to the extent possible.

Reply of Government

It is estimated that about Rs. 200 crore to 400 crore is being spent on various schemes run by different Departments of the Government and implemented through Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and there is a mushrooming of NGOs in the recent past. The Planning Commission has now been declared the nodal agency for Voluntary Organisations (VOs)/NGOs and its first responsibility will be to create an exhaustive database of VOs/NGOs. A Standing Committee of Secretaries on VOs has been constituted to coordinate and review various policy issues related to VOs/NGOs.

For building the database of VOs/NGOs, a meeting under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission was organised on 12th May, 2000. In the meeting, representatives of concerned Ministries/Departments were requested to send the required information on a prescribed format. The information already received from different Ministries/Departments for NGO database is now available on the website of Planning Commission.

Issues like the simplification of procedures, selection of NGOs on a very objective and judicious manner and NGOs doing commendable work to be helped to the extent possible; would be taken up in the meetings of the Standing Committee of Secretaries on VOs.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/200-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5, Para No. 27)

From the figures made available to them, the Committee are constrained to find that there is a wide gap between Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actual utilization of funds meant for Expertise for Planning Process. The Committee are not inclined to accept the viewpoint of the Ministry that it was not possible to maintain any regular increase or decrease in the budget allocation or the actual expenditure, but it depended on the need in a particular year. The Committee are of the considered view that since it is not difficult to assess the type or number of studies requiring the services of Experts, which are going to be undertaken during a particular year, it should be possible to project a reasonably realistic demand. The Committee, therefore, desire that the budgetary exercise should be taken up with due seriousness so that the gap between Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actuals get minimized.

Reply of Government

A sizeable part of the Budget/Revised Estimates under the Plan Scheme, "Payment for Professional and Special Services (Expertise for Planning Process)" is meant for the Agro-Climatic Regional Planning

Project being run through the Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research (SPIESR), Ahmedabad and funded by the Planning Commission. The Project is being operated at various Zonal Planning Centres located in different States. The release of funds by the Planning Commission under this Project depends upon the progress of work at SPIESR and other Zonal Planning Centres, utilization of the funds earlier released and the demands made by them in a particular year for additional funds. Although the Planning Commission makes sufficient provision in the Budget Estimates in advance in view of the likely activities to be taken up by them in a particular year, yet it has been observed that the progress both in terms of the physical targets and in respect of the utilization of earlier funds by various Zonal Planning Centres has been slower than anticipated. In view of this reason, the funds provided at Budget/Revised stage could not be utilized in full.

2. The other component of expenditure under the said scheme is on account of hiring of the services of Institutes/Individuals for undertaking such plan studies as are of current interest to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can engage upto 25 Consultants on a monthly fee basis besides assigning studies to various Institutes on a lump-sum payment basis. While it is considered desirable to make sufficient provision in the Budget Estimates on the basis of these numbers as also taking into account other relevant factors, it is true that the actual expenditure has not been of that level because the number of Consultants/Institutes engaged has been less than what was expected while formulating Budget Estimates.

3. Nevertheless, the observations made by the Standing Committee on Finance have been noted and all possible efforts will be made by the Planning Commission to ensure that the Budget Estimates for 2001-2002 and onwards are prepared on realistic demands and in the light of these observations of the Standing Committee on Finance.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para No. 48)

One of the most important function of the Planning Commission is to have proper perspective and vision for the years to come and plan accordingly. However, the Committee observe that Planning Commission since its inception has basically concentrated on formulation of Annual and Five Year Plans etc. and the perspective planning which relates to the overall integration of the plan into macro framework delineating possibilities and constraints and projecting a long term vision, has remained, more or less, an ignored area. The representatives of the Ministry (Planning Commission) conceded that there is lot of potential available in other areas such as oceanography, space research, science and technology, economic zone, knowledge based industry etc. which requires to be further explored and tapped. They also acknowledged the fact that the desired attention in this regard has not been paid so far. However, the Committee were informed that the Ministry have recently set up a grouping the Planning Commission with the idea of making India into knowledge based industry and a workshop is proposed to be convened on 22nd and 23rd June, 2000 to find out ways as to how knowledge based industry could be promoted.

The Committee are of the view that in the perspective plan development of science and technology has to remain one of the main focal point for overall integrated development of various facets of the economy including Agriculture, Industry, Trade and Allied sectors because in the absence of research and advanced technology, natural resources will always remain untapped.

The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry of Planning should without losing further time, initiate formulation of perspective plan for the future. They expect that the Planning Commission will come out with a long term vision document and release the same to the public for open discussion.

Reply of Government

The Planning Commission is engaged in medium and long-term planning for development. With the initiation of economic reforms and liberalisation, and the increase in the share of private sector in total

investment, the role of planning has changed with greater orientation towards planning for policy. However, even with this reorientation, the long term vision of planning has not been diluted. The Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) continues the tradition of placing the plan in a 15-year perspective framework. In order to give greater thrust to long term planning, the Planning Commission has constituted a Committee on Vision 2020 under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.P. Gupta, Member, Planning Commission, with leading experts in the fields of agriculture, energy, demography, transport, health, education, etc. as members. The members also include eminent economists, statisticians, etc. The composition of this Committee is given in Annex-I.

The terms of reference of this Committee is first to set a common vision and then to move into the possible constraints, constraint-releasing activities and the new opportunities that are now available to make this vision a reality and achievable. The Committee has already met four times to deliberate on the broad issues, which may comprise such a vision. Some of the areas identified are as follows :

Population dynamics, urbanisation and land use pattern;

Quality of life and indicators of human development, including removal of poverty;

Food Security;

Social infrastructure requirements to achieve vision targets;

Enabling physical infrastructure and utilities;

Implication of energy sector development *vis-a-vis* the global energy scenario;

Issues in sustainable development in environment and natural resources;

Role of Technology for Vision 2020;

External economic relations, including trade blocs and WTO commitments;

India's role in geo-economic developments and benefits of economic cooperation;

Macro-economic balance; and

Issues in governance.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

**LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
VISION 2020 FOR INDIA**

Chairman

Dr. S.P. Gupta, Member, Planning Commission, 15 Yojana Bhavan,
Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

Members

- Dr. R.K. Pachauri, Director, Tata Energy Research Institute, Darbari
Seth Block, India Habitat Centre, Lodi Road, New Delhi-110003.
2. Prof. R. Radhakrishna, Vice Chancellor, Andhra University,
Vishakhapatnam.
 3. Dr. Panjab Singh, Director, Indian Agriculture Research Institute,
Pusa, New Delhi-110012.
 4. Prof. Ashish Bose, Hon. Professor, Institute of Economic Growth,
I-1777, Chittranjan Park, New Delhi-110019.
 5. Prof. Pravin Visaria, Director, Institute of Economic Growth, University
of Delhi, Delhi-110007.
 6. Shri K.L. Thapar, Director, Asian Institute of Transport Development,
Apt. E-5, Qutab Hotel, Shaheed Jeet Singh Marg, New Delhi-
110016.
 7. Dr. Padam Singh, Additional Director General, Indian Council of
Medical Research, Ansari Nagar, New Delhi-110029.
 8. Prof. Ramaswamy R. Iyer, Former Secretary, Ministry of Water
Resources, A-10, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi-110044.

9. Prof. K.C. Sivaramakrishnan, Visiting Professor, Centre for Policy Research, Dharma Marg, Chanakya Puri, New Delhi-110021.
10. Dr. V.A. Pai Panandiker, President, Centre for Policy Research, Dharma Marg, Chanakya Puri, New Delhi-110021.
11. Shri Jasjit Singh, Director, Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi.
12. Prof. V.R. Panchamukhi, Director-General, Research and Information System for the Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries, Zone IV-B, Indian Habitat Centre, Lodi Road, New Delhi-110003.
13. Prof. P.V. Indiresan, Visiting Professor, Centre for Policy Research, Dharma Marg, Chanakya Puri, New Delhi-110021.
14. Dr. J.S. Rajput, Director, National Council of Educational Research and Training, Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016.
15. Dr. Prema Ramachandran, Adviser (Health), Planning Commission, New Delhi.
16. Dr. Pronab Sen, Adviser (PP), Planning Commission, New Delhi.
17. Dr. Shovan Ray, Consultant, Planning Commission, New Delhi.

Committee Secretary

Shri J.N. Maggo, Joint Adviser (Industries & Infrastructure Planning), Perspective Planning Division, Planning Commission, 363, Yojana Bhavan, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Sl. Nos. 1 & 6, Para Nos. 8 & 36)

The Committee note that there has been steep rise in the allocation of funds at the Revised Estimates stage during the year 1998-99 which has been explained on account of the foreign visits of the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission who acted as a special envoy to the Prime Minister to hold discussions with representatives of the US Government. The Committee are of the view that since the then Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission acted as a special envoy to the Prime Minister, the expenditure incurred on such foreign visits should not have been borne by the Ministry of Planning but by the Ministry of External Affairs. Even if this expenditure had been incurred by the Planning Commission, the same should have been got reimbursed from the Ministry of External Affairs. The Committee expect that the Ministry of Planning will take up the matter with the Ministry of External Affairs.

Reply of Government

This issue was examined in Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure while considering the request of the Planning Commission for additional funds by re-appropriation to meet the expenditure incurred on Shri Singh's foreign visits as a special envoy of the PM and they were of the view that TA should be booked to the same head of account as Salary. It was specifically stated in the sanctions issued by the Ministry of External Affairs that the expenditure on TA/DA would be debitible to the budget

grant from which the officers draw their pay and allowances. (copy of one such sanction enclosed). Since the pay & allowances of Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission are met from the Budget Grant of the Planning Commission it is not proposed to pursue the matter further.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated ; 05.12.2000]

No. W. II/122/39/98-Pt.
 Ministry of External Affairs
 (AMS Division)

New Delhi, the Nov. 17, 1998

ORDER

SUBJECT. Deputation of a 5-member delegation led by Shri Jaswant Singh, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission to Rome, Italy, for holding discussions with a US Govt. delegation from Nov. 17-23, 1998 (excluding travel time).

Sanction of the President is hereby accorded to the deputation of a 5-member delegation led by Shri Jaswant Singh, Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission to Rome, Italy, for holding discussions with a US Govt. delegation from Nov. 17-23, 1998 (excluding travel time). The delegation comprises the following :

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------------------------------|
| (i) | Shri Jaswant Singh
Deputy Chairman,
Planning Commission | Leader, from Nov. 17-23, 1998 |
| (ii) | Shri. K. Raghunath,
Foreign Secretary | Member, from Nov. 17-21, 1998 |
| (iii) | Shri Naresh Chandra
Indian Ambassador to the US | Member, from Nov. 17-21, 1998 |
| (iv) | Shri Alok Prasad,
JS (AMS) MEA | Member, from Nov. 17-21, 1998 |
| (v) | Shri Rakesh Sood,
JS (DISA), MEA | Member, from Nov. 17-21, 1998 |

2. The officers have been sanctioned the following :

- | | | |
|-----|---------------|---------------------|
| (a) | Air Passage | By entitled classes |
| (b) | Accommodation | As per entitlement |

(c) Daily Allowance	As per entitlement
(d) Airport Tax	Will be reimbursable
(e) Excess Baggage	5 kgs. to carry official documents
(f) Entertainment	Rs. 6000/-
(g) Contingencies	@ Rs. 200/- per day for the entire delegation
(h) Cars	2 Cars @ US \$ 400 per day per car for the period 17-21 Nov. and thereafter one car for the period upto 23rd November.

3. The other terms and conditions of the visit will be as laid down in the Ministry of Finance O.M. No. 19036/7/83-E/IV dated November 7, 1994.

4. The expenditure on TA/DA will be debit to the Budget grant from which the officers draw their pay and allowances.

5. The sanction order issues with the approval of the SCS *vide* Deptt. of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, Diary No. 809-E. IV/98-DC dated 17.11.1998.

(O.P. Makhija)
Under Secretary (AMS)

To

1. The Controller of Accounts, MEA
2. Exchange Control Deptt., RBI, New Delhi
3. PS to FS
4. EOI, Rome
5. EOI, Washington
6. Planning Commission, New Delhi
7. Finance-I/Budget/Cash-III, TA Cell/TG Cell/PA. I/PA. II Section, MEA
8. Officers concerned
9. Spare copies : 5

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para No. 36)

Keeping in view the vital importance of Human Development Report, the Committee in their Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) had desired the Planning Commission to take up the matter in right earnest and prepare Human Development Report for the entire country without any further delay. They are, however, distressed to note that it was only in July, 1999 that the work relating to the preparation on Human Development Report was initiated by convening a National Workshop on Key concern and Core Indicators for National and States Human Development Reports.

The matter regarding the preparation of Human Development Report was discussed at length by the Members in the Standing Committee on Finance and they were of the considered option that in the absence of such a report which provides important parameters relating to poverty, literacy, health, water, electricity, etc. the planning itself is likely to remain a futile exercise.

The Committee now desires that the Planning Commission shall prepare the much awaited National Human Development Report by the end of fiscal year 2000-2001 as already committed.

Reply of Government

The Planning Commission have undertaken the task of preparing National Human Development Report for India. The Report is expected to be completed by 31st March, 2001. A Project Team, comprising of officers from different Divisions of Planning Commission has been constituted to undertake the preparation of the NHDR. The Steering Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission has been set up to oversee the preparation of NHDR. The Terms of Reference of the Committee are :

- To provide guidance in terms of data and other information to the Project Team.
2. To consider and approve the draft and HDR prepared and submitted by the Project Team.

The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 16th May, 2000.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. 11018/3/2000-Admn. IV, Dated :
05.12.2000]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Sl. Nos. 2, 3 & 7, Para Nos. 13, 17,
42.1, 42.2, 42.3 & 42.4)

The Committee note that Island Development Authority was set up in August 1986 to formulate policies and programmes for an ecologically sound, sustainable and integrated development of the Andaman & Nicobar and Lakshadweep Group of Islands and to review progress of implementation and impact of the programmes of development. A Standing Committee has also been constituted to suggest ways and means to tackle the special requirements of these Islands. The budgetary allocation under the IDA Head is meant for holding meetings of IDA, Standing Committee as well as to meet the expenditure on salaries, domestic travel and other office expenses etc. Consistent under-utilisation of budgetary allocation has been explained due to decline in the frequency of the meetings of the IDA and its Standing Committee and not filling up of some of the vacant posts under the IDA Cell.

The Committee find that the last meeting of IDA was held as far back as on 22.01.1996, after which no meeting has been convened. They opine that in the absence of any deliberations which ought to have taken place periodically in the meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee, any worthwhile policy or programme for bringing about the improvement in the overall integrated development of these islands can hardly be expected.

In view of the fact the Authority and its Standing Committee have now been reconstituted in January, 2000, the Committee desire that the meetings should be held more often with a view to suggesting policies and

programmes which would help these Islands to overcome their developmental problems. The Authority should also conduct regular review meetings in order to assess the progress of implementation and impact of the programmes undertaken.

Reply of Government

Due to various reasons, meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee could not be held as frequently as desired. However, as the Authority and its Standing Committee have now been reconstituted in January 2000, efforts are being made to organise the meetings at the earliest. Draft Agenda for the next meeting of the Standing Committee of IDA has been prepared and after reviewing it in a meeting held with concerned Ministries under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission, the date for the next meeting of the Standing Committee of IDA was fixed for 30th August, 2000. However, on the request of the A&N Administration the meeting was postponed. Now, the efforts are being made to organise the meeting at the earliest.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para No. 17)

The Committee are concerned to note that there has always been under-utilisation of the budgetary allocations (Plan) since 1995-96. Even when the budget estimates were reduced drastically at the Revised Estimates stage except in 1997-98, the actual expenditure was nowhere near the Revised Estimates.

It has been stated a sum of Rs. 200 lakh meant for the Institute of Economic Growth as grants-in-aid could not be released on account of the inability of the Institute to meet the requirement of grants. The Committee are at a loss to understand that when the detailed guidelines have already been prescribed for identification of the eligible Institutions, how an Institute could be selected which failed to meet the eligibility

criteria laid down under such guidelines with the result the amount remained unutilized. The Committee are also unable to understand as to why it took about five years to get the plan for building a new Campus of Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR) at Narela, approved by DDA which resulted in surrender of allocated funds year after year. The matter should have been taken up at an appropriate high level to get the plan approved well in time and construction work started in order to avoid the under-utilisation of funds.

In view of the foregoing, the Committee concludes that no serious efforts are being made by the Ministry of Planning (Planning Commission) either in projecting a realistic demand or in making a judicious selection of Institutes for providing grants. The Committee, therefore, desire that realistic approach should invariably be adopted by the Ministry while projecting a demand. The actual utilisation should be as near the budgetary allocation as possible. It is all the more important that only those Institutes should be selected for the grants which fit in within the framework of the guidelines already prescribed.

Reply of Government

The land was handed over to IAMR by DDA on 31st January, 1996. Thereafter, the Chairman, Executive Council, IAMR constituted a Building & Campus Development Committee (BCDC) under the Chairmanship of Special Secretary, Planning Commission, BCDC, after deliberation in its meetings, finally decided to entrust the construction work to CPWD and to utilize the services of private architects for planning, designing etc. The modalities of selection of architect through competition by a panel of jury under the chairmanship of Shri M.N. Buch, IAS, took some time upto May, '97. Based upon the proceedings of these exercises, BCDC decided to entrust the work of planning, designing etc. also the CPWD. The lay out plans and conceptual designs of the building prepared by CPWD were approved by BCDC by November, 1997. Thereafter Delhi Urban Arts Commission accorded its approval in March,

1998. Detailed plan drawings were then prepared and submitted to DDA in July, 1998. Then, these drawings were circulated by DDA to Delhi Urban Arts Commission and other local authorities such as Delhi Fire Service, Delhi Vidyut Board and National Airport Authority for according their approvals from the respective angles. Finally, DDA approved the plans in April, 1999.

All along the process, IAMR has deputed a senior officer to liaison with various authorities involved in the process of getting the approval. IAMR has claimed that it is due to the untiring effort of the senior officers that they could get the approval of the plan in much a shorter time as compared to the other Government departments in general. Further, the process was also being monitored by the BCDC at regular intervals.

Due to the extraordinary efforts taken up, every time IAMR expected that the work of approval of plan would be completed immediately and as such steps were taken for providing the funds so that just for want of funds the work may not stop after taking the approval. But, the expectations inspite of the best efforts and good monitoring could not materialize resulting in under-utilisation of funds.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 42.1)

The Committee are pained to note that although the Ninth Plan had commenced from 1st April, 1997, the Plan document was accorded final approval only on 19th February, 1999 with the delay of almost two years. The Committee also express their displeasure over the fact that after the formation of the new Government in March, 1998, the Ministry almost took one year in redrafting the Ninth Five Year Plan and getting the same approved from NDC. Besides, even though it was finally approved in the month of February, 1999 the same was not placed in the Parliament till

December, 1999. The Committee are, therefore, not inclined to accept the explanation adduced by the Ministry that the delay took place on account of the change in the Government. It is distressing to note that neither the Approach Paper to Ninth Five Year Plan nor the Plan itself was discussed in Parliament.

Reply of Government

The Planning Commission initiated the Ninth Plan on 1.4.1997 as per schedule. The preparatory work for the Plan culminated in the finalisation of the "Approach Paper to the Ninth Plan (1997-2002)", giving broad guidelines for the preparation of the detailed Plan. The Approach Paper was approved unanimously by the National Development Council (NDC) on 16th January, 1997. Thereafter, a detailed draft Ninth Five Year Plan was prepared, discussed and approved in the Internal Meetings of the Planning Commission. The meeting of the Full Planning Commission could, however, not be convened to discuss this draft and place it before the Union Cabinet and the NDC because of the dissolution of Lok Sabha and the announcement of the General Elections. Subsequently, with the approval of Prime Minister, this draft was released to the public by the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission on 1.3.1998.

Due to the change of the Government at Centre after General Elections in March, 1998, the draft was reviewed so as to suitably reflect the altered priorities as enunciated in the National Agenda for Governance and also the directions of the Prime Minister setting out goals of the Government. The revised Ninth Five Year Plan Document was endorsed by the NDC on 19.2.1999. Before this Document could be printed and tabled in the Parliament, Twelfth Lok Sabha was dissolved. Five copies of the Document were, however, placed in the Parliament Library on 29.05.1999. On the constitution of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, the Ninth Plan Document was tabled on 1st and 9th December, 1999 in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha respectively.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 42.2)

The Committee have been informed that the Planning Commission has already completed mid-term, appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan with the objective to assess the performance of the Plan for the years it has been under implementation and the document is expected to be ready shortly.

Reply of Government

The draft Mid-Term Appraisal (MTA) Document of the Ninth Five Year Plan has been prepared and was discussed in the Full Planning Commission Meeting held on 30th September, 2000 under the Chairmanship of the Hon'ble Prime Minister and Chairman, Full Planning Commission. In pursuance of the decision taken in the said meeting, the Planning Commission is initiating steps to circulate the MTA Document of the Ninth Plan to all Central Ministries/Departments as also the State/ UT Governments with a request to look into important aspects and conclusions reached in the MTA, particularly in the context of the balance period of the Ninth Five Year Plan, and more so, as a part of the preparatory work for the Tenth Five Year Plan. The Document will be placed in the Parliament after it is printed. Copies of the Highlights of the MTA have already been placed in the Parliament Library.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
- Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 42.3)

The Committee strongly emphasise that the Approach Paper should be ready well before the start of the Plan and placed before Parliament so that a full-fledged discussion could be held thereon. Based on the discussion, the final Plan document may be prepared reflecting the popular wishes and aspirations. The Committee recommend that the final Plan

document as well as the mid-term appraisal report should be placed before the Parliament well in time. All efforts should be made to see that these documents are discussed in the Parliament.

Reply of Government

The direction of the Committee has been noted for compliance and it is being kept in view while framing the schedule for preparation of the Tenth Plan.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 42.4)

The Committee are also constrained to note that due to the abnormal delay in getting the Ninth Plan approved the growth target had to be revised downwards from 7% to 6.5%. During the evidence, the Secretary was candid enough to admit that in order to achieve even the growth rate of 6.5%, the percentage of the growth during the remaining two years will have to be 7.4%. He has also expressed an apprehension that since three vital years of the Plan have already passed during which the GDP has grown by 5%, 6.8% and 5.9% only, it may be difficult even to achieve a growth rate of 6.5%. In view of the fact that valuable time has already been lost, concerted efforts need to be made at all levels to achieve at least the revised targets now fixed in the Ninth Five Year Plan.

Reply of Government

The Ninth Plan has projected an average growth rate of 6.5 per cent per annum in GDP as against the growth rate of 7 per cent envisaged in the approach paper approved by the NDC. The scaling down of the target was necessitated by the changes in the national as well as global economic situation. In the first two years of the Plan, there was a slow down in the growth rate of Indian economy, a sharp decline in the export growth, a

significant revenue shortfall and significant deterioration in the State Government's finances. Taking these developments into account, it was decided to recommend to the NDC that the growth target be scaled down to 6.5 per cent per annum. Implicit in this target is an average growth rate of more than 7 per cent over the last three years (1999-2000) of the Ninth Plan. In this regard, the primary objective of the MTA of the Ninth Plan has been to assess the possibility of reaching the targets of the Ninth Plan, identify the areas of significant shortfall and the reasons therefor, so as to arrive at a basis for evolving appropriate Policy Package/Plan Strategies for mid-term corrections in the implementation of the Plan.

[Ministry of Planning, File No. H-11018/3/2000-Admn. IV,
Dated : 05.12.2000]

CHAPTER V

**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH
FINAL REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT IS STILL AWAITED**

-NIL-

NEW DELHI;
11 April, 2001

21 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

SHIVRAJ V. PATIL,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE

The Committee sat on Monday, 19 March, 2001 from 1500 hours to 1700 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Shivraj V. Patil — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ajay Chakraborty
3. Smt. Renuka Chowdhury
4. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
5. Shri Rupchand Pal
6. Dr. Sanjay Paswan
7. Shri Annasaheb M.K. Patil
8. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan
9. Shri T.M. Selvaganpathi
10. Shri C.N. Singh
11. Shri Kirit Somaiya
12. Shri Kharebela Swain

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
14. Dr. Biplab Dasgupta
15. Shri Suresh A. Keshwani
16. Dr. Manmohan Singh
17. Shri Narendra Mohan
18. Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy

SECRETARIAT

- Dr. (Smt.) P.K. Sandhu — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri S.B. Arora — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members. Thereupon the Committee took up for consideration the draft action taken reports on the recommendations contained in the fifth, sixth and seventh Reports of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of Ministries of Planning and Finance (Departments of Economic Affairs, Expenditure and Revenue).

3. The draft Report on action taken on the fifth Report was adopted without any amendments.

4. ** **

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX

(Vide Para 3 of the Introduction)

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FIFTH REPORT OF
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE (THIRTEENTH
LOK SABHA) ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2000-2001) OF
THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING**

	Total	% of Total
(i) Total number of recommendations	8	
(ii) Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government	3	
<i>(Vide Recommendations at S. Nos. 4, 5 and 8)</i>		
(iii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	2	25
<i>(Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 1 & 6)</i>		
(v) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	3	
<i>(Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 2, 3 and 7)</i>		
(v) Recommendation/Observation in respect of which final reply of the Government is still awaited	0	00.00
<i>(Nil)</i>		