

57

**PERFORMANCE OF THE MINISTRY OF
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS**

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE
2011-2012**

FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2011-2012)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

PERFORMANCE OF THE MINISTRY OF
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND
FORESTS

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 27.4.2012
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 27.4.2012*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2012/Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)

PAC No. 1972

Price: Rs. 44.00

© 2012 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2011-2012)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)

REPORT

PART-I

I. Introductory	1
II. Afforestation	1
III. Bio-diversity	5
IV. Pollution Control	14
V. Non-Achievement of Objectives of Pollution Control caused by Leather Tanneries	16
VI. Environmental Education	18

PART-II

Observations and Recommendations	22
----------------------------------------	----

APPENDICES

I. Minutes of the Fourth Sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2011-12) held on 28th July, 2011.	29
II. Minutes of the Fifth Sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2011-12) held on 5th September, 2011	32
III. Minutes of the Twenty-first Sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2011-12) held on 24th April, 2012.	36

COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2011-2012)

Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Dr. Baliram
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Shri Anant Kumar Hegde
6. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
7. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
8. Shri Sanjay Nirupam
9. Shri Jagdambika Pal
10. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
11. Shri Adhi Sankar
12. Kunwar Rewati Raman Singh
13. Shri K. Sudhakaran
14. Dr. M. Thambidurai
15. Dr. Girija Vyas

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Tariq Anwar
17. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
18. Shri Naresh Gujral
19. Shri Prakash Javadekar
20. Shri Satish Chandra Misra
- *21. Shri J.D. Seelam
22. Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Devender Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Director*

*Elected *w.e.f.* 29th August, 2011 *vide* the vacancy occurred *vice* Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan was appointed Minister *w.e.f.* 12th July, 2011.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Public Accounts Committee (2011-12), having been authorised by the Committee, do present this Fifty-Seventh Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Performance of the Ministry of Environment and Forests' based on C&AG Report No. 17 of 2010-11, Union Government (Scientific Departments) relating to the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

2. The Report of Comptroller and Auditor General of India was laid on the Table of the House on 26th November, 2010.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests on the subject at their sittings held on 26th July and 5th September, 2011. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 24th April, 2012. Minutes of the Sittings form Appendices to the Report.

4. For facility of reference and convenience, the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

5. The Committee would like to express their thanks to the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests for tendering evidence before them and furnishing the requisite information to the Committee in connection with the examination of the subject.

6. The Committee place on record their appreciations of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI;
24 April, 2012

4 Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

PART I

REPORT

I. INTRODUCTORY

This report is based on the audit of the transactions and performance of the Ministry of Environment and Forests by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 2008-09. The Ministry incurred an expenditure of Rs. 1711.29 crore during the said year. The Audit findings are contained in C&AG's Report No. 17 of 2010-11. The objective of the Audit was to create awareness and urgency about conservation and protection of the environment. The thrust areas of the audit were afforestation, biodiversity, pollution control and environmental education.

The Committee, after scrutinizing the Audit Report, the written replies obtained from the Ministry and their oral deposition, found a number of deficiencies and irregularities in various schemes and programmes which were initiated by the Government, as highlighted in the succeeding paras.

II. AFFORESTATION

2. The Planning Commission, in its Approach Paper in September 2001, had fixed the target of increasing the forest/tree cover in India to 25 per cent of the geographical area of the country by the end of Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007) and 33 per cent by 2012. Further, it had also been observed that availability of land and quality planting material were major gap areas as highlighted during the discussions for the Tenth Five Year Plan. The National Afforestation and Eco-Development Board (NAEB) under the Ministry of Environment and Forests is responsible for promoting afforestation, tree planting, ecological restoration and economic development in the country. Keeping this in mind, the NAEB decided to restructure the existing Grants-in-Aid scheme which was introduced in 1987 for providing assistance to voluntary agencies for tree planting (VA Scheme) and also to identify the constraints. The voluntary agencies could be non-Governmental organizations, registered societies, non-profit organisations, cooperatives, charitable trusts etc. Only those agencies which had been registered at least for the last five years and had requisite experience in the field of environment and social sector were considered for financial assistance. The re-structured scheme renamed as Grants-in-Aid for "Greening India Scheme" was approved by the Expenditure Finance Committee in March, 2005 at a total cost of Rs. 49.50 crore to be implemented during the Tenth Five Year Plan.

3. The broad objectives of this scheme was to financially assist the Voluntary Agencies (VAs) for taking up the afforestation, tree planting and eco-developmental activity. The Greening India Scheme further extends these objectives by including setting up of nurseries, training, evaluation activities, etc. Funds under these schemes were to be given to the voluntary agencies in three instalments to the State Forest

Departments/Forest Development Agencies in two instalments. During the period 2003—08, National Afforestation & Eco-Development Board sanctioned 647 projects at a cost of Rs. 59.48 crore of which 560 projects (87%) were sanctioned to voluntary agencies and 87 projects, (13%) to FDAs/SFDs. The total amount released during 2003-09 was Rs. 47.03 crore. The Audit findings indicated that the project completion rate under the said scheme was very poor and there was no assurance that the funds released to the voluntary and other agencies had actually been utilized by them for the purpose for which they were sanctioned. The following table highlights the findings of the Audit Report.

Table 1

Audit findings in respect of the 647 sanctioned projects

(Amount Rs. in crore)

	Released of instalments						Projects		Total	
	One Instalment		Two Instalment		All Instalments		Dropped			
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Projects sanctioned to VAs	352	13.64	185	15.92	20	1.77	3	0.22	560	31.55
Projects sanctioned to FDAs & SFDs	47	3.59	35	3.20	NA*	NA*	5	0.50	87	7.29
Total	399	17.23	220	19.12	20	1.77	8	0.72	647	38.84

*Funds under these schemes were given to the SFDs/FDAs in two instalments.

4. The Audit findings in respect of the 647 sanctioned projects are detailed in the following paragraphs:—

(a) Projects sanctioned to Voluntary Agencies:

- Out of 560 projects sanctioned to VAs, in 352 projects (62.85 per cent) costing Rs. 30.70 crore, only first instalment amounting to Rs. 13.64 crore was released but remaining two instalments were not released as NAEB did not receive necessary documents viz., UCs and progress reports from the VAs concerned or the mid-term evaluation reports from concerned State Government/PCCF. Thus, implementation of all of these projects was incomplete as VAs did not come back to NAEB for release of the second and third instalments. This casts doubt on whether the VAs actually spent the funds released to them in the first instalment and the possibility of misutilisation/fraud cannot be ruled out.
- In 185 projects (33.04 per cent) involving Rs. 18.15 crore sanctioned to VAs, first and second instalments were released (Rs. 15.92 crore) but final instalment (Rs. 2.23 crore) was not released by NAEB due to non-receipt of final evaluation report and UCs from concerned State Government/PCCF of necessary documents from VAs. Thus, these projects also remained incomplete.

- Only in 20 projects (3.57 *per cent*) costing Rs. 1.79 crore sanctioned to VAs, all the installments of grants were released (Rs. 1.77 crore).
- Three projects (0.54 *per cent*) involving Rs. 22.44 lakh were dropped.

(b) Projects sanctioned to Forest Development Agencies and State Forest Departments:—

- Out of 87 projects sanctioned to FDAs and SFDs, in 47 projects (54.02 *per cent*) involving Rs. 4.91 crore sanctioned to FDAs/SFDs, only first instalment amounting to Rs. 3.59 crore was released but remaining instalments were not released as NAEB was yet to receive necessary documents/progress reports from FDAs/SFDs. Thus, project implementation was incomplete in 54.02 *per cent* of the projects sanctioned to FDAs/SFDs.
- In 35 projects (40.23 *per cent*) involving Rs. 3.20 crore all the installments of grants were released. However, only in 20 projects (23 *per cent*) final progress report and UC were received.
- Five projects (5.75 *per cent*) involving Rs. 50 lakh were dropped.

5. The Committee note that only 3.57 *per cent* of the projects sanctioned to VAs were actually completed. In financial terms, only 5.65 *per cent* of the total funds were spent on these completed projects. The possibility of misutilisation/fraud is not ruled out as majority of the VAs neither came back to NAEB for the next instalments after release of first instalment nor did they furnish UCs/progress reports. The NAEB had failed to ensure recovery of funds from these VAs and it did not initiate any action against the defaulting VAs. In case of the projects sanctioned to FDAs/SFDs only 23 *per cent* of the sanctioned projects could be completed. More than 93 *per cent* of projects did not achieve their targeted objectives, thereby affecting the overall objective of afforestation.

6. The first instalment was to be released to the VAs immediately after the sanction of the project. After the utilization certificates and progress reports for the first instalment were received, NAEB was required to carry out mid-term evaluation of the project through Principal Chief Conservator of the Forest of the State concerned. Based on this report, NAEB was to release the second instalment. The third instalment was payable only after the receipt of utilization certificates for the second instalment and final evaluation report by the Principal Chief Surveyor of Forest. concerned. Thus, project completion was contingent on VAs/SFDs/FDAs getting all the three instalments and submitting utilization certificates.

7. On being asked about the number of VAs that availed all the three instalments of funds under the afforestation project, the representative of the Ministry during the evidence informed as under:—

"In 269 cases, only one instalment was released, in 246 cases, two instalments were released and only 54 VAs have received all the three instalments and complied with all the relevant formalities."

8. The Committee wanted to know the concrete action taken against those voluntary agencies which siphoned off public money and vanished without trace. In reply, the Ministry stated that:—

"Only seven such agencies have been blacklisted and FIRs have been lodged against them,"

Asked whether any FIR had been lodged against any officer of the Ministry as such a large scale fraud could not have been committed without the support of the concerned officers in the Ministry, the Secretary stated:—

"The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests was trying to trace the defaulter NGOs and that the Ministry had filed FIRs against 07 delinquent VAs. However, FIR was filed against only one erring officer."

9. On being asked further on the matter, the Secretary stated:—

"Prior to 2005, no target was set for tree plantation activity and the scheme was 'demand driven' and the term 'demand driven' was not recorded in the files."

10. In response to a question about the total area of afforestation, the witness informed the Committee that:—

"After 2005, out of a total target of 27,000 hectares to be afforested, only 7200 hectares were covered under the VA Scheme."

Audit found various inadequacies in project implementation and monitoring under the tree planting component such as lack of correspondence with the defaulting VAs, absence of mid-term evaluation and failure to blacklist VAs as required under the general financial rules. On being asked about the discrepancies in the implementation of the scheme, the Secretary stated:—

"There is a need to involve civil society and also for some checks and balances in regard to the flawed system of money flowing directly to the NGOs/VAs. In order to avoid further loss to the national exchequer, the Ministry is now planning to route the money through the State Governments."

On being asked whether in a way the Ministry was not abdicating its responsibility, the Witness clarified that:—

"By involving the State Governments the fiscal monitoring would be done in a more effective manner. Further they were insisting on furnishing of Utilization Certificates by the VAs apart from photographic and videographic evidence directly from the villages where the afforestation was targeted. The Ministry would also monitor the progress through their six regional offices in different parts of the country."

When asked whether the Ministry officials have any mechanism in place to undertake regular visits for physically monitoring the green cover, the representative testified that:—

"officers do visit the fields to verify the effectiveness of the afforestation".

11. On the issue of monitoring, the Secretary conceded that:—

"The Hon'ble Member is correct and that our Ministry do it at random and we do not do thorough monitoring because we just do not have the manpower and the capacity to do it. But we are involving the State Governments because they should have a stake in this in terms of protection."

As per the Guidelines, financial assistance was to be given to SFDs for facilitating production and availability of quality planting material through establishment of high-tech nursery and satellite nursery.

However, Audit Report categorically pointed out that during the years 2005-08, there was no achievement under setting up of satellite nurseries even though 464 such nurseries were targeted to be set up during 2005-06 and 2006-07. In December 2009, NAEB replied that no such proposal for satellite nurseries was received and hence none was approved. Apparently, the targets were fixed without preliminary survey and NAEB also did not take adequate steps to generate demand for quality planting material.

III. BIO-DIVERSITY

12. The Annual Report of the Ministry of Environment and Forests for the year acknowledges that bio-diversity is under threat world-wide and India is no exception. Threat to species is primarily due to decline in the areas of habitation and, fragmentation of habitats. Loss of bio-diversity may lead to unpredictable changes in the eco-system. India is one of the 17 identified mega bio-diverse hot spots in the world. Out of 70% of the total geographical area surveyed so far, 45500 plant species and 91000 animal species representing about 7% of the world's flora and 6.5% of the world's fauna, respectively, have been identified. From the bio-diversity point of view, India has 59,353 insect species, 2546 fish species, 240 amphibian species, 460 reptile species, 1232 bird species and 397 mammal species, of which 18.4% are endemic and 10.8% are threatened. It has been estimated that at least 10% of the country's recorded wild flora, and possibly the same percentage of its wild fauna, are on the endangered list, many of them are on the verge of extinction.

(a) Efforts to Conserve Bio-diversity

13. To encourage protection of bio-diversity by national Governments, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and international legally binding treaty was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro in 1992. CBD has three main objectives (i) conserving biological diversity; (ii) using biological diversity in a sustainable manner; and (iii) sharing the benefits of biological diversity fairly and equitably. India became a party to this treaty in 1994.

14. To give effect to the CBD, the Biological Diversity Act was enacted in 2002. The Act empowered the Central Government to notify any species that were on the verge of extinction or were likely to face extinction in the near future and take appropriate steps to conserve them. The NBA constituted an Expert Committee in October 2005. This Expert Committee was to develop guidelines within 90 days to identify, notify and denotify rare, threatened, endangered and endemic species and also to recommend the final list of regulations for conservation. The Expert Committee made its recommendations in April, 2006 which were approved by NBA in 2007 and forwarded to Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) in July, 2007. Ministry of Environment and Forests directed BSI and Zoological Survey of India (ZSI) to prepare State-wise list of critically endangered species of plants and animals along with measures to rehabilitate and to preserve them. ZSI prepared the list in August 2008 and BSI prepared the list and Guidelines in October 2008 to send their views/approval on the list of threatened species and directed NBA to take follow-up action with the State Diversity Boards and State Governments for their response within one month. The Audit found NBA did not revisit the list of critically endangered species as requested by the Ministry of Environment and Forests. It was also found that NBA did not have any information on the receipt of its information from SBBs/State Governments regarding the list of critically endangered species. As a result, list of critically endangered species could not be notified and the measures to ensure their conservation could not be put in place.

15. The Act listed provisions for regulated access to biological resources by bonafide end-users for various purposes including scientific research, commercial activities and sustainable use of non-timber forest produce. The Act was to be implemented through the National Bio-Diversity Authority (NBA) at the national level followed by State Diversity Boards at the State level and Bio-Diversity Management Committees at the local community level. As provided in the Act, the Central Government established the National Bio-Diversity Authority (NBA) in October 2003 in Chennai for implementing the provisions of the Act. While examining the functions of NBA, the Committee found that one of the most essential components to make any institution workable, is to have a Chairman who will assist in providing guidance, counsel and act as a mentor to the organization. However, the post of the Chairman, NBA had been lying vacant for the past several years. On being asked about the credentials of the Chairman, the NBA, the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests stated:—

"The selected Chairman is a technocrat with specialization in IPR and presently the head of the Bio-diversity wing of the United Nations Environment Programme."

16. During the course of evidence, the Committee also found that while 21 States had established State Diversity Boards, 7 States namely Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Bihar, Orissa, Meghalaya, Jammu & Kashmir and Assam had not established State Bio-diversity Boards as of April, 2009.

17. On being asked about the progress with regard to the formation of State Bio-diversity Boards in respect of the States lagging, the Ministry replied that:—

"NBA has been pursuing the matter of Constitution of State Bio-diversity Board by addressing letters to Hon'ble Chief Minister, Hon'ble Minister of Forests, Chief Secretary, Principal Secretary (Forests), Principal Chief Conservator of Forests of Government of Jammu & Kashmir since 2004 and most likely the SBB would be constituted in near future. In respect of Assam, the State Bio-diversity Board has already been constituted in September 2010."

18. In order to implement the Guidelines of National Bio-diversity Authority (NBA), Bio-diversity Management Committees (BMCS) and Peoples Bio-diversity Registers are required to be formed at the habitation level. The Bio-diversity Management Committees (BMCs) are to be constituted in all local bodies for promoting conservation, sustainable use and documentation of bio-diversity resources. The main function of the BMCs is the preparation of Peoples Bio-diversity Registers (PBRs) in consultation with the local people. Peoples Bio-diversity Register (PBR) is to contain comprehensive information on availability and knowledge of local biological resources or any other traditional knowledge associated with them. The establishment of comprehensive PBRs would not only help to inventorise and document the local biological and genetic resources, but it would also help to conserve and sustainably use the biological resources. However, Audit scrutiny revealed that these PBRs are not being maintained by a majority of BMCs. As a result, information on bio-diversity remains undocumented. Moreover, out of 14,000 registers, only 932 have been formed so far in eight States like Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal. In this regard, the Committee wanted to know the reasons for such a low number of Bio-diversity Registers in various States and the efforts made by the Ministry to achieve 100 *per cent* figures. Replying to this query, the Ministry in a written note intimated as under:—

"The documentation of People's Bio-diversity Register involves collection of primary data/information which is local/informal/unstructured/oral and in traditional/folk form. This has to be transformed into a highly structured scientific format. Therefore, it is a tedious and complex exercise which involves field visits/camps in a given territorial jurisdiction of BMC. The documentation of PBR also requires support of local NGOs, technical groups and other Government line departments. It is pertinent to mention that completion of a PBR for a given area requires a couple of years as it involves listing out all organisms including micro-organisms. Sometimes, the samples need to be sent to laboratories for identification and classification etc."

19. In reply to a question, the Ministry replied that as of October, 2011:—

"1121 PBRs have been documented in the country. It is pertinent to mention that documentation of PBRs have also been carried out in those areas where BMCs are yet to be formed owing to proactive steps taken by SBBs and other agencies. One of the main reasons for slow progress is lack of availability of taxonomists/experts in the country especially in the districts to identify flora and fauna correctly. In addition, lack of specific financial allocations to develop PBRs has slowed down the process."

20. The Ministry also furnished State-wise details on the documentation of PBRs as given in Table 1:—

Table 1: State-wise documentation of PBRs

State	Documentation of PBRs
Andhra Pradesh	1
Arunachal Pradesh	—
Assam	—
Bihar	—
Chhattisgarh	—
Goa	—
Gujarat	—
Haryana	—
Himachal Pradesh	1
Jammu & Kashmir	—
Jharkhand	3
Karnataka	212
Kerala	265
Madhya Pradesh	480
Maharashtra	—
Manipur	2
Meghalaya	—
Mizoram	—
Nagaland	—
Odisha	—
Punjab	—
Rajasthan	—
Sikkim	—
Tripura	—
Tamil Nadu	—
Uttarakhand	139
Uttar Pradesh	1
West Bengal	17
Total	1121

21. On being asked to furnish the reasons for not notifying the list of critically endangered species in 21 States and the action plan to conserve them, the Ministry replied as under:—

"The relevant Section in the Act dealing with threatened species in Section 38 which provides that the Central Government in consultation with the concerned State Government to notify from time to time any species which is on the verge of extinction or likely to become extinct in the near future as a threatened species, and prohibit or regulate their collection and also to take appropriate steps to rehabilitate and preserve those species.

Accordingly for implementation of this Section, the Ministry of Environment and Forests requested two national survey organizations, Botanical Survey of India (BSI) and Zoological Survey of India (ZSI) to prepare State-wise lists of threatened species of plants and animals which are likely to become extinct in the near future, alongwith guidelines for rehabilitating and preserving such species. The BSI and ZSI got these State-wise lists and guidelines prepared *inter alia* through organizing a national consultation with experts. This list was sent to all State Governments for comments. The comments received from some of the State Governments were examined in consultation with BSI and ZSI. Thereafter, notifications notifying threatened species have already been issued for 14 States, of Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, Meghalaya, Goa, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Bihar, Tripura and Tamil Nadu. The matter is being actively pursued with other State Governments who have despite regular reminders not sent their comments/approval on the list sent to them."

22. Asked to explain the absence of uniform regulation for conservation and protection of BHS and the delay in notification of Guidelines on establishment of Biodiversity Heritage Sites (BHS) and formulation of the rules for management and conservation of BHS, the Ministry replied as under:—

"The NBA has finalized and issued the model guidelines on selection and management of BHS to all the SBBs in May 2011 for necessary follow up action. As per Sec-37 (1) and (2) of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, the State Government in consultation with local bodies may notify areas of biodiversity importance as biodiversity heritage sites. The State Government in consultation with the Central Government may also frame rules for the management and conservation of all the heritage sites. The State of Karnataka has already submitted its draft rules for scrutiny and notification since it is the only State which has notified three BHS in the country so far."

23. According to Audit, though the NBA appointed a legal consultant in November, 2005, it did not take effective action to contest questionable IPRs but the NBA claimed in April 2009 that they were in the process of establishing a legal cell. When the Committee queried further, the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, stated:—

"They still do not have a full-fledged legal cell but are using advocates for the purpose."

24. In addition, various biodiversity species worth thousands of millions of rupees have been taken away by foreign scientists, botanists and businessmen from this country causing an incalculable loss to the national exchequer. Asked whether the lost/plundered biodiversity which originally belonged to India based on various sources of literature, tradition or geographical appellations has been traced in the last 15 years of the post-globalization era, the representative of the Ministry stated:—

"The Botanical Survey of India was able to identify only 46,000 floral species and 81,000 faunal species in our country, which is no where near the total, which is in millions."

The witness admitted that:—

".....we do not have enough taxonomists. We are not getting the right people; people are not coming here."

Elaborating further, the representative stated:—

"In collaboration with the Department of Science and Technology, India established Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) in 1999 and it is in the public domain and is being used by the research bodies. However, much needs to be done in this field."

25. In January 2008, the NBA constituted an Expert Committee for medicinal plants. The Committee came into being after 4 years of the establishment of NBA. The job of the Committee *inter-alia* was to provide a list of medicinal plants in India, suggest ways of safeguarding traditional knowledge relating to medicinal plants, suggest a list of endangered medicinal plants and develop guidelines for their conservation, etc. However, Audit pointed out that the said Committee met only once in April 2008 and until March 2009, the regulations had not been finalized. In April 2009, the NBA stated that they proposed to reconstitute the Expert Committee. In March 2010, the Ministry of Environment and Forests replied to an Audit query that Botanical Survey of India was asked to prepare a State-wise list of threatened list of plants. Audit found that only 07 States notified the list.

(b) Botanical Survey of India (BSI)

26. The Botanical Survey of India (BSI) was established in the year 1890 at Kolkata. It works as a subordinate office under the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). Its basic objective was to undertake surveys by exploring the plant resources of the country and identifying flora with economic virtues. After the ratification of the Convention on Bio-Diversity in 1994 by 150 countries including India, a larger role for the BSI was envisaged. Some of the major objectives of the BSI remodeled in line with the provisions of CBD are as below:—

- (i) Exploration, inventorisation and documentation of phytodiversity¹ in general and protected areas, Hotspots, Fragile ecosystems and Sacred Groves² in

¹Phytodiversity is the enumeration of total number and variety plant species of an area.

²Sacred Groves are groups of plants or a small forest protected by humans inhabiting near or around them due to their religious belief.

particular; publication of national, State and district floras. (Article 7 of CBD: Identification and Monitoring)

- (ii) Identification of red list species³ and species rich areas needing conservation. (Article 7 of CBD: Identification and Monitoring)
- (iii) Survey and documentation of traditional knowledge (ethanobotany⁴) associated with plants. (Article 7 of CBD: Identification and Monitoring)
- (iv) *Ex-situ* conservation of critically threatened taxa⁵ in botanical gardens, develop and maintain botanical gardens, musea⁶ and herbaria to aid conservation. (Article 8 of CBD: *in-situ* conservation and Article 9: *ex-situ* conservation)
- (v) Revisionary/monographic studies on selected plant groups. (Article 12 of CBD: Research and Training)
- (vi) Environment Impact Assessment of areas assigned to BSI for study. (Article 14 of CBD: Impact Assessment and Minimising Adverse Impacts)

27. According to Audit, the BSI was not effective in meeting its remodeled objectives as there are inadequate identification/documentation and monitoring of plant species. Only a few surveys and explorations were carried out to identify and document the Protected Areas and Fragile Ecosystems. The Red Data Book was updated in 1990 and last updated version was printed in 2003 thereby impacting conservation efforts. Further, identification of different ethnic groups associated with usage of plant species for different purposes was not done. The BSI did not generate adequate data for *in-situ* conservation and it did not carry out *ex-situ* conservation with impacted conservation of bio-diversity. As such, BSI could not effectively fulfil its role in meeting India's commitment to CBD. A review of the financial management and manpower of BSI for the period 2002-09 by the Audit is contained in the table below (Table 2).

³ Red listed species are those threatened species under various categories, which are listed in the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) list.

⁴ Ethnobotany is the scientific study of the relationships that exist between people and plants.

⁵ It is plural of "Taxon" which is a taxonomic unit from the rank of Family downwards e.g., Family/genus/species (and its different infra-specific categories like sub-species, variety, sub-variety and forma) which have characters in common differentiating the unit from other such group.

⁶ It is a depository for living or on non-living objects having scientific value.

Table 2: Funds required and sanctioned by MoEF

Year	Funds asked for by BSI during 2002-09			Funds released by MoEF during 2002-09			Actual expenditure during 2002-09		
	Plan	Non Plan	Total	Plan	Non Plan	Total	Plan	Non Plan	Total
2002-03	10.65	12.38	23.03	5.15	12.38	17.53	4.97	10.97	15.94
2003-04	11.33	12.27	23.60	6.41	12.27	18.68	5.83	10.62	16.45
2004-05	14.38	12.42	26.80	8.78	12.42	21.20	7.89	11.61	19.50
2005-06	16.97	13.10	30.07	6.50	13.10	19.60	6.73	12.43	19.16
2006-07	23.26	13.83	37.09	8.00	13.83	21.83	7.52	12.90	20.42
2007-08	8.00	13.84	21.84	8.00	13.84	21.84	7.66	13.09	20.75
2008-09	10.69	15.13	25.82	10.69	19.33	30.02	10.27	18.81	29.08
Total	95.28	92.97	188.25	53.53	97.17	150.70	50.87	90.43	141.30

28. Audit scrutiny revealed that against the projected requirement of Rs. 95.28 crore towards plan activity during 2002-09, the BSI got Rs. 53.53 crore which was only 56.18% of the projections made by BSI. Further, of the Rs. 53.53 crore, BSI could spend only Rs. 50.87 crore. Table 3 shows the sanctioned strength and vacancies in the BSI.

Table 3: Details of sanctioned strength and men in position in BSI

Position as on	Scientific			Non-scientific		
	Sanctioned strength	Men-in-position	Vacancy	Sanctioned strength	Men-in position	Vacancy
As on 01.04.2006	459	283	176 (38.34)	825	618	207 (25.09)
As on 01.04.2007	441	275	166 (37.64)	822	592	230 (27.98)
As on 01.04.2008	441	270	171 (38.78)	817	585	232 (28.40)
As on 01.04.2009	441	268	173 (39.23)	817	587	230 (28.15)
As on 01.04.2010	439	245	194 (44.19)	799	551	248 (31.04)

29. It was found by the Audit that only 21 national parks, 4 bio-reserves and 27 wild-life sanctuaries were fully explored and partially explored for the first time during 2002-09. As of 2009, 64% national parks, 54% bio-sphere reserves and 94% of the wild-life sanctuaries remained to be explored. Thus, it may be appreciated that periodic survey exploration and identification work relating to protected areas was grossly inadequate. The BSI also failed to conduct population studies and mapping. Population studies are conducted to determine the total number of individuals of a taxon (species) in the area explored while mapping is done to determine the range of distribution of that particular species. The Audit reviewed 35 tour reports out of the 695 tour reports submitted by scientists. It was found that in none of the cases, activities relating to population studies and mapping were conducted during survey of the above area and tour reports did not contain adequate information for monitoring of plant species. Similarly, in the case of Sacred Groves, Audit observed that out of 15397 Sacred Groves, only 02 Groves situated in Meghalaya were explored by BSI as of 2002. It was further observed that one more Sacred Grove situated in Sikkim was studied during 2002-09. However, the report of the work is yet to be published. On being asked about the poor performance of the BSI in this regard, the Ministry through a note has intimated as under:—

"Sacred Groves, as the name suggests, are held sacred because of religious beliefs of people who link them to supernatural powers and therefore, such Groves are protected in majority of cases, by such people themselves. Therefore, from the point of view of urgency for prioritization, these Groves assume lesser significance compared to Protected Areas, Bio-diversity Hotspots and Fragile Ecosystems which are under tremendous anthropogenic pressure. Accordingly, with the available resources, it is prudent on part of the BSI to generate baseline data for these vulnerable areas for their effective monitoring and conservation, thereby resulting in lesser thrust on the Sacred Groves."

30. The Audit further found that the red data book which represents the present status of rare, threatened, endangered, vulnerable, extinct species were upgraded in 1990 and the last upgraded version was printed in 2003. As no status survey has been conducted by BSI, the same has not been updated since then. Ethno-Botanical studies document the traditional knowledge of different ethnic groups. With the advancement of civilization, this ethnic botanical information has been depleting at an alarming rate. While reviewing the information of BSI in 2002, the Audit found that much needed to be done by the BSI in this respect. On being enquired whether the Ministry had brought out any detailed report on the initiatives taken by the botanical Survey of India on target based specific publications on Protected Areas, Bio-diversity Hotspots, Fragile Ecosystem etc. the Ministry explained as under:—

"No. Publication is not only a human resource intensive work but also a revenue intensive work. BSI is accordingly bringing out publications in a phased manner with the resources available with it. Bringing out of specific publication on Protected Areas, Bio-diversity Hotspots, and Fragile Ecosystems requires a lot of funds and this amount is required in addition to

the expenditure on other important publications like Flora of India/States, periodicals, etc. If the funds are made available, the above publications will be accomplished over the next three years. However, to minimize the cost of printing and enhance the Carbon credit, bringing out e-publications of the floristic accounts of these protected areas could also be considered".

31. When the Committee wanted to know about the targets in terms of hectares set by the BSI for the exploration of fragile ecosystems in the country, the Ministry submitted:—

"As per the Annual Action Plan duly ratified by the Research Monitoring and Advisory Committee constituted for the purpose, targets for exploration of fragile ecosystems are not set in terms of hectares but ecosystems and these targets are fixed on an annual basis depending on the available manpower, infrastructure and finances available and the thrust areas fixed for a particular year. While the target for the year 2010-11 was fixed for exploration of fragile ecosystem "Flora of cold desert of Ladakh" which is continuing during 2011-12, the target fixed for 2011-12 is for exploration of 'Wetland Flora of Gangetic Plain of Bihar'."

32. When the Committee wanted to know the details of the likely action plan to implement specific projects for comprehensive study on specific protected area, biodiversity hotspots, fragile ecosystems and sacred groves etc. the Ministry intimated through a note as under:—

"The Action Plan for implementation of projects to study specific protected areas, biodiversity hotspots, fragile ecosystems and sacred groves is already in place on yearly and 5-yearly basis and these areas are targeted in a phased manner with judicious deployment of available resources. During 11th Five Year Plan period, 23 Protected Areas, 2 fragile ecosystems spread across all the four Biodiversity hotspots of the country were taken up. During the 12th Five Year Plan period, 40 Protected Areas, 3 wetlands and 650 sacred groves will be taken up."

33. The Audit during its examination found gross failure on the part of the BSI to conduct population studies and mapping. Population study is conducted to determine the total number of individuals of a taxon in the area explored while mapping is done to determine the range of distribution of a particular species. These two are the essential tools of monitoring of species. In this connection, Audit reviewed 35 tour reports out of the 649 tour reports submitted by the scientists and found that in none of the cases, activities relating to population studies and mapping were conducted during survey of these areas. Further, the tour reports did not contain adequate information for monitoring of plant species.

IV. POLLUTION CONTROL

34. It is through the mechanism of pollution control that the process of reduction of elimination of pollutants into the environment is controlled. Various regulatory authorities have been put in place to keep a check on the discharge of pollutants into

the atmosphere. Non-compliance to the laid down standards for pollution control poses a risk to human health and environment.

35. The Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB), a statutory organization under the Ministry of Environment and Forests had conceptualized an 'eco-city programme'. Its overall objective was to improve the environment of selected cities and bring in visible results in environment through implementation of identified environmental projects. The programme in the long run was expected to create awareness and local dynamics for decreasing environmental burden/stress, improving living conditions and help in achieving sustainable development in the city. The CPCB initiated the eco-city programme at a total cost of Rs. 30 crore under the Tenth Five Year Plan for the period 2002-07. Initially, twelve towns/cities were earmarked keeping in view the historical, cultural and tourism importance. However, the programme was initiated in only 06 towns viz. Ujjain, Puri, Thirupathy, Kottayam, Vrindavan and Thanjavur. More towns were to be covered later on based on the results of the study on these six towns. The eco-city programme was to be coordinated and executed by the CPCB and was to be implemented by the municipality with local coordination and fund management by the respective State Pollution Control Board (SPCB).

36. It was observed by the Audit that works undertaken under the programme remained incomplete in all the six cities selected for the first phase of the programme. In Puri, no progress was made in three projects sanctioned and entire fund released was lying unspent with SPCB/municipality for more than seven years. In Kottayam, both the projects identified and sanctioned remained incomplete and none of the activities identified later were implemented. In Ujjain, the projects being implemented remained incomplete. In Vrindavan, no project was implemented under the eco-city programme and the entire fund sanctioned to the SPCB was lying unutilized with it for more than seven years. In Thanjavur, no project was started under the eco-city programme and in Thirupathy, only three out of six projects were implemented.

37. It was further revealed by the Audit that the CPCB did not take any action to revive any of the projects after August-September 2008, leaving the works undertaken under the programme incomplete. In addition, the second phase of the project was not initiated at all. Thus, the objectives of the programme to improve the environment through implementation of identified environmental improvement projects in towns and cities of cultural/historical/heritage and tourism importance were not achieved.

38. The Audit further pointed out that the following deficiencies in the implementation of eco-city programme:—

- **Unspent balance not refunded:** CPCB released Rs. 2.79 crore to SPCBs against which SPCBs released Rs. 92 lakh to municipalities. The unspent balance of Rs. 1.88 crore was lying with SPCBs.
- **Interest accrued by the SPCBs not disclosed:** As per MoUs, SPCBs were to keep a record of the interest accrued on the budget releases by CPCB and same was to be provided to CPCB while submitting request for release of subsequent instalments. The interest accrued was to be adjusted while releasing subsequent instalments to SPCBs. It was observed in audit that

only two SPCBs, Kottayam and Puri had disclosed the accrued interest earned on payments released to them and that too only once in a span of seven year duration.

- **Commitment from the municipalities not taken:** The CPCB did not take firm commitment from municipalities regarding contribution of matching fund. As a result, in the case of the cities of Puri and Vrindavan, work could not be started till date as there was no commitment from the municipalities for the matching fund. CPCB did not include any penalty clause in the agreement which can be invoked in the event of default.
- **Delay in implementation of the projects:** On an average, the duration of the projects sanctioned by CPCB was for six months. However, there was delay of almost four years in implementation of these projects and they continued to be implemented without any sanction for extension by CPCB.

39. On being asked about the poor implementation and the financial impropriety of the eco-city project, the Secretary while deposing before the Committee submitted that:—

"This particular scheme was conceived when the scheme of Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) was not there and the funds were allocated on the basis of certain projects. Some city corporations were given only one week time to submit their proposals. They were asked to hurriedly suggest some projects by stating that if they did not do so within that time, then this money would go to some other place. So, based on that, very quickly these projects were gathered without a proper city plan as such. The money was not enough and that this is one of the reasons why it was not utilized fast enough, the way it should have been done. But today because the money under JNNURM is much more, this scheme was withdrawn."

V. NON-ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES OF POLLUTION CONTROL CAUSED BY LEATHER TANNERIES

40. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in a public interest litigation case, ordered in April, 1995 that 538 tanneries located in three clusters in Kolkata and generating about 30 million litres per day (mld) of effluents be shifted from the city to a leather complex and a Common Effluent Treatment Plant (CETP) be provided to treat the effluent generated from the proposed leather complex. Accordingly National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) sanctioned interest-free loan of Rs. 67.72 crore to Government of West Bengal for construction of a Common Effluent Treatment Plant at Bantala, about 20 km. south-east of Kolkata. The project was originally targeted for completion by November 1997 but could not be completed as of June 2010. The NRCD has sanctioned only four out of seven components under the project. Delay of more than 12 years in completion of the project adversely impacted the objective of ensuring safe disposal of toxic industrial effluents and solid waste from tanneries, causing immense environmental damage and health risks.

Delay in Implementation

41. The entire project was to be completed by March, 2010 as per the revised EFC though the original target was November, 1997. Even after the delay of more than 12 years, the NRCDC could sanction only four out of seven components under the project and this whole project remained incomplete as of June, 2010.

Loan agreement not signed

42. As per Rule 219 of General Financial Rules, 2005 (GFRs), all sanctions to loans should specify the terms and conditions of loan including repayment terms. However, it was noticed that NRCDC was yet to finalise the terms and conditions for repayment of loan and sign the loan agreement. In July 2009, NRCDC replied that the draft loan agreement had not been submitted by Government of West Bengal (GWB) despite repeated requests. As such, further funds would not be released till the loan agreement was signed.

43. The Audit has further pointed out that as per the Government Accounting Rules 1990, provision for the release of grants-in-aid and loans to State/Union Territory Governments under Central Plan Schemes and Centrally-sponsored Plan Schemes should be made in the Union Budget under the major heads '3601/3602-Grants-in-aid to State/Union Territory Governments' and '7601/7602 Loans and Advances to State/Union Territory Governments' respectively. However, it was noticed in audit that the NRCDC did not make any budgetary provisions for sanctioning the loan under the project. Instead, during 2001-09, the NRCDC released interest free loan of Rs. 42.24 crore to GWB from its grants-in-aid head. This was in violation of provisions of Government Accounting Rules 1990. In July 2009, the NRCDC replied that subsequent to the signing of loan agreement, the account under the loan head would be created and funds released so far would be adjusted as loan amount accordingly. According to Audit, all these provisions were to be complied with before releasing the loan. On being asked about the likely agreement between the Centre and the West Bengal Government, the Ministry through a note stated as under:—

"The State Government has to submit a plan for repayment of the Government of India contribution for the project as 'interest-free loan'. The Government of West Bengal has been requested several times to submit a draft loan agreement to be signed between the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal. The State Government has been informed that no further funds would be released for the project till the loan agreement is signed. A meeting in this regard was held on August 5, 2011 under the chairmanship of Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Forests. In response, State Government *vide* their letter dated August 12, 2011 has informed that the matter regarding loan agreement is under consideration. However, loan agreement is yet to be received."

44. As per the NRCDC's statement of November 2009, Government of West Bengal (GWB) had signed an agreement with CLC Tanners Association in May 2005 whereby the tanners were to return the cost of construction of the Central Effluent Treatment Plant (CETP). It was, however, noticed that the Association was now reluctant to pay

back the construction cost and was requesting that the loan be converted to a grant, raising the prospect of GWB not returning the loan to the NRCD. In Audit's opinion such request of CLC Tanners Association should not be entertained as it will go against the 'polluters pay principle'. On being enquired by the Committee as to whether the Ministry had directed the NRCD to open up the loan head and adjust the amount of interest free loan released under the said head, the Ministry replied as under:—

"As per the Hon'ble Supreme Court Order dated 7.4.1995, an effluent charge shall be levied on the tanneries for reimbursing the amount spent on the CETP. The repayment of loan will commence after three years from the date CLCTA completes the process of taking over charge of all infrastructure assets in an operational stage, and repayment will be spread over a period of ten years in monthly installments of equal amount on *pro-rata* basis. In order to discharge effectively its duties and responsibilities and to ensure implementation of the tripartite agreement, the CLCTA will enter into an appropriate agreement with each tannery in CLC.

Therefore, while the funds for the project were given from the existing grant-in-aid budget head of NRCD, the repayment of the loan was to commence after three years of completion of the CETP project. The State Government has to submit a plan for repayment of the Government of India contribution. The Government of West Bengal has been requested several times to submit a draft loan agreement to be signed between the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal which is yet to be received. After the signing of the loan agreement for repayment of Government of India's share, matter will be taken up with Ministry of Finance regarding the modalities of loan repayment by the Government of West Bengal into an appropriate budget head."

45. On the issue of polluting tanneries, the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and forests testified as under:—

"Out of the 483 tanneries, 400 tanneries had been shifted to new areas and settled."

The witness however confessed that:—

"as per the latest inspection, all the technologies that have been applied so far have failed to work perfectly."

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

46. Environmental education is a process of developing skills necessary for understanding and appreciating the inter-relationship among human beings, their culture and their bio-physical surroundings. In India, environmental education is imparted through methods like infusion of environmental concepts in the text books, natural history museums, programmes like National Environmental Awareness Campaign, National Green Crops, etc.

47. The National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) was set up to promote environmental education all over the country. The objectives of the NMNH *inter-alia* are to develop NMNH to achieve the highest level of quality to promote environmental education on a national level, to develop museum based educational projects so as to help school curriculum on environmental education, to develop resource material, such as audio-visual aids, low-cost teaching aids, school loan kits, etc. to promote environmental education.

48. However, Audit in its findings pointed out numerous shortcomings and came to the conclusion that the NMNH failed to meet its objectives. The four permanent galleries depicting various aspects of environment housed in NMNH were opened between June 1978-1989 but they were not updated to reflect the current issues. The exhibits it seemed were frozen in time. Current issues like climate change, global warming, combating desertification, tsunamis, depletion of ozone layer etc. were not depicted in the galleries. Audit observed that the Advisory Committee of NMNH in December, 2006 had advised that the restoration of galleries and exhibits of NMNH be completed by March, 2007 but it was not done. It also recorded in March 2007 that the exhibits in some galleries were archaic and suggested that the development of galleries be outsourced immediately and some skilled workers should be taken on contract basis, however, this too was not done. Besides the exhibits being very old and limited in scope, they were very amateurish and not presented in a way to encourage people to explore and learn concepts of natural history.

49. One of the major objectives of NMNH was to undertake museological and collection based research activities in consonance with the scope and resources of the museum. Audit observed that no research was being conducted by NMNH. In the follow-up action on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee meeting held in November 2007, it was stated that the NMNH should collaborate with other institutions in organizing new innovative programmes. But it was noticed in audit that the NMNH had not undertaken any national/international cooperation/collaboration programmes/projects during the period 2004-05 to 2008-09. NMNH has not signed any Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with any natural history museum/environment educational institutions for collaborating in research on environmental issues.

50. The NMNH is housed in the FICCI building, New Delhi. When the proposal for setting of NMNH was mooted in April 1973, it was suggested that the museum be temporarily seated in the FICCI building until a permanent building was ready. However, despite a proposal for acquiring land construction of the museum being included in the Ninth and Tenth Five Year Plans, no tangible progress has been made so far. Audit scrutiny revealed that the museum galleries were full of dust and grime. The exhibits had no labels and some of them were damaged. During monsoon, the floors of the galleries were flooded, the walls suffered from leakage and seepage resulting in damage to exhibits. In case of power failures, there was no power back up system. The upkeep of the taxidermy unit was very poor. The cell was poorly maintained. Some of the specimens were dumped in cupboards and above the almirahs of a room. The NMNH

has neither conducted any physical inspection/verification of these collections nor maintained complete lists of these items. Audit also found that the library too was in a shabby condition. Its collection lacked relevant books on the subject of environment. The library software installed for easy access to the library books was not working since 2006. There was no proper sitting arrangement.

51. On being asked about the number of school children/public who visited the NMNH, the Ministry provided the following statement:—

Table 4: Visitors to NMNH

S. No.	Year	General visitors	School students	Total
1.	2006 April—2007 March	75938	32886	108824
2.	2007 April—2008 March	74280	45563	119843
3.	2008 April—2009 March	79507	45493	125000
4.	2009 April—2010 March	34901	166147	201048
5.	2010 April—2011 March	27013	87941	114954
Total (5 years)		291639	378030	669669

It was noticed that there was a downward trend in the year 2010-11 when the number of visitors declined from 201048 in 2009-10 to 114954 in the year 2010-11.

52. The Committee wanted to know the steps being taken for the recruitment of sufficient number of trained guides to explain the environmental concepts displayed in the galleries to school children and general visitors. The Ministry in its written reply responded as under:—

"At present there are four guides/educational staff working in the NMNH headquarters. An advertisement has already been given for the recruitment of one educational assistants through SSC for filling up of the vacancy. NMNH has initiated a proposal for recruitment of four additional educational assistants on contractual/out-sourcing basis."

53. On being asked about the Ministry's action plan of framing any policy for governing acquisition of exhibits, framework to guide research activities undertaken by the Museum, plan to guide the development of the Museum etc., the Ministry submitted in a written reply as under:—

"The Ministry has constituted an Advisory Committee comprising of eminent experts to guide and monitor activities of the museum including research and also provide directions for further development of NMNH. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to be held in October 2011."

54. When enquired by the Committee with regard to the steps taken to intensify the research activities at NMNH with the collaboration of foreign research institutes, the Ministry submitted as under:—

"A team of officials including Natural History Museum, London were invited to visit the NMNH in this regard. A team from NHM, London visited India during 4-8 March 2009 and held discussions with officials of the NMNH and MoEF. The team suggested to have return visits by the Director of NMNH for further discussions on future collaboration. Possible collaboration for research in natural history and museology with Natural History Museums in Europe and USA are being explored."

PART II

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee are anguished to note that indiscriminate exploitation of natural resources for meeting ever increasing developmental needs coupled with the uncontrolled growth of urbanisation, industrialisation and population explosion is adversely impacting our environment. Dumping of industrial wastes into our rivers and lakes, clearing forest lands for agricultural activities along with the increased emission of harmful pollutants into the atmosphere, have all contributed to the environmental degradation. It is in this context that Government of India put in place institutional measures and schemes for promotion of afforestation, conservation of bio-diversity, pollution control and environmental awareness/education. However, the Committee note serious deficiencies and inadequacies as pointed out by the C&AG in the implementation of environmental programmes and in the functioning of various institutions working under the Ministry of Environment & Forests. The Committee's examination of the subject as contained in the succeeding paragraphs further reinforces the Audit findings and underlines the imperative need for speedy and effective governmental intervention for conservation and protection of the environment.

2. The Committee note that the National Afforestation and Eco-Development Board (NAEB), solely responsible for promoting afforestation, tree planting and restoration of ecology, directly disbursed funds to the voluntary agencies (VAs) without taking the State Governments into confidence. According to Audit, out of total 647 projects, only 20 VAs could comply with all the relevant procedures as laid down by the NAEB. The representative of the Ministry testified before the Committee that prior to 2005, no target was set for tree plantation and the scheme of afforestation was 'demand driven' though the term as such 'was not recorded in the files'. The witness further conceded that there was a need to involve civil society and application of checks and balances against the flawed system of money flowing directly to NGOs/VAs. The Ministry further admitted that only 54 VAs received all the three instalments of the grant whereas, in 269 cases the VAs vanished after receipt of the first instalment of the grant and in 246 cases after receipt of the second instalment of the grant. The Committee deplore that only 7 defaulter VAs were blacklisted by the Government against whom FIRs were filed whereas FIR was filed against only one erring officer. Apparently, grants were released to bogus VAs who were content with one or two instalments and the Ministry admitted that they vanished without a trace. The Committee are shocked that public money was looted in the name of afforestation and little tangible effort was made by the Government to book the defaulters. Surprisingly, in the whole chain associated with the screening and monitoring of the grants sanctioned to VAs, only one officer was held responsible. The Committee therefore recommend that, as in the case of Prime Minister's Gramin Sadak Yojna (PMGSY),

there should be a third party monitoring of the afforestation programme including geo-reference based verification of the real afforestation with satellite mapping with the assistance of the national Remote Sensing Agency. Besides, all the Ministries/ Departments of Government of India must be alerted about the said shady/bogus VAs so that they are debarred from grants from any Government Department in any form or manner.

3. In order to track down the defaulter/spurious VAs, the Committee further recommend that the Ministry must take the assistance of all those banks through which the money was routed to the VAs and also of the State Governments to establish the identity of the office bearers of the defaulting VAs and the beneficiaries of the grants so that the culprits are brought to justice. The Committee should like to be furnished within three months of the presentation of this report the list of all those defaulter/unscrupulous VAs who defrauded the public exchequer and the penal action taken against them as also the aggregate grants to all the VAs between 2003-04 to 2008-09 and the total area afforested by them as against the total target. Taking note of the target fixed by the Planning Commission to provide tree cover to 33 per cent geographical area of the country by the end of 2012, the apparent failure to provide the targeted tree cover and the serious ecological consequences of fast depleting forest cover, desertification and the rising threat of global warming, the Committee would like to be apprised of the latest figure of national forest cover, forest cover State-wise and the necessary fiscal measures put in place to achieve the stipulated target having regard to their specific climatic conditions. Besides, the national programme of afforestation cannot be left solely for implementation by the VAs/NGO but all the departments/agencies of the Union as well as the State Governments and Panchayati Raj Institutions need to be involved effectively to achieve the desired target and the Committee be informed.

BIO-DIVERSITY

4. The Committee note that India has a rich and varied heritage of bio-diversity encompassing a wide spectrum of habitats, from tropical rain forest to alpine vegetation and from temperate forests to coastal wet lands. India is considered to be the centre of origin of 30,000 to 50,000 varieties of rice, mangoes, turmeric, ginger, sugarcane, etc. and it is this great bio-diversity which makes it possible for millions of species including humans to co-exist. Further, the Committee note India is one of the 17 identified mega bio-diverse hot spots in the world. Out of 70% of the total geographical area surveyed so far, 45,500 plant species and 91,000 animal species representing about 7% of the world's flora and 6.5% of the world's fauna, respectively, have been identified. From the bio-diversity point of view, India has 59,353 insect species, 2546 fish species, 240 amphibian species, 460 reptile species, 1232 bird species and 397 mammal species, of which 18.4% are endemic and 10.8% are threatened. It has been estimated that at least 10% of the country's recorded wild flora, and possibly the same percentage of its wild fauna, are on the endangered list, many of them are on the verge of extinction. There is a growing apprehension that thousands of varieties of plant species is being lost and the gene pool is getting eroded by the hybrid seed. The Committee recall the hoary Indian belief "save the seeds",

demonstrating without an iota of doubt that since time immemorial respect for bio-diversity was deeply ingrained in the Indian psyche. The Committee therefore recommend that such a great bio-diversity which is typically Indian in terms of traditions, literature or geographical appellations must be preserved/protected and digitalized with the assistance of other premier scientific organizations of the Government of India including the Departments of Science and Technology, Atomic Energy and DARE. The Committee would like to be apprised of the measures instituted in this behalf.

5. The Committee note that the Biological Diversity Act 2002 was to be implemented through the National Bio-diversity Authority (NBA), the State level Boards and the Bio-Diversity Management Committees (BMCs) at the Community level across the country. The main function of the BMCs is the preparation of People's Biodiversity Registers (PBRs) in consultation with the local people with a view to compiling comprehensive information on availability and knowledge of local biological resources or any traditional knowledge associated with them. The objective behind establishment of comprehensive PBRs is to help inventorise and document the local biological and generic resources with a view to conserve and sustainably use them. The Committee are anguished to note that as against 14,000 PBRs required to be maintained, only 1121 registers had been documented by October, 2011 mainly by Madhya Pradesh (480), Kerala (265), Karnataka (212) and Uttarakhand (139). The Committee observed that though the post of Chairman, NBA has been filled after several years, seven States namely Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Bihar, Meghalaya, J&K and Assam were yet to constitute the State level Boards. Further the Committee are anguished to note that precious diverse bio-diversity species have been taken away by unscrupulous foreign scientists, botanists and businessmen causing an incalculable damage to India's bio-diversity and irretrievable loss to the national exchequer. The Committee are saddened to note the pathetic performance of national Bio-diversity Authority (NBA) as even after six years of its formation, it failed to notify important regulations like access to bio-diversity, transfer of research results and intellectual property rights, recruit or hire adequate number of taxonomists, set up a regular legal cell etc. Further, the Expert Committee to suggest lists of endangered medicinal plants in India and the guidelines for their conservation was yet to be set up. Moreover, it had no information in regard to the grant of intellectual property rights outside India on many biological resources obtained from India. The Committee therefore recommend that NBA should urgently set up a monitoring cell to keep track of Intellectual Property rights granted outside India which rightfully belong to India and also set up a regular legal cell to assist them. NBA should also develop guidelines for documentation of local bio-diversity, bio-resources and associated traditional knowledge and document the selected areas/fields of 'traditional knowledge' for commercial exploitation. NBA, therefore, needs to draw a time bound action plan to ensure that the list of endangered species in rest of the 21 States is notified expeditiously to prevent exploitation of medicinal plants for commercial purposes and to minimize threat to their conservation. Further, the Committee recommend that concerted and sustained efforts be made to recruit or engage adequate number of taxonomists/experts for identification of flora and fauna and to prepare the list of

endangered species which are on the verge of extinction or are threatened and appropriate administrative and legislative framework must be put in place for their protection and conservation. The Committee would like to be apprised about the corrective measures taken to address the deficiencies and to meet the objectives of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002.

6. The Committee are deeply concerned over the indiscriminate use of agricultural pesticides and the use of a veterinary drug-Diclofenac-as cattle feed and their mortal effect on fauna and flora. They are all the more disturbed over the vanishing population of vultures which are almost on the verge of extinction and disappearance of sparrows and black bucks from many parts of the country. Also, of equal concern is of uprooting and displacement of people from vast areas designated as wild life sanctuaries particularly the displaced people of Kolleru Lake in the Andhra Pradesh. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government commission an empirical study of the vanishing species of our fauna, the causes responsible for and the corrective measures required to be taken. They also recommend that the affected/displaced families of the national parks/wild life sanctuaries be properly rehabilitated with provision of adequate and alternative means for their sustenance and the Committee be apprised.

7. The Committee observe that the objectives of Botanical Survey of India (BSI) were remodeled to meet the provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Since only a few surveys and explorations were carried out to identify and document the protected areas and fragile eco-systems, the BSI was not effective in meeting its remodeled objectives due to gross inadequacy in identification/documentation and monitoring of plant species. The Committee note that the Red Data Book was updated in 1990 and last updated version was printed in 2003. The Committee deplore that no further identification of different ethnic groups associated with usage of plant species for different purposes was done after 1990. Admittedly, the BSI is also hamstrung by serious financial shortages, infrastructure and dearth of manpower especially taxonomists. The Committee regret to note that BSI miserably failed to fulfil its objectives and the assigned role in meeting India's commitments to CBD due to want of necessary infrastructure and requisite manpower with the BSI for conservation of bio-diversity. The Committee, therefore, recommend that:—

- (i) Necessary resources/infrastructure be made available to the BSI for effective and speedy conservation of India's precious bio-diversity and to meet its commitment on the convention on Biological diversity;
- (ii) The ethnobotanically important plant species be inventorised and a suitable publication brought out periodically for sustainable utilization of bio-resources;
- (iii) The Red Data Book showing the status of threatened, rare, endangered, endemic, vulnerable species, extinct species be updated urgently to give necessary spurt to conservation efforts to these threatened and vanishing species;

- (iv) Comprehensive survey and documentation may be done of bio-diversity hot spots, fragile eco-systems and sacred groves for their proper conservation;
- (v) The monitoring mechanism for *ex-situ* and *in-situ* conservation be strengthened to conserve India's great biological diversity;
- (vi) The causes of environmental degradation due to developmental activities be studied closely and suitable corrective measures taken;
- (vii) The format of tour reports of the visiting scientists/researchers be suitably devised so as to make them all encompassing and result-oriented; and
- (viii) The education programme need to be revisited with specific changes in the curricula for creating interest in the student about bio-diversity and its importance in our life.

POLLUTION CONTROL

8. The Committee note that the Central Pollution Control Board conceptualized an 'Eco-city Programme' with a view to bringing environmental improvement in select cities at a total cost of Rs. 30 crore during the 10th Five Year Plan period 2002-07. Twelve cities of historical/heritage/cultural significance were selected but the programme was initiated in six cities namely, Kottayam, Puri Thanjavur, Tirupati, Ujjain and Vrindavan. Audit scrutiny of the projects reveals startling irregularities in project approvals, release of instalments in violation of prescribed financial procedure or without approval the Detailed Project Report (DPR), release of funds even when there were reports of unsatisfactory implementation, non-implementation of the Scheme where the municipality was unable to provide matching fund of 50 per cent, non-refund of unspent balances, non-disclosure of interest by some State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs) failure of CPCB to take prior commitment from the SPCBs to implement the projects, etc. The Committee therefore urge the Government to ascertain the reasons for such a slackness on the part of CPCB and also to revisit the 'Eco-city Programme, for effective and speedy implementation and to apprise them in due course.

9. The Committee observe delay in effective implementation of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in April 1994 directing that 538 tanneries, located in three clusters in Kolkata generating 30 mld of effluents, be shifted from the city to a leather complex with facility of Common Effluent Treatment Plant (CETP). With a view to implementing the order, the Government of West Bengal (GWB) submitted a proposal to the GoI in the National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) based on which the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) approved the estimated project cost of Rs. 65 crore to be shared in equal measure by the GWB and NRCD. The project was to be completed by November 1997. The Committee are anguished to note the cavalier manner in which the project cost was worked out without providing for Efficient Transportation System (ETS), Common Chrome Recovery System (CCRS), Safe Solid Waste Disposal System (SSWDS) and Treated Effluent Sump and Pumping Station (TESPS) which were integral components of the CETP. CCEA therefore sanctioned the revised proposal at a revised cost of Rs. 135.44 crore with

a share of Rs. 67.22 crore to be borne by the NRCDC. The project was scheduled to be completed by March 2010. The Committee are concerned to note the inspection reports of the NRCDC and the field functionaries of the MoEF highlighting deficiencies, irregularities and delay in the implementation of the Project. Asked to explain, the representative of the MoEF admitted that 400 tanneries had been shifted to areas but as per latest inspection, all the technologies that have been applied so far have failed to work perfectly. As regards the loan agreement, which was required to be signed before releasing the loan, the MoEF admitted that the loan agreement was yet to be signed and efforts were underway to materialize the same. While deploring the unconscionable delay in safe disposal of industrial effluents and solid waste from tanneries causing incalculable environmental damage, the Committee recommend that the MoEF expedite implementation of the project within a definitive time frame through regular coordination and rigorous monitoring of the project. The Committee should like to be apprised within four months of the presentation of this Report, the measures taken and the physical outcome thereof to meet the stated objects of the project, the total expenditure incurred by the GoI on the project, the status of loan recovery as also the measures instituted to combat the environmental degradation by tanneries elsewhere in the country, State-wise/cluster-wise.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

10. The Committee note that the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) was set up with the laudable objective to depict India's rich diversity of flora, fauna and mineral wealth to provide an out of school facility for education of children and to promote environmental awareness among the masses. To begin with, the NMNH was set up on a rented building in New Delhi in 1978 with a long term vision to emerge as a recognized institution, nationally and internationally, in the field of environmental education and natural history museology. Later regional Museums were set up in Mysore in 1995, in Bhopal in 1997 and in Bhubaneswar in 2004. The fourth Museum was to be set up in Sawai Madhopur in Rajasthan by 2009. The Committee are startled to note the Audit findings relating to the functioning of NMNH *vis-a-vis* its objectives. NMNH did not have any consultation with the NCERT for the development of curriculum for standardizing environment education, no audio-visual aids were developed for environmental education during 2004-2009; no school loan kits were developed after 1986; the exhibits remained the same for decades without depicting current environmental concerns like global warming, natural disasters, afforestation, pollution control, sustainable development, utilization of solar energy, rain water harvesting, depletion of Ozone layer, climate change, etc. The Committee are, therefore, of the considered view that the whole concept of NMNH needs a revisit.

11. The Committee are saddened to note that the Museum is utterly in defunct and dilapidated conditions and it would be nothing short of mockery to call it a national Museum worthy of National and International acclaim. The visitors' comments truly reflect the abject state of neglect of the Museum, some of which read, "very, very ill maintained, a very bad and dirty place"; "this Museum does not make sense being named National Museum"; "should be closed immediately"; "there is nothing to be seen except filthy building and non-working models", etc. Asked to explain the

shortcomings and deficiencies pointed in Audit, the MoEF had no cogent replies especially with regard to the inordinate delay in setting up a permanent Museum. Mindful of the conceptual objective and conscious of the need for heightening environmental education and showcasing our great diversity of fauna and flora and mineral wealth, the Committee recommend that the Government set up a Committee of eminent museologists, environmentalists and educationists drawing clue from the National Science Museum and the Parliament Museum equipped with interactive story-telling museum with sound-light-video animation and set up a permanent state-of-the-art first rate National Museum of natural history to fulfil the vision of the former Prime Minister late Smt. Indira Gandhi behind setting up the museum and to meet the ever growing need of setting up a national museum of natural history.

12. Further, the Committee recommend that in order to build a sustained and momentous national drive for protection and conservation of environment, the students be involved actively in surveying the fauna and flora in their vicinity and in afforestation and for disseminating environmental awareness and heightening environmental concerns across the country. Suitable summer vacation programmes for heightening environmental awareness be drawn up and the students incentivised to partake in the programmes in a big way apart from revisiting the school curricula as recommended elsewhere in this Report. The Committee would like to be apprised of the measures initiated in this behalf as also the mechanism put in place to monitor periodically the outcome of such measures.

NEW DELHI;
24 April, 2012
4 Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)

DR. MURLIMANO HAR JOSHI
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2011-12) HELD ON 28TH JULY, 2011

The Public Accounts Committee sat on Thursday, the 28th July, 2011 from 1100 hrs. to 1320 hrs. in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Anant Kumar Hegde
5. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
6. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
7. Shri Sanjay Nirupam
8. Shri Jagdambika Pal
9. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
10. Shri Adhi Sankar
11. Shri K. Sudhakaran
12. Dr. M. Thambidurai

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
14. Shri Naresh Gujral
15. Shri Prakash Javadekar
16. Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Devender Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Sanjeev Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

Representatives of the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Shri Jayant Sinha | — | Principal Director of Audit (Report Central) |
| 2. Ms. Geetali Taare | — | Principal Director of Audit (Scientific Department) |
| 3. Ms. Shubha Kumar | — | Director General of Audit (Report Central) |
| 4. Ms. Nameetha Prasad | — | Director General of Audit (Scientific Department) |

Representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Dr. Tishyarakshit Chatterjee | — | Secretary |
| 2. Shri A.K. Bansal | — | Addl. Director General (FC) |
| 3. Smt. Meera Mehrishi | — | Addl. Secretary |
| 4. Smt. Gauri Kumar | — | Addl. Secretary |
| 5. Shri Rajiv Gauba | — | Joint Secretary |
| 6. Shri Rajneesh Dube | — | Joint Secretary |
| 7. Shri A.R. Chadha | — | Inspector General of Forest |
| 8. Dr. B. Venugopal | — | Director, NMNH |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of the Office of C&AG to the sitting of the Committee. The Chairman, then apprised the Members that the sitting was convened with a view to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests on the subject 'Performance of the Ministry of Environment and Forest'. Considering the wider significance of the subject, the Chairman observed that the Secretary may in the first instance brief on the various points raised by the C&AG. The Committee would then again call the representatives of the Ministry for detailed oral evidence. The Members concurred with the suggestion of the Chairman.

3. The representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests were then called in and the Chairman welcomed them to the sitting. The representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests then briefed the Committee on the Audit Paras. Members raised concerns over the serious deficiencies and irregularities pointed out in Audit. Members also pointed out that various aspects of environmental governance such as climate change, global warming etc. need to be addressed urgently. On being asked, the Secretary assured to furnish within a week the complete list of defaulter Voluntary Agencies, State-wise and the amounts involved. The representative also assured to consider the suggestion of the Committee to involve some Central Universities with a view to create a basket of courses on environmental studies and main streaming of environmental education.

4. The Chairman thanked the representatives of the Ministry for briefing the Committee and furnishing the available information that the Committee desired in connection with the examination of the subject. The Chairman also thanked the officers of the C&AG of India for providing assistance to the Committee in the examination of the subject and asked them that the Committee would resume further evidence on the subject in due course.

The witnesses, then, withdrew.

A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting has been kept on record.

The Committee, then, adjourned.

APPENDIX II

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2011-12) HELD ON 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2011

The Public Accounts Committee sat on Monday, the 5th September, 2011 from 1500 hrs. to 1725 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Anant Kumar Hegde
5. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
6. Shri Sanjay Nirupam
7. Shri Jagdambika Pal
8. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
9. Kunwar Rewati Raman Singh
10. Dr. Girija Vyas

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Tariq Anwar
12. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
13. Shri Prakash Javadekar
14. Shri Jesudasu Seelam

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Devender Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Director*
3. Shri Sanjeev Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

Representatives of the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Ms. Rekha Gupta | — | Deputy C&AG |
| 2. Shri Jayant Sinha | — | Principal Director of Audit
(Report Central) |
| 3. Ms. Geetali Taare | — | Principal Director of Audit
(Scientific Department) |

Representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Dr. Tishyarakshit Chatterjee | — | Secretary |
| 2. Shri A.K. Bansal | — | Addl. Director General (FC) |
| 3. Smt. Gauri Kumar | — | Addl. Secretary |
| 4. Smt. Meera Mehrishi | — | Addl. Secretary |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of the Office of C&AG to the sitting of the Committee. The Chairman, then apprised the Members that the sitting was convened to take further oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests on the subject 'Performance of the Ministry of Environment and Forests'.

3. The representatives of the Ministry of Environment and Forests were called in and the Chairman welcomed them to the sitting. The Members expressed their concern over the fact that a number of NGOs which were associated with the afforestation schemes had disappeared after availing the first instalment of the grant and the outstanding amount continued to be unaccounted. A large number of NGOs were also untraceable. The Committee asked the Ministry to take the assistance of the banks through which the money was routed to establish the identity of the office bearers of the NGOs. Such defaulting NGOs should also be blacklisted and an alert may be sent to all the Ministries about such NGOs. The Committee gave three months of time to the Ministry for tracing all the NGOs which vanished after taking the grants. The representative of the Ministry assured that conclusive action would be taken to trace the defaulter NGOs with the help of the Banks and State Governments.

4. The Committee thereafter took up the issue of bio-diversity. The Committee was informed that the Bio-Diversity Act, 2002 exhaustively deals with bio-diversity including bio-diversity hertiage sites. It was stated that all relevant information has been digitalized. The Committee was apprised by the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests that on the directions of the Committee, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development has been approached to introduce a programme of study on Taxonomy which will be funded by the Ministry of Environment and Forests. A suggestion was also made that the taxonomic studies could be funded by the Government by way of suitable scholarships.

5. The Committee urged the Ministry to take immediate and effective steps to save vulture population which is on the verge of extinction due to adverse effects of veterinary drug called Diclofenace being used in cattle feed. Taking note of the plea that the drug cannot be banned, the Chairman observed that the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR)/Indian Council for Agriculture Research (ICAR) may be requested to find a suitable substitute for Diclofenace. The Committee also expressed their concern over the dwindling number of sparrows in the country and underlined the need for their protection.

6. The Committee pointed out the flawed land acquisition policy of the Ministry for national parks and sanctuaries without actually initiating any work on them as in the case of Kolleru lake in Andhra Pradesh. The Committee emphasized that school children may be sensitized and involved to protect the flora and fauna during vacations by way of holding workshops and field visits. The Committee also brought to the notice of the Ministry the decline of the Black Buck population near Allahabad and the need for immediate reversal of the trend.

7. The Committee, thereafter, took up the issue of functioning of CPCB and pointed out that Fluorosis and Chromium, the carcinogenic substances found in alarming proportions in the tanneries and the pollution being caused to water bodies including rivers, lake and underground water.

The Chairman thanked the representatives of the Ministry for deposing before the Committee.

The witnesses, then, withdrew.

8. The Committee, thereafter, took up for consideration the Memorandum No. 2 regarding selection of additional subjects for examination during the year 2011-12. After some discussion, the Committee selected the following additional subjects for examination and report during the year 2011-12.

- (i) Report No. 6 of 2011-12 —Union Government (Civil) Performance Audit—XIX Commonwealth Games, 2010.
- (ii) Report No. 7 of 2011-12—Union Government (Defence Services) Coast Guard Performance Audit Role and Functioning of Indian Coast Guard.
- (iii) Union Government (Civil) Performance Audit—Fertiliser Subsidy.
- (iv) Union Government (Defence Services)—Adarsh Co-operative Housing Society, Mumbai.
- (v) Union Government (Civil)—Autonomous Bodies.
- (vi) Report No. 34 of 2010-2011 Union Government (Railways)—Para Nos. 2.2, 3.1, 4.1 and 7.2.
- (vii) Report No. 38 of 2010-11 on Autonomous Bodies—Para Nos. 5.1, 8.4, 8.5 and 8.8.

9. The Chairman then thanked the Officers of the C&AG of India for providing assistance to the Committee in the examination and selection of subjects.

A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting has been kept on record.

The Committee, then, adjourned.

APPENDIX III

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY FIRST SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2011-12) HELD ON 24TH APRIL, 2012

The Public Accounts Committee sat on Tuesday, the 24th April, 2012 from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Room No. '51' (Chairman's Chamber), Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
5. Dr. Girija Vyas

Rajya Sabha

6. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
7. Shri Prakash Javadekar
8. Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Devender Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Abhijit Kumar — *Director*
3. Shri D.R. Mohanty — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Smt. A. Jyothirmayi — *Deputy Secretary*

Representative of the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India

1. Shri A.M. Bajaj — Pr. Director, Audit
2. Ms. Geetali Tare — Pr. Director, Audit
3. Ms. Sudha Rajan — Director

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India to the sitting of the Committee. Apprising the Members that the meeting had been convened to consider and adopt four Original Draft Reports of the Committee, the Chairman desired that the said Reports be taken up one by one for consideration for appropriate incorporation of the views, if any, of the Members therein.

3. Accordingly, the Committee took up the following Draft Reports for consideration and adopted the same:

(i) *** **

(ii) 'Performance of the Ministry of Environment and Forests' based on the C&AG Report Nos. 17 of 2010-11 (Para No. 63) and 15 of 2010-11 (Chapter II);

(iii) *** **

(iv) *** **

4. The Committee, then authorized the Chairman to finalise the Draft Reports in light of the factual verifications, if any, received from Audit and present the Reports to the House on a date convenient to him.

5. The Chairman thanked the Members for their cooperation and active participation in the discussions. He also thanked the representatives of the Office of the C&AG for their valuable inputs and assistance to the Committee in the examination of the subjects. The Committee also appreciated the hard work put in by the Secretariat in drafting and finalising 25 Reports during the current term of the Committee.

The Committee, then, adjourned.

PARLIAMENTARY PUBLICATIONS CAN ALSO BE OBTAINED FROM THE FOLLOWING AUTHORISED AGENTS:—

Sl.No.	Name of Agent	Sl.No.	Name of Agent
	ANDHRA PRADESH		
1.	M/s. Ashok Book Centre, Benz Circle, Vasavya Nagar, Vijaywada-520006. (A.P)	13.	M/s. Jayna Book Depot, Chowk Chhapparwala, Bank Street, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.
	BIHAR	14.	M/s. Standard Book Co., 125, Municipal Market, Connaught Place, P.B. No. 708, New Delhi-110001. (T. No. 23411919)
2.	M/s. Progressive Book Centre, Zila School, Pani Tanki Chowk, Ramma, Muzaffarpur-842002. (Bihar)	15.	M/s. D.K. Agencies (P) Ltd., A/15-17, Mohan Garden, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-110059.
	DELHI	16.	M/s. Vijay Book Service, C-D/123/C, Pitam Pura, New Delhi-110034.
3.	M/s. Jain Book Agency, C-9, Prem House, Connaught Place, P.B. No. 1113, New Delhi-110001.		MADHYA PRADESH
4.	M/s. Bookwell, 2/72, Sant Nirankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009.	17.	M/s. Suvidha Law House, 28, Malviya Nagar, Roshanpura, Bhopal-462003.
5.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-D-50, Lajpat Nagar, Old Double Storey, New Delhi-110024. (T. Nos. 26412362 & 26412131)		MAHARASHTRA
6.	M/s. Central News Agency Pvt. Ltd., P-23, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001.	18.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 585/A, Chitra Bazar, Khan House, P.B. No. 2621, Mumbai-400002.
7.	The Manager, M/s. Books India Corporation, Publishers, Importers & Exporters, L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110052.	19.	M/s. Jaina Book Agency (India), 649-A, Girgaum Road, Opp. 2nd Dhobi Talao Lane, Mumbai-400002.
8.	M/s. Sangam Book Depot, LG-3, Akarshan Bhawan, 23, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.		PUDUCHERRY
9.	M/s. Biblia Impex Pvt. Ltd., 2/18, Ansari Road, New Delhi-110002. (T.No. 23262515)	20.	Editor of Debates, Legislative Assembly Department, Puducherry-605001.
10.	M/s. Universal Book Traders, 80, Gokhale Market, Opp. New Courts, Delhi-110054. (T. No. 23911966)		TAMILNADU
11.	M/s. Seth & Co., Room No. 31 D, Block-B, Delhi High Court, Sher Shah Road, New Delhi-110003.	21.	M/s. M.M. Subscription Agencies, 123, Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore-641012.
12.	M/s. Dhanwantra Medical & Law House, 592, Lajpat Rai Market, Delhi-110006. (T. No. 23866768)	22.	M/s. C. Sitaraman & Co., 73/37, Royappettah High Road, Chennai-600014.
			UTTAR PRADESH
		23.	M/s. Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 1077, Allahabad (U.P).
		24.	M/s. Ram Advani Bookseller, Mayfair Building, Hazrat Ganj, GPO Box No. 154, Lucknow-226001.