

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2011-2012)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF PANCHAYATI RAJ

*[Action taken on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-Second Report  
(Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants of the  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj for the year 2011-12]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 22.03.2012*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22.03.2012*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*March, 2012/Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)*

C.R.D. No. 28

*Price* : Rs. 56.00

© 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 Anupam Art Printers, New Delhi-110 005.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2011-2012) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	13
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	27
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	28
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited.....	33

### APPENDICES

I. Status of Plan Plus .....	36
II. Extracts of Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 29 February, 2012.....	46
III. Analysis of Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-second Report (15th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development.....	48



COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2011-2012)

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit
5. Shri Maheshwar Hazari
6. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti
7. Shri P. Kumar
8. Shri Raghuvir Singh Meena
9. Dr. Ratna De (Nag)
10. Shri Rakesh Pandey
11. Shri A. Sai Prathap
12. Shri P.L. Punia
13. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
14. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
15. Shri Bishnu Pada Ray\*\*\*
16. Dr. Sanjay Sinh
17. Smt. Supriya Sule
18. Shri Kodikunnil Suresh
19. Shri Narendra Singh Tomar
20. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan
21. Smt. Vijaya Shanthi M\*\*

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
23. Shri Ganga Charan

---

\*\*\* Nominated to the Committee *w.e.f.* 03.01.2012 *vice* Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu.

\*\* Nominated to the Committee *w.e.f.* 25.11.2011.

24. Shri Hussain Dalwai
25. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa
26. Dr. Ram Prakash
27. Shri P. Rajeeve\*
28. Shri Mohan Singh
29. Smt. Maya Singh
30. Miss Anusuiya Uikey
31. Vacant\*\*\*\*

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Brahm Dutt — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Raju Srivastava — *Deputy Secretary*

---

\* Nominated to the Committee *w.e.f.* 02.11.2011 *vice* Shri P.R. Rajan.  
\*\*\*\* Dr. (Smt.) Kapila Vatsyayan retired on 15.02.2012.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2011-2012) having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present the 26th Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 22nd Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (15th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2011-12) of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj.

2. The 22nd Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 26 August, 2011. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 13 February, 2012.

3. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 29 February, 2012.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 22nd Report of the Committee (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) is given in **Appendix-III**.

NEW DELHI;  
21 March, 2012  

---

1 Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,  
Chairperson,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.





## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2011-12) deals with the action taken by the Government on the observations/recommendations contained in their Twenty-Second Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj for the year 2011-2012.

2. The Twenty-Second Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 26 August, 2011 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. The Report contained 17 observations/recommendations.

3. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the observations/recommendations contained in the Report have been received from the Government. These have been examined and categorised as follows:

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

Serial Nos.: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 17

Total: 12  
Chapter-II

- (ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies:

Serial No.: NIL

Total: 00  
Chapter-III

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

Serial Nos.: 3 and 15

Total: 02  
Chapter-IV

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

Serial Nos.: 11, 13 and 16

Total: 03  
Chapter-V

4. The Committee desire that final replies in respect of recommendations (Serial Nos. 11, 13 and 16) for which only interim replies have been given by the Government and the Action Taken Notes on the recommendations contained in Chapter-I of the Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.

5. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of the recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.

**A. Devolution of 3Fs and Centrality of Panchayats in Centrally Sponsored Schemes**

**[Recommendation Serial No. 3 (Para No. 2.3)]**

6. The Committee noted that in a country like India, largely populated in villages, the growth and empowerment of Panchayats has not taken place in post Independence era as it ought to have. It was more disheartening to find that during post Independence period spanning over six decades of Parliamentary democracy almost all the constitutional provisions related to Panchayats have not been implemented in letter and spirit. These include concept of Gram Sabha (article 243A), constitution of Panchayats (article 243B), powers, authority and responsibilities of Panchayats (article 243G) etc. as laid down in Part IX of the constitution, article 243ZD of Part IXA relating to District Planning Committees (DPCs) read with Eleventh Schedule illustrating 29 matters which might be considered by the State Legislatures for devolution to the Panchayats so as to ensure that they function as a 'unit of self-Government'.

The Committee learnt from the Document 'Roadmap (2011-17) for Panchayats' brought out by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj recently that slow progress on the implementation of article 243ZD regarding consolidation of Plans prepared by the Panchayats at District Planning Committees in relation to 29 subjects listed in Eleventh Schedule was due to non-cooperation of Line Departments in different States. Similarly, they were also dismayed to find that same dismal scenario prevailing over implementation of article 243G (endowing Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them as institutions of self-Government) because of discretion being enjoyed by the State Governments under that article. The Committee's examination of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj of the last 2-3 years had revealed that *status quo* is prevailing on the important issues of (i) devolution of Functions, Finances and

Functionaries from different State Governments to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), (ii) ensuring centrality of Panchayats on different Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSSs) related with subjects enumerated in the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution that are being mandated exclusively for Panchayats under the Constitution. Coming to the issue of devolution of 3Fs, the Committee observed that although devolution of Functions and Finances has made some progress, these have not been accompanied by transfer of Functionaries to the Panchayats. For instance, from the latest details made available to the Committee which pertain to 2009-2010 showing State-wise progress on 3Fs, the Committee were dismayed to know that whatever devolution of 'Functions' from various State Governments to Panchayats has been done that has been restricted to the pro-Panchayat States of Kerala, Karnataka, West Bengal, Bihar and Maharashtra. However, the same is not the case with the States of Assam, Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttarakhand and Uttar Pradesh. Similarly on devolution of Finances, the Committee find that majority of the State Governments are releasing funds to Panchayats based on 'Functions' devolved. However, on devolution of Functionaries, the Committee were alarmed to note that barring the States of Kerala, Karnataka and West Bengal and to some extent Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Chhattisgarh, in the majority of the States, the situation highly unsatisfactory as Panchayats under these State Governments are being managed with departmental staff, skeleton staff or staff on deputation from the Government Departments. To sum up, the Committee found that largely the devolution of 3Fs from different State Governments to Panchayats has not taken place as contemplated in the Constitution even after the six decades of enforcement of the Constitution of India. In view of this, the Committee were of the strong opinion that a lot more is needed on the part of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj and State Governments which are lagging behind in the entire process of devolution of 3Fs to Panchayats.

The Committee also recommended that this issue should be taken up at the level of Union Minister of Panchayati Raj with Chief Ministers of different States to have a first hand idea of the issues involved and for faster transition of power to the Panchayats.

The Committee also strongly recommended that a high level Committee should be constituted to assess the implementation/present status of various provisions existing in the Constitution as also in the relevant Central/State Acts aimed at strengthening the Panchayats. Such a Committee should be asked to give their Report before start of the Twelfth Five Year Plan with a view to ensuring that goal, objectives and priorities of the 12 Five Year Plan cover the areas which need greater focus for strengthening the Panchayats.

7. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under:—

“MoPR has continued to pursue with States/UTs to devolve 3Fs to Panchayats as per Constitutional mandate. Recently, Rajasthan has transferred all functions with funds and functionaries in respect of 5 Departments namely Primary Education, Health, Women Child Development, Agriculture and Social Welfare up to District level to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) at appropriate level. Ministry of Panchayati Raj has prepared model GOs on devolution of 3Fs to the PRIs and has sent the same to 17 States namely UP, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Tripura, Tamil Nadu, Sikkim, Punjab, Odisha, Manipur, J&K, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh & Andhra Pradesh on 3rd May, 2011 with a request to issue similar GOs after necessary changes, if needed.

Meetings with Principal Secretaries/Secretaries have been held on 25.4.2011 and 19.9.2011 to review the status of devolution and to recommend ways to ensure effective devolution to PRIs. In the last meeting held with them, MPR has underscored the need for devolving 3Fs by States/UTs. Besides, during visits to States/UTs, Officers of MoPR continue to emphasise need for adequate devolution of 3Fs to Panchayats.

MoPR also continues to improve its Panchayats Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS) aimed at incentivizing of States that devolve 3Fs to Panchayats. For the last two years, awards under PEAIS have been given by the Prime Minister to emphasize the importance of devolving 3Fs to the States.”

**8. The Ministry in their reply have stated that States/UTs have been pursued to devolve 3Fs to Panchayats as per constitutional mandate. The Committee appreciate the action taken by the Government on their recommendation on this aspect. The Committee had also recommended that a high level Committee should be constituted to assess the implementation/present status of various provisions existing in the Constitution as also in the relevant Central/ State Acts aimed at strengthening the Panchayats. Further, the Committee had emphatically desired that the said Committee should be asked to give their Report before the start of Twelfth Five Year Plan. However, the Committee find that the Ministry had conveniently skipped these aspects in the action taken reply. The Committee are constrained to express that the Ministry have not taken their recommendation in its right perspective inspite of the**

fact that the Panchayats are the only institutions which could effectively exercise the powers of preparation and implementation of special developmental plan for alleviating poverty and employment generation through various rural development programmes. Now that the Twelfth Five Year Plan would commence from April, 2012, the Committee expect that their recommendation for constitution of a high level Committee to assess that implementation/present status of various provisions for strengthening the Panchayats would be taken up with all seriousness and in a result-oriented manner. The Committee may be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

#### B. Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana (RGSY)

[Recommendation Serial Nos. 9 and 10 (Para Nos. 2.9 and 2.10)]

9. The Committee found that RGSY Scheme under the MoPR brought out for twin objectives of (i) training and capacity building and (ii) infrastructure development that budget of Rs. 73.50 crore under this scheme for around 350 non-BRGF districts in different States was far less compared to Rs. 5,050 crore to BRGF scheme covering only 250 districts across the country. The inadequacy of funds under RGSY had also been highlighted by the MoPR. The Committee were informed that major schemes of the MoPR including RGSY are pending before the Planning Commission for proposed merger with the proposed umbrella scheme of Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Shashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA). The Committee recommended that BRGF should not be merged with other schemes considering its unique objectives. Also the issue of merger of various schemes of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj into a single umbrella scheme *viz.* Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Shashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA) should be reviewed by MoPR threadbare with a view to ensure that basic objectives of the specific schemes are not lost.

10. The Committee also found that the major area of operation under RGSY is training of elected representatives and functionaries of Panchayats. In this connection, the Committee found that as against the MoPR plans to provide training of 30 lakh elected representatives and 10 lakh functionaries each year training was provided by the MoPR to only 3.5 lakhs representatives and 11.65 lakhs representatives respectively in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. The other infirmities noted *inter alia* included mismatch of official figures of training with ground realities, absence of physical verification of training, no symptoms of improvement in SCs/STs trained under RGSY to fight back in a effective manner, absence of accountability of funds given for training

as trainer officers elude Gram Panchayats quite often, delay in releases of funds for training ranging from 3 to 4 months, absence of effective Panchayat Secretary for utilization of funds at Gram Panchayat level resulting in hijacking of Gram Panchayats by dishonest and persons with criminal background, lack of coordination on the issue of training among different Departments at district level etc. The Committee felt that all these issues were relevant and should be adequately addressed at the time of restructuring of the proposed new scheme. The suggestions came up before the Committee *inter alia* included association of local MPs in training programme for PRIs, fashioning the duration of training programmes in such a manner that may invariably include the involvement/interaction with the farmers for undergoing such training programme, giving empowerment, protection and necessary help under the training programme to the weaker sections *i.e.* SCs/STs elected representatives and functionaries of Panchayats etc. for making them more effective to run Panchayats. In this connection, the Committee had been informed that various remedial mid-course corrections have already been undertaken by MoPR these include mid-course correction evaluation, online monitoring and computerization etc. Since the fate of the RGSY is hanging on the proposed merger of the scheme, the Committee felt that the remedial measures taken by the Ministry are too inadequate and are to be supplemented by proactive role of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj and concerned State Governments.

11. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under:—

“The Working Group on Panchayati Raj and Rural Governance for 12th Plan has proposed that during the 12th plan existing schemes of MoPR, be rationalized through (a) segregation development grant component of Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) and (b) merger of Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana(RGSY), e-Panchayat, Panchayat Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme(PEAIS), Panchayat Mahila Evam Yuva Shakti Abhiyan (PMEYSA) and capacity building component of BRGF into one scheme, which will have some additional features to be named as Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan(RGPSA). As per the proposals of the Working Group, this rationalization will result in following two schemes:—

- (i) RGPSA strengthening the Panchayats as effective and accountable units of Governments in all districts of the country.

- (ii) BRGF: For providing adequate Development Grant for Panchayats in blocks identified as backward as per their own context specific plans.

RGPSA is envisaged as a scheme that will allow States to strengthen their Panchayati Raj systems by taking up a range of activities as needed. As the status of Panchayats varies across States, States need to undertake different activities to strengthen Panchayati Raj in their context. For example, in UP a major concern would be staffing at the GP level. However, West Bengal already has substantial staff at GP level and Karnataka has recently strengthened its GPs by appointing Panchayat Development Officers. The focus in these States may be on the creation of good quality training infrastructure, improving Panchayat processes of planning, accounting etc. RGPSA will allow a range of activities to be undertaken by States as per State needs, so that each State can bring about needed changes to strengthen their Panchayati Raj system.

RGPSA will strengthen the Panchayati Raj system across the country and address the critical deficiencies that constrain the functioning of Panchayats. The goals of RGPSA will be:—

- Enhance the capacities and effectiveness of Panchayats and the Gram Sabhas.
- Enable democratic decision-making and accountability in Panchayats.
- Strengthen the institutional structure for knowledge creation and capacity building of Panchayats.
- Promote devolution of powers and responsibilities to Panchayats as per the spirit of the Constitution.
- Specially strengthen Gram Sabhas in Schedule V areas to discharge their responsibilities as envisaged in Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas 1996 Act (PESA).

RGPSA will have following components:—

- Strengthening of Panchayats: provision of manpower; GP buildings; e-enablement of PRIs; support to Panchayat processes; special support for Gram Sabhas in PESA areas.
- Capacity Building and Strengthening Institutional structure: Training of elected representatives and functionaries; institutional structure for training by way of provision of

State Panchayat Resource Centers in SIRDs; District Panchayat Resource Centres; institutional support at National level; Performance Assessment and incentivization of Panchayats and Gram Sabhas; IEC activities; innovation with new forms of capacity building and accountability systems; and strengthening of SEC.

- Programme Management by establishing Programme Management Units at National, State and District levels.

It is important to mention that the report of the Committee on Restructuring of Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSSs) headed by Sh.B.K.Chaturvedi, Member, Planning Commission recommended restructuring of existing 147 CSSs and reducing these to 59. The Committee has recommended that small schemes should be merged into bigger flagship, umbrella or sectoral schemes.

A Mid-course Evaluation of RGSY was commissioned by MoPR in 2010, which covered several aspects of the programme in 6 States *viz.* Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and West Bengal. The key findings and recommendations of the Evaluation Report are:—

- Outreach of Capacity Building training needs, improvement through collaboration with non-government bodies, academic institutions etc.
- A pool of trainers/resource persons should be developed at the States, Districts and Block levels.
- The SIRDs and ETCs need to be strengthened in terms of Human Resources.
- Training Needs Assessment of ERs and Functionaries should be carried out at regular intervals.
- Exposure visits to beacon Panchayats should be made mandatory.
- Monitoring and supervision mechanism needs to be set up at MoPR, State and District levels.

MoPR has initiated steps to act on these recommendations. States are being advised to avail the Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) option in various CB&T activities including actual training programmes following the Business Meet of Service Providers on 7.1.2010; it is proposed to strengthen the Training infrastructure and Human resources in SIRDs and ETCs through the proposed



scheme of RGPSA. Training programmes undertaken by States are usually done through a pool of Trainers. The Monitoring mechanism is also being strengthened. MoPR has empanelled 37 National Level Monitors from amongst retired senior level bureaucrats, academicians and Defence personnel. These NLMs are being sent to States to monitor implementation of the BRGF and RGSY programmes. Simultaneously, efforts are being made to promote use of computerization through uploading of plans and execution status in PlanPlus software. Training of SC/ST ERs is given priority and from the current year, separate grants have been provided for CB&T of SC/ST ERs. These steps would take some time to bear fruit.”

12. The Committee find that the Ministry have reiterated their earlier stated position of restructuring of existing Centrally Sponsored Schemes and merging it into bigger flagship, umbrella and sectoral schemes like Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Shashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA). The Committee would like to draw attention of the Government to the recurring malady of initially floating various schemes and subsequently merging and renaming them instead of gearing up the existing mechanism of review, monitoring and control. The Committee are of the considered opinion that to accelerate and sustain development, there is need to strengthen Panchayats at all levels so that they function as institutions of self-governance in the letter and spirit of Article 243G of the Constitution. A fresh national *impetus* is, therefore, required to be given to various schemes floated by the Ministry in the past through conferences, activity mapping, incentives and consensus instead of oft-repeated and simplest method of merging and renaming of schemes. The Committee, therefore, urge the Ministry to be extra careful while implementing the recommendations of the Committee constituted for restructuring of Centrally Sponsored Schemes headed by Shri B.K. Chaturvedi so that the basic features of earlier schemes, especially BRGF and RGSY do not get disoriented.

The Committee also note that the Ministry had initiated steps to act upon the recommendations of Evaluation Report in regard to mid-course evaluation of RGSY. The Committee would like to be apprised of the progress made in this regard.

C. Evaluation of Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana (RGSY) by CRAN

[Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para No. 2.11)]

13. The Committee found that valuable findings have come up as a result of evaluation of RGSY by an UN Agency CRAN for capacity development of PRIs in 6 States of Assam, Andhra Pradesh,

Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and West Bengal. These pertain to outreach of capacity building, training needs with association of NGOs, pooling of trainers, strengthening of SIRDs, regular assessment of training needs, exposure to beacon Panchayats, etc. The Committee felt that such an evaluation be undertaken in all the States under RGSY to have a national perspective on this issue. The Committee recommended that based on the evaluation necessary follow up action should be initiated.

14. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under:—

“The recommendations of the Committee have been accepted by the Ministry. Action in this regard would be taken and the Committee would be kept informed of the developments.”

**15. The Committee are happy to note that the findings of evaluation of RGSY made by an UN Agency CRAN for capacity development of PRIs which was confined to six States would now be extended to all the States of the country. The Committee while acknowledging the initiatives of the Ministry, re-emphasise the significance of capacity building of PRIs for development of rural areas and prepare them to deliver effectively on their responsibilities. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the progress made in this connection.**

#### **D. Action Research and Studies**

##### **[Recommendation Serial No. 15 (Para No. 2.15)]**

16. The Committee noted that another scheme of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj “Action Research and Studies” to formulate appropriate policy and to identify and remove the gaps in implementation of Part IX of the Constitution has not been implemented properly taking into account underutilization of allocations during 2009-10 and low physical performance during 2008-09 and 2009-10 in terms of studies sanctioned and studies completed. The Committee were unhappy to note that there are cases of defaulting agencies also which have not submitted their reports. The Committee, therefore, recommended that there is a need to have a fresh look into this scheme so that allocations are given with reference to physical targets.

17. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:—

- “Under the scheme the total expenditure during the year 2009-10 was to the tune of Rs. 1.61 crore. Due to the shortage/non-receipt of meaningful and substantial

proposals on the themes identified by this Ministry. The total allocation was reduced from Rs. 2.70 crore to Rs. 1.75 crore (RE). Actual Financial Achievement during the Financial Year 2009-2010 is as under:

(Amount in crore)

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Achievement
2009-10	2.70*	1.75	1.61

\*Excluding North Eastern Areas provision.

- During the year 2008-09 & 2009-10, it was decided that the Ministry will only sanction projects on the themes identified by the Ministry depending upon the needs arising out from the respective divisions of this Ministry. Accordingly bids were invited and projects were sanctioned.
- The reasons for the non-completion of large number of sanctioned research studies during the previous years was that most of the studies sanctioned during 2007-08 and 2008-09 were at the end of the year, since the proposals were received late and the organizations took some time to revise their proposals as suggested to them by the Research Advisory Committee. Also, the duration of the research projects in most of the studies sanctioned were around 15-18 months. A list of studies sanctioned, completed and still underway during the previous years till date are as follows:

Year	No. of Studies Sanctioned	No. of Studies Completed	Studies Still Underway
2004-05	5	5	-
2005-06	18	17	1 (*)
2006-07	18	17	1 (*)
2007-08	15	14	1
2008-09	10	8	2
2009-10	18	11	7
2010-11	7	4	3
2011-12 (till Dec., 2011)	4	-	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>19</b>

(\*)The organizations have submitted the draft reports along with the utilization certificate. They have been requested to make certain modifications in the report, which will be submitted by them at the earliest.

- During 2010-11, it was decided that if an organization fails to complete the project on time, the Ministry stops the subsequent instalment until the agency submits the draft report, makes a presentation on the findings and submits utilization certificate along with audited statement of accounts duly certified by a Chartered Accountant. Besides, 5% of financial penalty per month from the expiry of the due date is imposed while releasing the last instalment to the defaulting agency. The Ministry also imposes a time line for the completion of a project depending upon the area of the work, the sample to be covered and the time line proposed by the concerned agency.”

18. Scrutiny of the Ministry’s reply shows that due to shortage/ non-receipt of meaningful and substantial proposals on the themes identified by them, the total allocation under the scheme “Action Research and Studies” was substantially reduced. The Ministry in their action taken reply have also co-related the non-completion of large number of sanctioned research studies with late receipt of proposals and organizational delays in the form of revision of proposals as suggested by Research Advisory Committee. Although the Ministry have stated that time line for completion of a project depending upon the area of work, sample to be covered etc., are being imposed by them, yet they have been unable to come out with any effective prescription in the form of monitoring mechanism to oversee the flow of expenditure, completion of projects and expeditious implementation of the findings of the Reports submitted. The Committee, therefore, trust that the Ministry would come out with an innovative method to follow up their action plan meticulously so that their efforts which are aimed at identifying and removing the gaps in implementation of Part IX of the Constitution are converted into results for building of a vibrant India. The Committee also desire that the Ministry should be proactive in identifying the subjects for research alongwith individuals and organisations for efficient and purposeful attainment of objectives.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Para No. 2.1)**

The Committee take note that the Rule 331G of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha relating to examination of Demands for Grants by the Departmentally Related Standing Committees (DRSCs) was suspended by the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha due to rescheduling of the Financial Business in Lok Sabha to pass the Demands for Grants for the year 2011-12 during the Seventh Session of Fifteenth Lok Sabha without being referred to the concerned DRSCs. However, the Committee have examined the Demands for Grants and made report thereon. Since the Budget for the year 2011-12 has already been passed by the Parliament, the Committee endorse the same. Nevertheless, the Committee feel that the suggestions and recommendations of the Committee would help the Ministry of Panchayati Raj in analyzing their performance and implementation of various Schemes/Projects during the current year, which happens to be the terminal year of the 11th Plan period. The Observations/Recommendations of the Committee are given in the succeeding paragraphs.

#### **Reply of the Government**

Need no comments. The suggestions and recommendations of the Committee have been noted and necessary action is being taken as per recommendations.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para No. 2.2)**

The Committee are dismayed to note that the Ministry of Panchayati Raj is not complying with the Direction 73A of the 'Directions by the Speaker' in-as-much-as the Minister's Statement showing action taken by the Government on recommendations contained in Committee's Sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2010-11) of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj presented to the House on

16 April, 2010 has not been made in the Parliament in stipulated time frame of six months. The Committee consider non-compliance of Direction 73A by the Ministry as apathy towards the House. It also denies the legitimate right of the House to get the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee. The Committee expect that the aforesaid mandatory statement would be made in Lok Sabha expeditiously.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The concern of the Committee in the matter has been noted. All out efforts are being made to submit the statement in both the Houses of Parliament, at the earliest.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 4, Para No. 2.4)**

The Committee's examination of Eleventh Plan Projections and allocations has revealed that the Ministry of Panchayati Raj, the most important and people oriented Ministry, is not getting desired level of attention from the Planning Commission in securing the much needed funds during the entire Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) on the ground that there is a constraint with regard to overall limit of Gross Budgetary Support (GBS). While analysing the year-wise position of proposed *vis-a-vis* actual outlay, the Committee find that as against the demand by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj of nearly Rs. 3,000 crore each year during 2008-2009 and 2011-2012 to the Planning Commission, the Ministry could get even lower than 10 per cent of the demanded amount. Similarly, during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the allocation was much lower than the demand. The Committee regret to note that the Planning Commission as also the Ministry of Finance have not at all appreciated the role assigned to Panchayats in governance at grassroot level in the country. The Committee, therefore, recommend that both the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance should consider the requirement of funds for the Ministry of Panchayati Raj which is primarily meant for strengthening the Panchayats.

#### **Reply of the Government**

In response to this Ministry's letter to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission has furnished comments on the point and the same are as under:—

- (i) It has been the endeavour through the policy framework put in place to strengthen the Panchayati Raj Institutions and to make them effective delivery institutions. The funds

are flowing to the PRIs through Central schemes of various Ministries such as MGNREGA to implement the projects. Therefore, allocation of funds to PRIs has to be looked into in totality rather than just looking at the allocations of Ministry of Panchayati Raj.

- (ii) The MoPR has proposed introduction of a Panchayat Sashaktikaran Yojana in the Twelfth Plan for increasing the functional capacity of Panchayats besides the ongoing capacity building programmes for elected representatives and functionaries of Panchayats. An enhanced 12th Plan allocation has been proposed.
- (iii) The outlay for the schemes of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj will have to be considered keeping in view the total GBS available for all the plan schemes and requirement of funds for the flagship programmes of the Government which should not be starved of funds.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl.No. 5, Para No. 2.5)**

Another area that has attracted the attention of the Committee is the staggering unspent amount available with the Ministry of Panchayati Raj at end of March, 2009–March, 2010 to the tune of over Rs. 5,000 crore, and around Rs. 4,500 crore respectively. The Ministry has attributed this on account of non-receipt of Utilization Certificates in stipulated period of 12 months. Besides, the Committee regret to note that during 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 funds of BRGF to the tune of Rs. 789 crore and over Rs. 1000 crore were reduced/unilaterally cut by the Ministry of Finance. The Committee feel that these issues could have been managed at the level of Ministry of Panchayati Raj with proper and timely coordination with the Ministry of Finance. The Committee strongly recommend that the Ministry should liaise with the concerned State Governments and implementing agencies to address the problem of unspent balances and surrender of funds with a view to ensuring that this position is not repeated. The Committee would await conclusive action in the matter.

#### **Reply of the Government**

This matter has been discussed with the Secretaries of the Panchayati Raj of the State Governments requesting them to send Utilization Certificates (UCs) in time so that the funds in the next Plan period are sanctioned by the concerned authorities in time as allocated to the State Governments.

In regard to Panchayat Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS), MoPR has regularly been interacting with State Governments for sending UCs in respect of award money given to them each year. They were reminded on 23.11.2009, 23.12.2009, 8.3.2010, 24.5.2010, 15.10.2010, 25.11.2010, 25.1.2011, 5.4.2011, 31.05.2011 and 7.09.2011 in the matter. As part of this exercise, they have been requested to furnish UCs or return amount alongwith accrued interest failing which the amount would be adjusted against subsequent releases from other Schemes of MoPR. Andaman & Nicobar Islands has returned a sum of Rs. 41.02 lakh as against Rs. 36.52 lakh released to them in the year 2005-2006.

In respect of RGSY, owing to regular monitoring and review with the State Governments/implementing Agencies, the unspent balance/outstanding UCs under the scheme have been considerably reduced as would be seen from the following table:

**Status of Outstanding UCs under Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana**

(Rs. in crore)

As on 31.3.2009	As on 31.12.2009	As on 31.12.2010	As on 31.03.2011	As on 30.09.2011
38.71	25.77	19.50	15.60	11.80

The budgetary allocation of e-Panchayat in the current Five Year Plan period is Rs. 130 crores against which a sum of Rs. 50 crore (approx.) has been released during the last three years. Total pending utilization certificate under the scheme so far is of the tune of Rs. 20.85 crore only. Out of this Rs. 20.82 is outstanding with NICSI and Rs. 0.03 crore with the Government of Puducherry. The Implementing Agencies (IAs) have been reminded from time to time by this Ministry for sending the utilization certificate.

In so far as the Schemes of Panchayat Mahila Evam Yuva Shakti Abhiyan (PMEYSA) and Rural Business Hub (RBH) are concerned, it is stated that these Schemes are demand driven. In the Scheme of PMEYSA, the funds are released to the concerned States/UTs or their designated authorities in two instalments. The request for second instalment is agreed to only when UCs etc. and funds earlier released if any, of the first instalment are received by the Ministry. Similarly, the Scheme of RBH is also a demand driven scheme, under which the financial assistance is provided to the willing Implementing Agencies/Organizations who submit viable proposals on RBH with proper justifications. In their cases also the second instalment is released taking



into account the position of expenditure with regard to the amount released in first instalment, receipt of Utilization Certificate, etc. Nonetheless in deference to the observations of the Committee, the concerned States/UTs/designated Authorities and the Implementing Agencies related to implementation of the Scheme of PMEYSA and the sanctioned projects of RBH are being requested separately in this behalf appropriately.

The Ministry is regularly pursuing the issue of large unspent balances and outstanding UCs with the State/District authorities. As a result, there has been considerable improvement in the situation. The BRGF programme had an unspent balance of Rs. 3641.21 crore and the Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana (RSVY) which has since subsumed in BRGF had an unspent balance of Rs. 834.28 crore as on 31.03.2011. These figures take into account the releases up to 2009-2010. These figures do not include releases during 2010-2011. The outstanding UCs in BRGF have been reduced from Rs. 306.62 crore as on 31.3.2011 to Rs. 181.79 crore as on 31.01.2012, whereas the outstanding UCs in respect of RSVY have been reduced from Rs. 827.50 crore as on 31.3.2011 to Rs. 234.17 crore as on 31.01.2012.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

**Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para No. 2.6)**

While reviewing the preparedness of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj for Twelfth Plan (2012-2017), the Committee find that entire gamut of vital areas like restructuring of BRGF, sanctioning of funds to 'Mission project on e-Panchayats' etc. have been unnecessarily delayed and linked with the Twelfth Plan by the Planning Commission. Keeping in view that as high as 2.4 lakh Panchayats in the country with over 28 lakh elected representatives, the Committee are of the opinion that there is an error of judgment on the part of Planning Commission in delaying these two crucial issues for the Twelfth Plan on the ground that the proposed restructuring of BRGF is to be considered after getting the Reports of the Steering Committee and Working Group for Twelfth Five Year Plan. The Committee have been informed that the Working Group is likely to submit its Report in August 2011. The Committee also find that the MoPR has already placed before Planning Commission a proposal to institutionalise the role of Panchayats in governance, planning, implementation etc. creating their cadres including infrastructure requirements with a view to effectively use the huge outlay of the order of Rs. 1.7 lakh crore under the Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSSs). The Committee have also been informed that a proposal of restructuring of BRGF is pending before the Planning

Commission that envisages the merger of Capacity building component of BRGF, RGSY, e-Panchayat and PMEYSA into a single scheme under the umbrella of Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Shashaktikarn Abhiyan (RGPSA) for capacity building of PRIs in the country for augmenting the genuine requirement of Panchayats like Panchayat staff, Panchayat Ghars, Panchayat accounting, e-Panchayat, training & decentralized planning etc. and keeping the BRGF Development Grant separately with substantially higher allocations. The Committee do not approve the proposal of merger of BRGF with other schemes of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj. They, therefore, strongly recommend a thorough review of the issue of proposed merger of BRGF with various schemes of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj into one umbrella Programme as the very objective of the BRGF scheme is aimed at providing assistance to backward areas whereas the other schemes of the Ministry are aimed at Capacity building of PRIs in general.

#### **Reply of the Government**

BRGF as a separate scheme is proposed to be continued in the 12th Plan with enhanced allocation. The RGPSA would aim at comprehensive capacity building of PRIs with main component for training manpower and infrastructure.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para No. 2.7)**

While reviewing the Scheme-wise performance of MoPR, the Committee find that under BRGF as on 31.03.2011, there has been staggering amount of unspent balances in Bihar (Rs. 924.16 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 556.07 crore), Jharkhand (Rs. 423.79 crore), Madhya Pradesh (Rs. 327.93 crore), Odisha (Rs. 287.21 crore), West Bengal (Rs. 264.66 crore), Andhra Pradesh (Rs. 268.12 crore), Chhattisgarh (Rs. 210.65 crore), Maharashtra (Rs. 205.53 crore) etc. These amounts include unspent balances both in Capacity Building as also Development Grants for the Panchayats. The Committee do not approve such parking of precious funds, particularly when, there are cases of insufficiency of funds highlighted before the Committee from time to time. In Committee's view, this position is unjustifiable on the part of the MoPR and concerned State Governments to sit over much needed funds. This has seriously impacted the progress of Capacity Building of the Panchayats in a big way. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation of the MoPR that they are interacting with the concerned State Governments for expediting Utilization Certificates (UCs). The Committee note that the BRGF, being the biggest Central Assistance to State Plan (CASP) being currently handled by MoPR, is

poised for restructuring during the Twelfth Plan. The Committee recommend that the MoPR should work hard to impress upon the States to utilise their outstanding unspent balances so that the needed amount is passed on to the Panchayats for the purpose of Capacity Building and Development Grants.

### **Reply of the Government**

Ministry of Panchayati Raj have been impressing upon the State Governments for liquidating the unspent balance at the earliest. Meetings, video conferences and interactions are being held with the representatives of the State Governments in this regard from time to time.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para No. 2.8)**

The Committee note that the BRGF has been evaluated twice, first by World Bank and secondly by Ramachandran Committee constituted by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj on matters of Capacity Building of Panchayati Raj Institutions, identification of backwardness, emphasis on convergence, identification of block as a unit, e-panchayat etc. and these have been conveyed to States for action. The Committee have also been informed that subsequent to Ramachandran Committee, the Planning Commission in January, 2011 has set up a study and assigned the task to Institute of Human Development, Delhi. The Institute was to submit its report by March 2011. The Committee trust that the Institute must have given their Report by now. The Committee do not appreciate the system of constituting Committee after Committee for evaluating schemes like BRGF which touches the pulse of the people and needs no further lengthening of the process of decision making. The Committee recommend that the findings of World Bank and Ramachandran Committee and the findings of the Institute of Human Development should be the basis for course correction since these are sufficient enough for evaluating BRGF in a proper manner. Considering its objectives and utility the Committee strongly recommend that the funds for the scheme should be enhanced.

### **Reply of the Government**

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted. Planning Commission had set up a Working Group on Area Development Programme for Restructuring the BRGF and other programme during the 12th Plan period. The submissions made by Ministry of Panchayati

Raj to the working Group had taken into account the recommendations of the World Bank review and the Ramachandran Committee's report. MoPR has also requested for enhanced funds to the tune of about Rs. 10,000 crore per annum under BRGF during the 12th Plan Period.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Para No. 2.9)**

The Committee find that RGSY Scheme under the MoPR brought out for twin objectives of (i) training and capacity building and (ii) infrastructure development that budget of Rs. 73.50 crore under this scheme for around 350 non-BRGF districts in different States is far less compared to Rs. 5,050 crore to BRGF scheme covering only 250 districts across the country. The inadequacy of funds under RGSY has also been highlighted by the MoPR. The Committee have been informed that major schemes of the MoPR including RGSY are pending before the Planning Commission for proposed merger with the proposed umbrella scheme of Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA). As recommended elsewhere in the Report, the Committee reiterate that BRGF should not be merged with other schemes considering its unique objectives. Also the issue of merger of various schemes of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj into a single umbrella scheme *viz.* Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA) should be reviewed by MoPR threadbare with a view to ensure that basic objectives of the specific schemes are not lost.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Working Group on Panchayati Raj and Rural Governance for 12th Plan has proposed that during the 12th plan existing schemes of MoPR, be rationalized through (a) segregation development grant component of Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) and (b) merger of Rashtriya Gram Swaraj Yojana (RGSY), e-Panchayat, Panchayat Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS), Panchayat Mahila Evam Yuva Shakti Abhiyan (PMEYSA) and capacity building component of BRGF into one scheme, which will have some additional features to be named as Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Sashaktikaran Abhiyan (RGPSA). As per the proposals of the Working Group, this rationalization will result in following two schemes:—

- (i) RGPSA strengthening the Panchayats as effective and accountable units of government in all districts of the country.

- (ii) BRGF: For providing adequate Development Grant for Panchayats in blocks identified as backward as per their own context specific plans.

RGPSA is envisaged as a scheme that will allow States to strengthen their Panchayati Raj systems by taking up a range of activities as needed. As the status of Panchayats varies across States, States need to undertake different activities to strengthen Panchayati Raj in their context. For example, in UP a major concern would be staffing at the GP level. However, West Bengal already has substantial staff at GP level and Karnataka has recently strengthened its GPs by appointing Panchayat Development Officers. The focus in these States may be on the creation of good quality training infrastructure, improving Panchayat processes of planning, accounting etc. RGPSA will allow a range of activities to be undertaken by States as per State needs, so that each State can bring about needed changes to strengthen their Panchayati Raj system.

RGPSA will strengthen the Panchayati Raj system across the country and address the critical deficiencies that constrain the functioning of Panchayats. The goals of RGPSA will be:

- Enhance the capacities and effectiveness of Panchayats and the Gram Sabhas.
- Enable democratic decision-making and accountability in Panchayats.
- Strengthen the institutional structure for knowledge creation and capacity building of Panchayats.
- Promote devolution of powers and responsibilities to Panchayats as per the spirit of the Constitution.
- Specially strengthen Gram Sabhas in Schedule V areas to discharge their responsibilities as envisaged in Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas 1996 Act (PESA).

**RGPSA will have following components:—**

- Strengthening of Panchayats: provision of manpower; GP buildings; e-enablement of PRIs; support to Panchayat processes; special support for Gram Sabhas in PESA areas.
- Capacity Building and Strengthening Institutional structure: Training of elected representatives and functionaries; institutional structure for training by way of provision of State Panchayat Resource Centres in SIRDs; District Panchayat Resource Centres; institutional support at

National level; Performance Assessment and incentivization of Panchayats and Gram Sabhas; IEC activities; innovation with new forms of capacity building and accountability systems; and strengthening of SEC.

- Programme Management by establishing Programme Management Units at National, State and District levels.

It is important to mention that the report of the Committee on Restructuring of Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSSs) headed by Sh.B.K.Chaturvedi, Member, Planning Commission recommends restructuring of existing 147 CSSs and reducing these to 59. The Committee has recommended that small schemes should be merged into bigger flagship, umbrella or sectoral schemes.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 10, Para No. 2.10)**

The Committee find that the major area of operation under RGSY is training of elected representatives and functionaries of Panchayats. In this connection, the Committee find that as against the MoPR plans to provide training of 30 lakh elected representatives and 10 lakh functionaries each year training was provided by the MoPR to only 3.5 lakhs representatives and 11.65 lakhs representatives respectively in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. In this connection, various other issues reflecting infirmities in the training programme have come up before the Committee. These include mismatch of official figures of training with ground realities, absence of physical verification of training, no symptoms of improvement in SCs/STs trained under RGSY to fight back in a effective manner, absence of accountability of funds given for training as trainer officers elude Gram Panchayats quite often, delay in releases of funds for training ranging from 3 to 4 months, absence of effective Panchayat Secretary for utilization of funds at Gram Panchayat level resulting in hijacking of Gram Panchayats by dishonest and persons with criminal background, lack of coordination on the issue of training among different Departments at district level etc. All these issues, the Committee feel are relevant and should be adequately addressed at the time of restructuring of the proposed new scheme. In this connection, the Committee also find that some valuable suggestions have also come up before the Committee. These include, association of local MPs in training programme for PRIs, fashioning the duration of

training programmes in such a manner that may invariably include the involvement/interaction with the farmers for undergoing such training programme, giving empowerment, protection and necessary help under the training programme to the weaker sections *i.e.* SCs/ STs elected representatives and functionaries of Panchayats etc. for making them more effective to run Panchayats. In this connection, the Committee have been informed that various remedial mid-course corrections have already been undertaken by the MoPR these include mid-course correction evaluation, online monitoring and computerization etc. Since the fate of the RGSY is hanging on the proposed merger of the scheme, the Committee feel that the remedial measures taken by the Ministry are too inadequate and are to be supplemented by proactive role of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj and concerned State Governments.

### **Reply of the Government**

A Mid-course Evaluation of RGSY was commissioned by MoPR in 2010, which covered several aspects of the programme in 6 States *viz.* Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and West Bengal. The key findings and recommendations of the Evaluation Report are:—

- Outreach of Capacity Building training needs, improvement through collaboration with non-government bodies, academic institutions etc.
- A pool of trainers/resource persons should be developed at the States, Districts and Block levels.
- The SIRDs and ETCs need to be strengthened in terms of Human Resources.
- Training Needs Assessment of ERs and Functionaries should be carried out at regular intervals.
- Exposure visits to beacon Panchayats should be made mandatory.
- Monitoring and supervision mechanism needs to be set up at MoPR, State and District levels.

MoPR has initiated steps to act on these recommendations. States are being advised to avail the Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) option in various CB&T activities including actual training programmes following the Business Meet of Service Providers on 7.1.2010; it is proposed to strengthen the Training infrastructure and Human resources in SIRDs and ETCs through the proposed scheme of RGPSA. Training programmes undertaken by States are usually done through a pool of Trainers. The Monitoring mechanism is also being strengthened. MoPR

has empanelled 37 National Level Monitors from amongst retired senior level bureaucrats, academicians and Defence personnel. These NLMs are being sent to States to monitor implementation of the BRGF and RGSY programmes. Simultaneously, efforts are being made to promote use of computerization through uploading of plans and execution status in Plan Plus software. Training of SC/ST ERs is given priority and from the current year, separate grants have been provided for CB&T of SC/ST ERs. These steps would take some time to bear fruit.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 12, Para No. 2.12)**

The Committee note that Ministry of Panchayati Raj is currently implementing a three year mega programme of computerization of Panchayats across the country with an estimated cost of Rs. 6,989 crore to be sourced through Grants under Central Finance Commission, BRGF-Capacity Building component, MGNREGA etc. by using two softwares of PRIA SOFT and Plan Plus. The Committee are, however, dismayed to note that the coverage of softwares of Plan Plus and PRIA SOFT has been very limited. For instance, under Plan Plus only 46,226 District/Block/Gram Panchayats have been covered and only 13,374 have been trained so far. Likewise the coverage of PRIA SOFT has been only 80,000 Gram Panchayats in 10 States so far. The Committee, therefore, feel that the Scheme is in initial stage and urge the Ministry of Panchayati Raj to move faster to meet the deadline of completing the task in stipulated period of three years time. The Committee also recommend that any decision of merger of this Scheme with Rajiv Gandhi Panchayat Shaskatikaran Abhiyan be reviewed with a view to ensure that each of the Schemes including 'Mission Project for e-Panchayat' receive due attention with regard to availability of funds for much needed capacity building of Panchayats in the country. They also recommend that the issue of merger of Mission Panchayat on e-Panchayats should not impede the progress of computerization under the programme.

### **Reply of the Government**

With a view to provide a whole range of IT related services such as Decentralized Database and Planning, Budgeting and Accounting, implementation and monitoring of Central and State Sector Schemes, Unique Code to Panchayat, essential GIS based applications, online



self-learning medium for elected representatives and official functionaries etc. MoPR has formulated a scheme of e-Panchayat MMP. Initially a sum of Rs. 130.39 crore has been approved under the scheme for carrying out Business Process Re-engineering (BPR), Information and Service Need Assessment (ISNA) and Detailed Project Report (DPR), and Capacity Building. Planning Commission had approved e-Panchayat MMP in principle in 2007. The project proposal was last considered by the Planning Commission in March 2011 and had desired that the proposal be revised after obtaining the views of DG, NIC. Now this Ministry is moving a revised proposal of the tune of Rs. 6897 crores to Planning Commission involving IT Infrastructure, manpower and training. The detailed study on Information and Service Needs of all stakeholders including Central Line Ministries, State Departments, District Administration, Panchayat and Citizens have been carried out and as a result of this study 12 Common Core applications have been indentified which address all aspects of Panchayats' functioning from internal core functions such as Planning, Monitoring, implementation to Accounting, Social Audit etc. Out of these 12 applications 5 have been developed. These are: PRIA Soft, Plan Plus, National Panchayat Portal, Area Profiler and National Panchayat Directory. The rest are expected to be developed within next 6 months. The current adoption status of PRIA Soft, Plan Plus, Local Governance Directory (LGD), National Panchayat Portal (NPP) and Area Profiler is enclosed at **Appendix I**.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

**Recommendation (Sl. No. 14, Para No. 2.14)**

The Committee are distressed to find that the important scheme of Panchayat Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS) of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj that seeks to encourage devolution of 3 Fs among different States by way of incentivizing the States to empower Panchayats and incentivizing Panchayats to put in place accountability systems to make their functioning transparent and efficient has not been getting sufficient funds for necessary empowerment of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). In this connection, the Committee find that as against the 2.4 lakh PRIs across the country, the fund for 2011-12 under this Scheme are Rs. 31 crore only. In this connection, the Committee find that the Ministry of Panchayati Raj has already proposed an amount of Rs. 1000 crores per annum (Rs. 500 crores for incentivizing States and 500 crores for incentivizing Panchayats) for 2011-12 and additionally appropriation of funds from MGNREGA, if necessary. The Committee do not approve aforesaid move of the MoPR of utilizing the funds of MGNREGA for promotion

of Panchayat Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS). Therefore, as recommended by them in Para Nos. 2.6 and 2.9, the issue of merger of all the schemes of MoPR including PEAIS be reviewed thoroughly with a view to ensure that each scheme including PEAIS receive due attention with regard to availability of funds for actual capacity building of Panchayats during the Twelfth Plan (2012-2017).

### **Reply of the Government**

The Working Group on the Twelfth Plan on 'PRIs and Rural Governance' has considered the funding requirements and merger of schemes, and is making its recommendations accordingly.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 17, Para No. 2.17)**

The Committee's examination has also revealed that the demand driven scheme of Panchayat Mahila Evam Yuva Shakti Abhiyan introduced in 2007-08, aiming at forming associations of elected women representatives and elected youth representatives for working collectively for attaining decentralization in Panchayati Raj Institutions has been getting lukewarm response from different States with only 23 States forming Core Committee and only 12 States conducting training and sensitization Programme. The Committee feel that adequate publicity has not been given by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj. They expect the Ministry now to convince the State Governments of the benefits of the Scheme.

### **Reply of the Government**

The pace of various activities being undertaken under the Scheme of Panchayat Mahila Evam Yuva Shakti Abhiyan (PMEYSA) and the achievements made so far on those counts has been assessed from time to time with a view to give a fillip to these activities. It has been realized that one of the factors impeding the onward progress of this Scheme is the lukewarm response from States. To do away with that lacuna, a number of steps are under contemplation e.g. for providing financial autonomy to the States/UTs to facilitate them for utilizing the funds released to them for desired activities etc. In addition to this, the States/UTs would also be addressed to accord their special attention to the Scheme for the empowerment of Elected Women Representatives.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

**CHAPTER III**

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

-Nil-

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Para No. 2.3)**

The Committee find that in a country like India largely populated in villages, the growth and empowerment of Panchayats has not taken place in post Independence era as it ought to have. It is more disheartening to find that during post Independence period spanning over six decades of Parliamentary democracy almost all the constitutional provisions related to Panchayats have not been implemented in letter and spirit. These include concept of Gram Sabha (article 243A), constitution of Panchayats (article 243B), powers, authority and responsibilities of Panchayats (article 243G) etc. as laid down in Part IX of the constitution, article 243ZD of Part IXA relating to District Planning Committees (DPCs) read with Eleventh Schedule illustrating 29 matters which might be considered by the State Legislatures for devolution to the Panchayats so as to ensure that they function as a 'unit of self-Government'.

The Committee learn from the Document 'Roadmap (2011-17) for Panchayats' brought out by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj recently that slow progress on the implementation of article 243ZD regarding consolidation of Plans prepared by the Panchayats at District Planning Committees in relation to 29 subjects listed in Eleventh Schedule has been due to non-cooperation of Line Departments in different States. Similarly, they are also dismayed to find that same dismal scenario prevailing over implementation of article 243G (endowing Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them as institutions of self-government) because of discretion being enjoyed by the State Governments under that article. The Committee's examination of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj of the last 2-3 years had revealed that status quo is prevailing on the important issues of (i) devolution of Functions, Finances and Functionaries from different State Governments to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), (ii) ensuring centrality of Panchayats on different Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSSs) related with subjects enumerated in the Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution that are being mandated exclusively for Panchayats under the Constitution. Coming to the issue

of devolution of 3Fs, the Committee observe that although devolution of Functions and Finances has made some progress, these have not been accompanied by transfer of Functionaries to the Panchayats. For instance, from the latest details made available to the Committee which pertain to 2009-2010 showing State-wise progress on 3Fs, the Committee are dismayed to know that whatever devolution of 'Functions' from various State Governments to Panchayats has been done that has been restricted to the pro-Panchayat States of Kerala, Karnataka, West Bengal, Bihar and Maharashtra. However, the same is not the case with the States of Assam, Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttarakhand and Uttar Pradesh. Similarly on devolution of Finances, the Committee find that majority of the State Governments are releasing funds to Panchayats based on 'Functions' devolved. However, on devolution of Functionaries, the Committee are alarmed to note that barring the States of Kerala, Karnataka and West Bengal and to some extent Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Chhattisgarh, in the majority of the States, the situation highly unsatisfactory as Panchayats under these State Governments are being managed with departmental staff, skeleton staff or staff on deputation from the Government Departments. To sum up, the Committee find that largely the devolution of 3Fs from different State Governments to Panchayats has not taken place as contemplated in the Constitution even after the six decades of enforcement of the Constitution of India. In view of this, the Committee are of the strong opinion that a lot more is needed on the part of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj and State Governments which are lagging behind in the entire process of devolution of 3Fs to Panchayats.

The Committee also recommend that this issue should be taken up at the level of Union Minister of Panchayati Raj with Chief Ministers of different States to have a first hand idea of the issues involved and for faster transition of power to the Panchayats.

The Committee also strongly recommend that a high level Committee should be constituted to assess the implementation/present status of various provisions existing in the Constitution as also in the relevant Central/State Acts aimed at strengthening the Panchayats. Such a Committee should be asked to give their Report before start of the Twelfth Five Year Plan with a view to ensuring that goal, objectives and priorities of the 12th Five Year Plan cover the areas which need greater focus for strengthening the Panchayats.

### **Reply of the Government**

MoPR has continued to pursue with States/UTs to devolve 3Fs to Panchayats as per Constitutional mandate. Recently, Rajasthan has transferred all functions with funds and functionaries in respect of

5 Departments namely Primary Education, Health, Women and Child Development, Agriculture and Social Welfare up to District level to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) at appropriate level. Ministry of Panchayati Raj has prepared model GOs on devolution of 3Fs to the PRIs and has sent the same to 17 States namely UP, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Tripura, Tamil Nadu, Sikkim, Punjab, Odisha, Manipur, J&K, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh & Andhra Pradesh on 3rd May, 2011 with a request to issue similar GOs after necessary changes, if needed.

Meetings with Principal Secretaries/Secretaries have been held on 25.4.2011 and 19.9.2011 to review the status of devolution and to recommend ways to ensure effective devolution to PRIs. In the last meeting held with them, MPR has underscored the need for devolving 3Fs by States/UTs. Besides, during visits to States/UTs, Officers of MoPR continue to emphasise need for adequate devolution of 3Fs to Panchayats.

MoPR also continues to improve its Panchayats Empowerment and Accountability Incentive Scheme (PEAIS) aimed at incentivizing of States that devolve 3Fs to Panchayats. For the last two years, awards under PEAIS have been given by the Prime Minister to emphasize the importance of devolving 3Fs to the States.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 8 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 15, Para No. 2.15)**

The Committee find that another scheme of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj "Action Research and Studies" to formulate appropriate policy and to identify and remove the gaps in implementation of Part IX of the Constitution has not been implemented properly taking into account underutilization of allocations during 2009-10 and low physical performance during 2008-09 and 2009-10 in terms of studies sanctioned and studies completed. The Committee are unhappy to note that there are cases of defaulting agencies also which have not submitted their reports. The Committee, therefore, recommend that there is a need to have a fresh look into this scheme so that allocations are given with reference to physical targets.

### Reply of the Government

- Under the scheme the total expenditure during the year 2009-10 was to the tune of Rs. 1.61 crore. Due to the shortage/non-receipt of meaningful and substantial proposals on the themes identified by this Ministry. The total allocation was reduced from Rs. 2.70 crore to Rs. 1.75 crore (RE). Actual Financial Achievement during the Financial Year 2009-2010 is as under:

(Amt. Rs. in crore)

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Achievement
2009-10	2.70*	1.75	1.61

\*Excluding North Eastern Areas provision

- During the year 2008-09 & 2009-10, it was decided that the Ministry will only sanction projects on the themes identified by the Ministry depending upon the needs arising out from the respective divisions of this Ministry. Accordingly bids were invited and projects were sanctioned.
- The reasons for the non-completion of large number of sanctioned research studies during the previous years was that most of the studies sanctioned during 2007-08 and 2008-09 were at the end of the year, since the proposals were received late and the organizations took some time to revise their proposals as suggested to them by the Research Advisory Committee. Also, the duration of the research projects in most of the studies sanctioned were around 15-18 months. A list of studies sanctioned, completed and still underway during the previous years till date are as follows:

Year	No. of Studies Sanctioned	No. of Studies Completed	Studies Still Underway
2004-05	5	5	-
2005-06	18	17	1 (*)
2006-07	18	17	1 (*)
2007-08	15	14	1
2008-09	10	8	2
2009-10	18	11	7
2010-11	7	4	3
2011-12 (till Dec., 2011)	4	-	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>19</b>

(\*) The organizations have submitted the draft reports along with the utilization certificate. They have been requested to make certain modifications in the report, which will be submitted by them at the earliest.

- \* During 2010-11, it was decided that if an organization fails to complete the project on time, the Ministry stops the subsequent installment until the agency submits the draft report, makes a presentation on the findings and submits utilization certificate along with audited statement of accounts duly certified by a Chartered Accountant. Besides, 5% of financial penalty per month from the expiry of the due date is imposed while releasing the last installment to the defaulting agency. The Ministry also imposes a time line for the completion of a project depending upon the area of the work, the sample to be covered and the time line proposed by the concerned agency.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)



## CHAPTER V

### RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 11, Para No. 2.11)**

The Committee find that valuable findings have come up as a result of evaluation of RGSY by an UN Agency CRAN for capacity development of PRIs in 6 States of Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and West Bengal. These pertain to outreach of capacity building, training needs with association of NGOs, pooling of trainers, strengthening of SIRDs, regular assessment of training needs, exposure to beacon Panchayats, etc. The Committee feel that such an evaluation be undertaken in all the States under RGSY to have a national perspective on this issue. The Committee recommend that based on the evaluation necessary follow up action should be initiated.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The recommendations of the Committee have been accepted by the Ministry. Action in this regard would be taken and the Committee would be kept informed of the developments.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, Para No. 2.13)**

The Committee have come across large number of constraints coming in the way of implementation of Mission Project on e-Panchayat like non-availability of computers in Gram Panchayats, lack of Panchayat Staff and buildings, absence of definite source of funding in different States, non-availability of power back-up to run computers, etc. The Committee recommend all these constraints are to be addressed by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj in association with the concerned States. The Committee also recommend that the issue of specific source of funding for e-Panchayat programme may be found out in States which have been facing such problem. The Committee also desire that

the issue of uninterrupted supply of power for computers in Gram Panchayats be taken up with different State Electricity Boards. Alternatively, State Governments may be asked to emulate the good work done in Odisha for use of Solar Photo Voltaic for running computers where electricity supply is erratic.

#### **Reply of the Government**

This Ministry is seized of the problems coming in the way of proper implementation of e-Panchayat MMP and has taken up the matter with the concerned authority in the States. The issue of non-availability of computers in Gram Panchayats with necessary manpowers support will be taken care of in the proposal being sent to Planning Commission by this Ministry. The problem of electricity and connectivity particularly at GP level is really a very big obstacle in implementation of the project. The States, facing such problems have been advised to make data entry at Block levels by bringing the data there. The connectivity problem will be improved after implementation of the proposed scheme of Optical Fiber Network by DoT in another three years time. As regards, uninterrupted power supply, the matter is being taken with the States.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

#### **Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Para No. 2.16)**

The Committee's examination has revealed that the innovative scheme of "Rural Business Hub" with the objective of providing technical support and market linkages has not picked up in a big way during the Eleventh Plan period as its allocation is stagnating between Rs. 2 crore to Rs. 2.70 crore during the years 2007-2008 to 2011-2012. The Committee are also unhappy to note that the scheme is not getting desired level of attention from the States as the scheme is demand driven. The Committee find that the scheme is now being expanded from pilot project basis in 35 districts to the extent of signing of 239 MoUs for setting up of Rural Business Hubs in 19 States. The Committee trust that the Ministry would find funds for the increased level of activities under the scheme.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Scheme of Rural Business Hub (RBH) is applicable to the 250 districts covered by the Scheme of Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) and the entire North-East Region. Signing of MoUs amongst

the concerned stakeholders is one of the conditions prescribed for submission of the proposal by the Implementing Agencies seeking financial assistance under the RBH Scheme. Merely signing of MoUs does not mean that the proposal qualifies for being granted financial assistance and the proposal has been sanctioned by the competent authority for providing financial assistance to the Implementing Agencies. Signing of MoU is just one of the conditions for submitting the proposal to be considered by the Ministry.

Taking into account the position that this Scheme has not picked up in a big way and it is not getting desired level of attention from the States, the evaluation of the implementation of this scheme has been got done through an independent agency for its being up-scaled. After examining the Report, action is further underway for working out a strategy for its effective and meaningful implementation on a larger scale. This will also depend on the decision taken in the 12th Five Year Plan period both with regard to strategy finally approved and plan allocation earmarked for the Scheme.

[No. G-20012/5/2011-B&F Dated: 03.02.2012,  
Ministry of Panchayati Raj]

NEW DELHI;  
21 March, 2012  
1 Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,  
Chairperson,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## APPENDIX I

### STATUS OF PLAN PLUS

Sl.No.	State	Notification issued on Use of Plan Plus	Is TSI being used? How is their support?	Availability of data entry manpower at block level	Are EAS being monitored using Plan Plus?	District-wise plan uploaded. If Yes, for which Year
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	No TSIs not responding	Yes	Yes	Yes, for FY 2011-12
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	No	Not yet started	No	No	No
3.	Assam	No	No	No	No	No
4.	Bihar	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
5.	Chhattisgarh	Yes	Not yet started	Yes	No	Yes, only for BRGF districts
6.	Goa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7.	Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, for 6 BRGF districts
8.	Haryana	No	TSI selected (CRRID) for 1 district only	Yes	Yes	Yes, only for BRGF districts
9.	Himachal Pradesh		Yes, for BRGF districts	Only in 2 districts	No	Yes, only for BRGF districts
10.	Jammu and Kashmir		TSI in 5 BRGF districts	Through TSIs		Yes, only for BRGF districts
11.	Jharkhand	Yes	Yes	Through TSIs	No	Yes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Karnataka	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
13.	Kerala		Sulekha being used	Only for BRGF districts		
14.	Madhya Pradesh	No	Yes	Yes		Only for BRGF districts
15.	Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.	Manipur					
17.	Odisha	Yes	Yes		No	For 6 BRGF districts
18.	Punjab	No	Yes	Yes		Yes, for BRGF districts
19.	Rajasthan	No	No	No	No	For BRGF districts from 2007 to 2012
20.	Tamil Nadu					
21.	Tripura	1 BRGF district	No	Yes, CIC and GRS being used	No	—
22.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	No	Engagement is in process	Under progress	Yes
23.	Uttarakhand	No	Yes	No	No	Yes, for BRGF districts till 2010-2011
24.	West Bengal	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

STATUS OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE DIRECTORY

Sl.No.	State	What is the status of data updation at all levels	Are the Census villages mapped with GPs and also with the Parliamentary Constituency & Assembly Constituency	In the Urban Area, are the wards also being mapped
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Completed	Yes	No
2.	Arunachal Pradesh			
3.	Assam			
4.	Bihar	(a) Mapping of Census Villages to GPs - 95% (b) Mapping of GPs to Census Villages - 98% (c) Mapping of GPs to ACs / PCs - 100%	Yes	Yes
5.	Chhattisgarh	95% Census Villages mapping completed	Yes	No
6.	Goa	North Goa completed South Goa yet to be mapped	Yes, 37%	No
7.	Gujarat	97% updated	Yes	Yes
8.	Haryana	86 % updated	Yes	No
9.	Himachal Pradesh			
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress
11.	Jharkhand	(a) GPs mapped - 96% (b) Census Villages mapped - 95% (c) PC mapping to Parliament Constituency, Assembly Constituency-0 (fully), 9(partially), 5(not yet mapped).	Yes	No

1	2	3	4	5
12.	Karnataka	Almost complete	Yes	No
13.	Kerala		Yes	Yes
14.	Madhya Pradesh	Updated		
15.	Maharashtra	86% mapped	Yes	No
16.	Manipur			
17.	Odisha	81% GP Mapped and 80% Village mapped with Census data	Yes	Yes
18.	Punjab	Almost Completed	Yes	
19.	Rajasthan	Updated with some Discrepancies	Yes	
20.	Sikkim	NA	Census Village Mapped with GPs only	No
21.	Tamil Nadu			
22.	Tripura	Mapping of Census Villages with GP's have been completed for 2 districts out of 4. Others are in process. Parliamentary and constituency mapping is under process. Letter is already issued to DM's for required information.	Under Progress	No
23.	Uttar Pradesh	% of GPs Mapped=74 % of Census Villages Mapped=71	Yes	Yes
24.	Uttarakhand		Yes	No
25.	West Bengal	Almost Completed	Yes	

STATUS OF NATIONAL PANCHAYAT PORTAL

Sl.No.	State	No. of Panchayats having their own websites	Has the State declared NPP the official portal of the PR Dept	Are URLs for websites of State ZP/BP/GP registered. What is the progress	Interest shown by state in it's usage. (High, Medium, Low)
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0	No	No	High
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	No	No	High
3.	Assam				
4.	Bihar	0	Yes	No	Medium
5.	Chhattisgarh	9 District Panchayats, 29 Blocks and 284 Gram Panchayats total 322 Panchayats have uploaded their 723 contents in NPP	No	State URL registration currently underway	Medium
6.	Goa	0	No	No	
7.	Gujarat	Till date 430 total content uploaded by state including ZP/BP/GP	No	No	Medium
8.	Haryana	None	Not yet	Yes	Medium
9.	Himachal Pradesh	300+ GPs (In BRGF districts have their own websites)	No	URL registration underway	Medium



1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	Yes	Not Yet	State URL has been created under the domain name www.jkpr.gov.in	Medium
11.	Jharkhand	0	No	State URL created under www.jharkhandpanchayats.gov.in	Low
12.	Karnataka	All 5628 GPs have own webpage	No	No	High
13.	Kerala	14 District Panchayats, 152 Blocks and 545 Gram Panchayats have uploaded their content in NPP	Yes	State website is registered	High
14.	Madhya Pradesh	None	Not yet (portal registered)	No	Medium
15.	Maharashtra	25 GPs have their websites	No	State website is registered	Medium
16.	Manipur	0			
17.	Odisha	All 6234 GPs have websites	Yes	No	Yes
18.	Punjab	0	Yes	In Process	High
19.	Rajasthan	10 GPs	No	No	Low
20.	Sikkim	1	No	No	Low
21.	Tamil Nadu				
22.	Tripura	0	In Process	URL registered for State Portal	High
23.	Uttar Pradesh	1	No	In Process	High
24.	Uttarakhand	0	No	In Process	Medium
25.	West Bengal	18	Yes	WiP	Medium

STATUS OF PRIA SOFT

Sl.No.	State	Status of Voucher Entries at GP level	How is Data Entry being done	Total No. of ZP/BP/GP	ZP/BP/GP using PRIA Soft
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Started in 360	Junior Assistants with support from DIOs	22/1097/21807	22/9874/635
2..	Arunachal Pradesh	Not yet started	N.A.	16/161/1779	—
3.	Assam	All GPs (except 6)	By PRI with assistance from CAs in A/c section	21/185/2202	21/185/2173
4.	Bihar	Not yet started	Would be done through PRI staff	38/531/8442	0/0/0
5.	Chhattisgarh	8053 GPs started	By PRI staff. Staff at GPs entering data at all 3 tiers	16/146/9734	16/138/8848
6.	Goa	—	—	2/0/189	—
7.	Gujarat	—	—	—	—
8.	Haryana	422	The data entry operator at Panchayat samiti level	21/119/6083	20/112/422
9.	Himachal Pradesh	Not yet started	Will be done by PRI staff	12/77/3243	0/0/3
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	Not yet started	PRI staff	22/143/4128	—
11.	Jharkhand	Entries started in 65 villages	PRI staff at block level	24/259/4423	11/13/65
12.	Kerala	(Saankhya being used)	Saankhya being used. Mapping with PRIA Soft A/c Heads yet to be done	N/A	N/A
13.	Madhya Pradesh	In progress	Data entry at ZP level, JP	50/313/23012	25/32/129
14.	Maharashtra	In progress	PRI staff at block level	33/351/27920	33/351/18734
15.	Manipur				

1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	Odisha	In progress	GRS and Panchayat Executive Officers	30/314/6236	30/314/6236
17.	Punjab	In progress	Data Entry Operators of System Integrator	22/142/12776	22/142/12776
18.	Rajasthan	Negligible	By PRI staff only at ZP and BP level	33/249/9177	16/21/0
19.	Sikkim	Not started	—	4/0/165	0/0/0
20.	Tamil Nadu				
21.	Tripura	71797 vouchers entered for FY 2010-11	CIC and PRI staff at BP/ZP level	4/40/1038	4/40/1038
22.	Uttar Pradesh	23041 GPs have started	PRI staff at all levels	72/821/51914	72/222/44442
23.	Uttarakhand	Entries just begun in few GPs	PRI staff at ZP level	13/95/7555	13/0/28
24.	West Bengal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voucher entry complete in State-specific application</li> <li>• State has not accepted PRIA Soft</li> <li>• GPMS &amp; IFMS being used at all Panchayats</li> </ul>	PRI staff	18/333/3351	18/331/2830

**STATUS OF AREA PROFILER**

Sl.No.	State	Geographic and Demographic Details	Health, Education, Drinking Water, Infrastructure	Block Backwardness Index	Elected Member Details	Training Details uploaded
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	No	No	Yes	Being captured in State-specific application	PlanPlus updated. PRIA Soft in process
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	No	No	No		
3.	Assam					
4.	Bihar	No	No	371/534 blocks updated	Yes	Yes
5.	Chhattisgarh	No	No	Yes	9 ZPs data uploaded	Yes
6.	Goa	No	No	No	No	No
7.	Gujarat	In progress	In progress	Yes	Initiated till GP level	Yes
8.	Haryana	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
9.	Himachal Pradesh				Being captured in State-specific application	In process
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	No	No	No	No	
11.	Jharkhand	No	No	No	No	Yes
12.	Karnataka	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
13.	Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
14.	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Maharashtra	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
16.	Odisha	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	Punjab	In progress	In progress	Yes	In progress	Yes
18.	Rajasthan	No	No	No	No	Yes
19.	Sikkim	No	No	No	No	No
20.	Tamil Nadu					
21.	Tripura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
22.	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23.	Uttarakhand	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
24.	West Bengal	In progress	In progress		Updated	Yes

## APPENDIX II

### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2011-2012)

#### EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SIXTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 29 FEBRUARY, 2012

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1730 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
3. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit
4. Shri Maheshwar Hazari
5. Shri P. Kumar
6. Shri Raghuvir Singh Meena
7. Dr. Ratna De (Nag)
8. Shri A. Sai Prathap
9. Shri Bishnu Pada Ray
10. Dr. Sanjay Singh

#### *Rajya Sabha*

11. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
12. Shri Hussain Dalwai
13. Dr. Ram Prakash
14. Shri P. Rajeeve
15. Smt. Maya Singh
16. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

#### SECRETARIAT

- |                         |   |                            |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Shri Brahm Dutt      | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>     |
| 2. Shri A.K. Shah       | — | <i>Additional Director</i> |
| 3. Shri Raju Srivastava | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i>    |

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee to the sitting convened to discuss \*\*\* consideration and adoption of draft Action Taken Report on action taken by the Government on recommendations of the Committee contained in 22nd Report on Demands for Grants (2011-12) in respect of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj.

3. \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

4. \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

5. \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

6. \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*

7. Thereafter, The Committee considered draft Action Taken Report on action taken by the Government on recommendations contained in 22nd report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2011-12) of the Ministry of Panchayati Raj. After detailed discussion, the Committee adopted draft Report with minor modifications. The Committee also authorized the Chairperson to finalize the Report and present the same to Parliament.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\*\*\*Relevant portion of the Minutes not related with the subject have been kept separately.

### APPENDIX III

[Vide Introduction of Report]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT  
ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE  
TWENTY-SECOND REPORT (15TH LOK SABHA)  
OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT

I. Total number of recommendations:	17
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government: Serial Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 17	12
Total:	12
Percentage:	70.59%
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies: Serial No. Nil	0
Total:	00
Percentage:	0%
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Serial Nos. 3 and 15.	02
Total:	02
Percentage:	11.77%
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited: Serial Nos. 11, 13 and 16	
Total:	03
Percentage:	17.64%