

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2011-2012)**

**30**

**FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

**Demands for Grants  
(2012-13)**

**THIRTIETH REPORT**

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**



**NEW DELHI**

**THIRTIETH REPORT**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2011-2012)  
(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

**Demands for Grants  
(2012-13)**

Presented to Lok Sabha on 03.05.2012  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 03.05.2012



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**  
*May, 2012/Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)*

CRD No. 30

*Price : Rs.*

© 2012 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Thirteenth Edition) and Printed by \_\_\_\_\_.

## CONTENTS

Page Nos.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(iv)
ABBREVIATIONS	(v)

### **REPORT**

#### **PART I**

#### *NARRATION ANALYSIS*

<b>I. Introductory</b>	1
<b>II. Responsibilities/functions of the Department</b>	1
<b>III. Overall Analysis</b>	2
A. Head-wise allocation	4
B. Outlay and Expenditure	5
C. Twelfth Five Year Plan	8
D. BPL survey	13
E. Revamping of DRDA administration	17
F. Involvement of PRIs in Implementation of rural programmes	18
<b>IV. Scheme-wise Analysis</b>	
A. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)	21
B. Aajeevika – National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM)	25
C. Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)	30
D. Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)	37
E. Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)	43
F. National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)	46
G. Management Support to Rural Development Programmes and Strengthening of District Planning	47
<b>V. Performance of Autonomous Bodies</b>	
National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	49
<b>VI. Monitoring Mechanism</b>	
A. Vigilance and Monitoring Committees (VMCs)	52
B. National Level Monitors (NLMs)	55
<b>VII. Information, Education And Communication (IEC)</b>	56
<b>VIII. Utilization Certificates and Unspent Balances</b>	59

## ***PART II***

**Observations/Recommendations of the Committee** 61

### **APPENDICES**

I.	MGNREGA : Agreed to Labour Budget	75
II.	Cumulative Number of Households Issued Job Cards	76
III.	Number of Households Demanded Employment	77
IV.	Households Provided Employment	78
V.	Average Days Employment Provided Per Household	79
VI.	State-wise Details of Loans Outstanding and Non-performing Assets against SHGs under SGSY for the years 2007-08 to 2010-11	80
VII.	No. of SHGs Taken up Economic Activities under SGSY	81
VIII.	State-wise Abstract of NQM inspections	82
IX.	State-wise Abstract of SQM inspection	83
X.	State-wise Housing Shortage in Rural Areas as per 2001 Census	84
XI.	Indira Awaas Yojana (State-wise Physical Achievements 2010-2011)	85
XII.	Benefit Availed Under DRI in Indira Awaas Yojana	86
XIII.	State-wise progress of convergence under Indira Awaas Yojana (2011-12)	87
XIV.	Total Number of Old Age, Disabled and Widow persons in the Country	88
XV.	Status of Reconstitution of State and District level VMCs	89
XVI.	State Level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee Meeting (2007-08 to 2011-12)	90
XVII.	District Level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee meetings (2007-08 & 2008-09)	91
XVIII.	District Level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee meetings (2009-10, 2010-11 & 2011-12)	92
XIX.	Minutes of the Twentieth Sitting of the Committee held on 10 April, 2012	93
XX.	Extracts of the Minutes of the Twenty-Fourth Sitting of the Committee held on 02 May, 2012	95

## 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 Singh
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. Vacant#
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. Vacant#
31. Shri D. Bandyopadhyay\$

#### **SECRETARIAT**

- |                         |   |                     |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri Brahm Dutt      | - | Joint Secretary     |
| 2. Smt. Veena Sharma    | - | Director            |
| 3. Shri Raju Srivastava | - | Additional Director |
| 4. Shri Sumesh Kumar    | - | Committee Officer   |

---

\* 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.

# Shri Ganga Charan and Miss Anusuiya Uikey ceased to be a members of the Committee w.e.f. 02.04.2012 consequent upon their retirement from Rajya Sabha

^ Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 02.11.2011 *vice* Shri P.R. Rajan.

\$ Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 18.04.2012 *vice* Dr. (Smt.) Kapila Vatsyayan.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2011-2012) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Thirtieth Report on Demands for Grants (2012-13) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development).

2. Demands for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E (1) (a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development) on 10 April, 2012.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 02 May, 2012.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development) for placing before them the requisite material and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

6. The Committee would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

**NEW DELHI;**  
**02 May, 2012**  
**12 Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)**

**SUMITRA MAHAJAN**  
*Chairperson,*  
**Standing Committee on Rural Development**

## ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	-	Annual Action Plan
ACA	-	Additional Central Assistance
ADB	-	Asian Development Bank
A & N Island	-	Andaman & Nicobar Island
ATR	-	Action Taken Reports
BE	-	Budget Estimate
BPL	-	Below Poverty Line
BPMUs	-	Block Programme Management Units
CAPART	-	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CAPEX	-	Capital Expenditure
CCEA	-	Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs
CD	-	Compact disc
CEO	-	Chief Executive Officer
CFT	-	Cross Functional Teams
DC	-	District Commissioner
DPC	-	District Programme Coordinator
DPP	-	District Perspective Plan
DPR	-	Detailed Project Report
DPMUs	-	District Programme Management Units
DRDA	-	District Rural Development Agency
DRI	-	Differential Rate of Interest
DSS	-	Decision Support System
DVD	-	Digital Versatile Disc
DWS	-	Drinking Water & Sanitation
DAVP	-	Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity
EFC	-	Expenditure Finance Committee
EoI	-	Expression of Interest
ETCs	-	Extension Training Centres
FAQs	-	Frequently Asked Question
GOIAY	-	Group of Officer on Indira Awaas Yojana
GP	-	Gram Panchayat
HH	-	Households
HLC	-	Habitation Level Committee
IAY	-	Indira Awaas Yojana
IAP	-	Integrated Action Plan
ICT	-	Information & Communication Technology
IEC	-	Information, Education and Communication
IGNOAPS	-	Indira Gandhi Old Age Pension scheme
IGNWPS	-	Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension scheme
IGNDPS	-	Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension scheme
IT	-	Information Technology
KM	-	Kilometer
LWE	-	Left Wing Extremism Affected Districts
MDG	-	Millennium Development Goals
MGNREGA	-	Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Act
MIS	-	Management Information System



M&E	-	Monitoring and Evaluation System
MP	-	Member of Parliament
MKSPs	-	Mahila Kisan Sashaktikaran Pariyojanas
MoRD	-	Ministry of Rural Development
MPR	-	Monthly Progress Report
MSPs	-	Mahila Sashaktikaran Pariyojanas
NABARD	-	National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
NA	-	Not Available
NFBS	-	National Family Benefit Scheme
NOs.	-	Numbers
NIC	-	National Informatics Centre
NIRD	-	National Institute of Rural Development
NC	-	Not Covered
NE	-	North-East India
NFDC	-	National Film Division Corporation
NLM	-	National Level Monitor
NMMU	-	National Mission Management Unit
NMT	-	National Management Team
NPAs	-	Non Performing Assets
NR	-	No Response
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organization
NSAP	-	National Social Assistance Programme
NRLM	-	National Rural Livelihoods Mission
NRRDA	-	National Rural Roads Development Agency
NSSO	-	National sample Survey Organisation
NQMs	-	National Quality Monitors
PMGSY	-	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana
PIU	-	Project implementation Unit
PPP	-	Public Private Partnership
PRC	-	Performance Review Committee
PURA	-	Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas
PRIs	-	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RBI	-	Reserve Bank of India
RD	-	Rural Development
RE	-	Revised Estimate
RfP	-	Request for Proposal
RGVY	-	Rajiv Gandhi Gramin Vidhyutikarn Yojana
RGI	-	Registrar General of India
Rs.	-	Rupees
RSETIs	-	Rural Self Employment Training Institutes
SC	-	Scheduled Caste
SECC	-	Socio Economic and Caste Census
SHGs	-	Self Help Groups
SGSY	-	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SIRD	-	State Institute of Rural Development
SoP	-	Shelf of Project
SPIP	-	State Perspective Implementation Plan

SPMUs	-	State Project Management Units
SRLMs	-	State Rural Livelihood Mission
ST	-	Scheduled Tribe
SQM	-	State Quality Monitors
TAF	-	Total Available Fund
TSC	-	Total Sanitation Campaign
TV	-	Television
UTs	-	Union territory
VMCs	-	Vigilance and Monitoring Committees

## **PART – I**

### **NARRATION ANALYSIS**

#### **I. Introductory**

The basic function of the Ministry of Rural Development is to realise the objectives of alleviating rural poverty and ensuring improved quality of life for the rural population, especially those below the poverty line. These objectives are sought to be achieved through formulating, developing and implementing programmes relating to various spheres of rural life and activities from income generation to environmental replenishment.

1.2 The Ministry consist of the following two Departments: -

- (i) Department of Rural Development
- (ii) Department of Land Resources

#### **II. Responsibilities/functions of the Department**

1.3 The Department of Rural Development implements schemes for generation of self-employment and wage employment, provision of housing to rural poor and the construction of rural roads. Apart from this, the Department provides support services such as assistance for strengthening of DRDA Administration, training & research, human resource development, development of voluntary action etc. for the proper implementation of the programmes. It also undertakes IEC activities to promote awareness about rural development programmes in rural areas. The objectives of the Department of Rural Development are as follows:-

- Providing livelihood opportunities to those in need including women and other vulnerable sections and food security to rural Below Poverty Line (BPL) households.
- Providing for the enhancement of livelihood security of households in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household.
- Provision of all-weather rural connectivity to unconnected rural habitations and upgradation of existing roads to enable them to market access.
- Providing basic housing and homestead to BPL households in rural areas.
- Providing social assistance to the elderly, widow and disabled persons.

- Providing urban amenities in rural areas for improvement of quality of life.
- Capacity development and training of rural development functionaries.
- Promoting involvement of voluntary agencies and individuals for Rural Development.

1.4 In order to achieve aforementioned aims, the Department implements the following major programmes:

- (i) Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)
- (ii) Aajeevika – National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM)
- (iii) Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)
- (iv) Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)
- (v) Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)
- (vi) National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)
- (vii) Management support to rural development programmes and strengthening of District planning.

1.5 The Department of Rural Development has three autonomous bodies viz. Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART), National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) and National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA).

### III. Overall analysis

1.6 Demand No. 82 which relates to the Department of Rural Development was laid in the Lok Sabha on 26.03.2012. The Department of Rural Development has been allocated sum of Rs. 73,221.82 crore for the fiscal year 2012-13 which includes Rs. 73,175 crore for Plan component and Rs. 46.82 crore for Non-Plan component. The outlay during the year 2012-13 is Rs.921.90 crore or 1.24% lower than the Budget Estimates of previous financial year (2011-12). When asked to provide the details of Budget Estimates (BE), Revised Estimates (RE) and Expenditure during fiscal years 2010-11, 2011-12 and the Budget Estimates for the fiscal year (2012-13), the following information was furnished by the Department:-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Estimates (BE)	Revised Estimates (RE)	Expenditure
2010-11	66137.86	76378.15	72,109.38
2011-12	74143.72	67183.32	48068.13*
2012-13	73221.82	--	--

\* Up to 31.01.2012

1.7 Asked further about the reasons for decline in the Budget Estimates for the fiscal year 2012-13, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the major reduction in allocation for 2012-13 is under MGNREGA where the provision has been kept at Rs. 33,000 crore vis-à-vis Rs.40,000 crore in BE 2011-12. The reduction is on account of the fact that the actual expenditure under MGNREGA based on demand during 2011-2012 was only Rs. 29215.05 crore which was much less than the provision of Rs.40,000 crore in B.E. 2011-2012. Since MGNREGA is a demand driven programme, the budget allocation could be augmented during the course of the year through Supplementary Grants, if the progress of expenditure justifies the same. The other item under which a substantial reduction has been made in B.E. 2012-13 is the provision for BPL Census. Against the provision of Rs. 2600 crore during 2011-12 of which Rs. 2300 crore was provided through the First Batch of Supplementary Demand, the allocation for 2012-13 has been kept at Rs. 275 crore. This is on account of the fact that bulk of the expenditure was required to be incurred during 2011-12 as per the schedule for SECC 2011.

1.8 When the Committee enquired about reasons for decrease in the Revised Estimate for the Fiscal year 2011-2012, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the actual expenditure under MGNREGA during 2011-12 was much lower than the originally budgeted provision of Rs. 40,000 crore. The allocation for this scheme was, therefore, reduced to Rs. 31,000 crore in R.E. 2011-12. This has not affected the implementation of the programme as the actual expenditure at the end of the year based on demand was only Rs. 29215.05 crore which is lower than the provision in R.E. 2011-12.

1.9 The Department has further informed that based on progress of expenditure, the provision for grants in aid to CAPART and NIRD was also reduced by Rs. 65 crore and Rs. 24 crore respectively in RE 2011-12. There was also a reduction of Rs. 10 crore under the provision for PURA. This was earmarked for the NE region where no project was sanctioned during 2011-12.

1.10 When asked about important parameters/considerations which form the basis of proposed allocation for various schemes for the next financial year, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the previous performance, current trends and future targets are the important parameters except for schemes which are demand driven where the previous performance and the ability of the States to absorb funds and implement the programmes are the important factors that are taken into consideration.

## A. Head-wise allocation

1.11 The head-wise allocation of funds for the fiscal year 2012-13 is given as under:-

(Rs. in crore)

Name of Scheme/ Programme	Major Head	Budget Estimates 2012-13
<b>PLAN</b>		
Aajeevika – National Rural Livelihood Mission	2501	3563.50
Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGA)	2505	33000.00
Rural Housing (IAY)	2216	9966.00
DRDA Administration	2515	449.00
Grants to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	2515	94.50
Assistance to CAPART	2515	35.00
Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)	2515	135.00
Management Support to RD Programme & Strengthening District planning process	2515	108.00
BPL Survey	2515	247.50
Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) – Rural Roads	3054	21699.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>69297.50</b>
Provision for North Eastern Region and Sikkim		
Aajeevika – National Rural Livelihood Mission	2552	351.50
Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGA)	2552	0.00
Rural Housing (IAY)	2552	1109.00
DRDA Administration	2552	51.00
Grants to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	2552	10.50
Assistance to CAPART	2552	0.00
Provision for urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)	2552	15.00
Management Support to RD Programme & Strengthening District planning process	2552	12.00
BPL Survey	2552	27.50
Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) – Rural Roads	2552	2301.00
<b>TOTAL-NE Region</b>		<b>3877.50</b>
<b>TOTAL-Plan (Rural Development):</b>		<b>73175.00</b>
<b>NON-PLAN</b>		
Headquarter's Establishment of Department of Rural Development	3451	25.97
Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	2515	19.30
Production of Literature for Rural Development	2515	0.30
Contribution to International Bodies	2515	1.25
<b>TOTAL - NON-PLAN</b>		<b>46.82</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL-PLAN &amp; NON PLAN</b>		<b>73221.82</b>

## B. Outlay and Expenditure

1.12 The Committee note that the Department has proposed allocation of Rs. 397071.13 crore to the Planning Commission for various schemes during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. The Committee also note that the Department has been allocated Rs. 261870 crore (BE) during this period. When the Committee sought the scheme-wise outlays and expenditure/releases during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the following information was provided by the Department:-

Name of the Scheme	Total 11 <sup>th</sup> plan		
	BE	RE	Actual
Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana	2800.00	11300.00	11175.57
Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme	147200.00	152200.19	141257.33
Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	12198.00	12165.29	11324.62
DRDA Administration	1578.00	1667.00	1962.00
Rural Housing	38240.00	41977.50	41695.09
Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana	58030.00	67601.40	67362.27
Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	250.00	227.81	242.81
Assistance to CAPART	360.00	297.20	210.74
PURA	294.00	234.00	156.21
Management support to RD Programmes and Strengthening District Planning Process	458.00	457.65	444.48
BPL Survey	462.00	2862.00	2730.65
<b>Total (PLAN)</b>	<b>261870.00</b>	<b>290990.04</b>	<b>278561.77</b>

1.13 On the specific question of percentage increase in the plan allocation for the preceding two fiscals as also the corresponding figures for the ongoing one, the Department furnished the following information:-

(Rs. in crore)

Name of the Scheme	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
	Outlay	% Increase	Outlay	% Increase	Outlay	% Increase
Aajeevika-National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM)	2984.00	26.98	2914.00	-2.35	3915.00	34.35
Mahatma Gandhi National for Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme	40100.00	2.56	40000.00	-0.25	33000.00	-17.50
Rural Housing (Indira Awaas Yojana)	10000.00	13.64	10000.00	0.00	11075.00	10.75
DRDA Administration	405.00	62.00	461.00	13.83	500.00	8.46
Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana - Rural Roads	12000.00	0.00	20000.00	66.67	24000.00	20.00
National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	105.00	600.00	105.00	0.00	105.00	0.00
Council for Advancement of People's Action & Rural Technology (CAPART)	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	35.00	-65.00
PURA	124.00	313.33	100.00	-19.35	150.00	50.00
Management support to RD programmes and strengthening District planning process	120.00	60.00	120.00	0.00	120.00	0.00
BPL Survey	162.00	0.00	300.00	0.00	275.00	-8.33
<b>TOTAL - RURAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>66100</b>	<b>5.47</b>	<b>74100</b>	<b>12.10</b>	<b>73175</b>	<b>-1.25</b>

1.14 When asked about the impact of aforesaid drastic reduction in the proposed outlay by the Planning Commission on prospects of the Ministry in achieving the targets during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that reduction in the proposed outlay by the Planning Commission has not affected the prospects of the Ministry of Rural Development in achieving the target during the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan because the targets are fixed on the basis of the approved outlays.



1.15 When asked about the quantum of funds proposed to the Planning Commission for different rural development schemes for 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Department had proposed an amount of Rs. 8,30,613.59 crore for different rural development schemes for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. As against a proposed outlay of Rs. 1,25,099.48 crore for the year 2012-13, an outlay of Rs. 73,175.00 crore has been approved by the Planning Commission.

1.16 Asked about the procedure followed while working out the financial requirements for their various activities, both for Five Year Plan and the Annual Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that taking into account of previous performance, current trends and the future need, and based on a State-wise review through meetings of quarterly Performance Review Committee (PRC), the Department of Rural Development works out the financial requirement for various activities for both Five Year Plan and the Annual Plan.

1.17 Asked further about use of concept of Zero-Based Budgeting while working out their Plan projections, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as a part of the overall review, all the programmes of the Department of Rural Development are reviewed by the Planning Commission keeping in view the Zero Based Budgeting before finalization of Annual Plan outlays.

1.18 On the query of the Committee about steps taken to ensure that the proposed allocations are duly prioritized, rational and realistic and also in accordance with the national goals so that drastic cuts are not resorted to at various subsequent stages of consideration, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Department of Rural Development proposes to the Planning Commission the allocation based on the priorities, rational and realistic yardsticks derived from the objectives of the programmes and the goals laid down in the vision and mission statement. However, the Planning Commission allocates financial resources to various Ministries/Departments including the Department of Rural Development taking a holistic view. The availability of Gross Budgetary Support during a particular year is also a factor.

## **C. Twelfth Five Year Plan**

1.19 Asked to spell out various aspects on advance planning for the Twelfth Five Year Plan, the Department informed that they focus on development and transformation of rural economy. It requires rapid expansion of employment and income opportunities as well as improving rural infrastructure. This plan also re-emphasizes the strategy of inclusive growth to ensure that benefits of economic development are shared by all the sections of the society. Therefore, the high growth rate has to be accompanied by a major effort to provide access to the basic facilities to large section of the population. It has, therefore, been emphasized that the strategy of accelerated growth has to be aimed at supporting incomes and welfare of the poorer sections through Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee, Bharat Nirman and National Rural Livelihood Mission (Aajeevika). It has been recognized that a comprehensive strategy for tackling poverty requires development of an appropriate social security net of the poor, besides providing sustainable self-employment. Thus, reduction of poverty through appropriate strategies is the thrust area of the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. The Ministry of Rural Development has been assigned the major responsibility of achieving the above National Goal.

1.20 In regard to MGNREGA, the Department has stated that the shelf of Projects (SoP) for two years should be based on the GP Perspective Plan. Cross Functional Teams (CFTs) will facilitate preparation of Perspective Plan for each Gram Panchayat. Grassroots Planning is the foundation upon which the entire edifice of the Mahatma Gandhi NREA programme rests. The recommendations made by the V. Ramachandran Committee on Grassroots Planning will be taken up by Ministry as a priority item and no Labour Budget should be passed without having undertaken grassroots planning. On the query of the Committee about adherence of condition for preparation of District Perspective Plan (DPP) by each District as provided under MGNREGA, 2005 the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Section 13(1) of MGNREGA provides that the Panchayats at District, intermediate and village levels shall be the principal authorities for planning and implementation of the schemes made under the Act. Panchayats have been given a pivotal role in the planning and implementation of projects under MGNREGA. Hence shelf of projects can be factored into the District plan. Under MGNREGA, provisions are laid down for formulation of labour budgets. In the month of December every year, the District Programme Coordinator (DPC) under MGNREGA considers the advance plans to prepare a labour budget for the next financial year containing the details of anticipated demand for unskilled manual work in the District and the plan for engagement of labourers in the works covered under the scheme for approval of District Panchayat.

1.21 The Department has further informed that Gram Panchayat has to forward the development plan with its priorities to the Programme Officer for preliminary scrutiny and approval prior to the commencement of the year in which it is proposed to be executed. The Programme Officer has to consolidate the Gram Panchayat proposals and the proposals of the Intermediate Panchayat into a block plan and after the approval of the Intermediate Panchayat, forward it to the District Programme Coordinator. The DPC will consolidate the Block Plans and proposals from other implementing agencies and the District Panchayat will approve the block-wise shelf of projects. When asked about status of involvement of Gram Sabha in preparation of District Perspective Plan, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...it is also very clear that in many ways MGNREGA requires a very high bottoms up approach, particularly, in planning the shelf of projects, demand supply management, in identifying the works to be taken up, in ensuring that the works are indeed taken up, executed and ensuring that the people are made available and they get paid. There Panchayats are also pivotal. Today our problem is that the envisaged role of the Panchayats is lacking. For instance, when we look at the labour budget that the State proposes, it is predominantly based on the pattern of the previous year. It is not a bottom up approach based on grassroots level assessment of the actual demand likely to come during a particular year. Even, we do notice here variations between highly optimistic States, who project what really is even a low demand but are not even able to achieve that and at least those States, whose ability to conceptualise a bottoms up approach is more evident. It is evident in the fact that the gap between what is achieved and what was projected is relatively low. When we did the labour budget of some of the States in the last two weeks, we have had in depth discussions State-by-State like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Rajasthan. The State which stood out in terms of accuracy of prediction, what they felt the demand was actually from Tamil Nadu and when we went deeper into it, it turned out that it is because they actually start by looking at the Panchayat level work out. Then, they aggregated at the District level, it is validated and then it comes to State level. But even that if you look at Tamil Nadu figures, this does not come out but what does come out is a fact that the number of households with 100 days is still very low. Therefore, it really reveals that while they are on the right track, some parts of that mechanism are still to work and possibly the supply part of it, which means development of the shelf of projects where you can immediately bring to bear the demand is lacking...”*

1.22 The Secretary of the Department of Rural Development further stated:-

*“...In so far as the role of Panchayats is concerned, I do agree that the MGNREGA always did and did have a primacy to the Panchayats as the implementation mechanism as also the social audit mechanism. If some parts of MGNREGA are not working, I do believe that it is our inability to get the Panchayati Raj mechanism fully operational...”*

1.23 Asked to furnish details of recommendations made by the V. Ramachandran Committee on Grassroots Planning, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that an expert group under the chairmanship of Shri V. Ramachandran was set up by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj in consultation with Planning Commission in May 2005 to study and make recommendation on strengthening Panchayats. The expert group submitted its report on planning at the grassroots level in March 2006 and report has been accepted by Ministry of Panchayati Raj and Planning Commission. The gist of recommendations expert group is as follows:-

1. Decentralized envisioning and stocktaking exercise
  - a. For basic human development indicators
  - b. For infrastructure development and
  - c. For development in productive sector.
2. Evolution of the District vision should be through discussions in Panchayats and other local bodies.
3. Stocktaking exercise should consider assessment of human conditions in the District, availability of natural, social and financial resources and infrastructure.
4. District Planning Committee should be assisted by a Technical Support Group.
5. The needs of the District should be prioritized following a participatory process.
6. Draft plan preparation should start at the Gram Sabha level and flow upwards through Intermediate Panchayats to District Panchayats.
7. Similar exercise should be done for urban local governments.
8. District Planning Committee should consolidate the two streams: (a) Panchayat Plans & (b) urban area plans & integrate the same with the departmental plans for the District.

1.24 When asked about the efforts being taken by the Department to strengthen the Planning under MGNREGA in view of the fact that 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is starting from the current financial year, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in order to strengthen planning and implementation of MGNREGA, the MGNREGA Operational Guidelines are proposed to be revised. A Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Mihir Shah, Member, Planning Commission for suggesting revisions to the Guidelines. The major recommendations of the committee relating to strengthening of participatory grassroots planning are given below:-

- (i) A "Habitation Level Committee" (HLC) shall be constituted by the "Habitation Assembly" consisting of all adult inhabitants of the habitation. The HLC will be the agency for planning and execution of works under MGNREGA with fully delegated powers of the Gram Panchayat for the purposes of MGNREGA. The Ministry have also prepared a capacity building plan for strengthening the planning process, execution and monitoring etc.

- (ii) The process of planning and identification of works must start in a participatory manner at the habitation level, reflecting the needs and aspirations of local people. These habitation level proposals will be collated at the GP level, incorporating inter-habitation works that will also need to be identified again in a participatory manner
- (iii) The plans prepared by the HLC shall be placed before the Habitation Assembly for its approval. Where the statutory Gram Sabha or Ward Sabha is co-terminus with the natural habitation, it will discharge the functions of the Habitation Assembly.
- (iv) To anchor the implementation of MGNREGA National and State Employment Guarantee Mission and Management teams should be put in place at National & State level.
- (v) A network of Capacity Building Institutions to be created at the national level with in the National Management Team (NMT) of the Department of Rural Development. On similar pattern a Capacity Building Division to be set up at the State and District level.
- (vi) Expand the list of permissible works under MGNREGA in order to
  - a. Strengthen the synergy between MGNREGA and rural livelihoods, especially agriculture and allied sectors
  - b. Respond to the demands of the States for greater location-specific flexibility in permissible works
  - c. Help improve the ecological balance in rural India and provide a cleaner, healthier environment to its people

1.25 The Department has also informed that a copy of the Committee's Report has been forwarded to all States/UTs and has also been placed in public domain for comments/suggestions and for feed back from various Stakeholders.

1.26 When asked to furnish details on advance planning on NRLM, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Working Group on NRLM has recommended various changes in the Implementation Framework of the Programme. Some of the changes suggested are (i) To set up a National Level Society under Aajeevika (ii) Re-defining the target group of the scheme (ii) Administrative Cost of the scheme should be increased (iv) subsidies to be given in the form of seed capital and vulnerability reduction funds to institutions of the poor (v) interest subvention at par with the farmers (vi) promotion of livelihoods collectives and provision of economic support for them (vii) scope of MKSP to be expanded to include agriculture and allied activities (viii) similar Mahila Sashaktikaran Pariyojanas (MSPs) to be initiated in non farm product sectors and social domains etc. During the 12<sup>th</sup> Plan period the Ministry will prepare the proposals, after taking into account the various changes suggested by the working group, for the approval of EFC & CCEA.

1.27 In regard to advance planning on PMGSY, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that PMGSY is being implemented since the Year 2000-01 under which all weather road connectivity is provided to the eligible habitations. As per Census 2001, 1,36,464 habitations are eligible for connectivity out of which 1,09,010 habitations have been cleared having a value of Rs. 1,18,949 crore. Against this amount, Rs. 84,731 crore have been released to the States up to March, 2011 thus there is a gap of Rs.34,218 crore for completing the roads already sanctioned. In addition, road works for 27454 habitations are yet to be sanctioned as per existing core network. Also left out habitations of IAP Districts, Bihar and Rajasthan are being added. In addition to above, against the total NABARD loan of Rs. 18,500 crore, Rs. 17,600 crore are yet to be refunded to the Bank. Certain relaxations have been given to LWE/IAP Districts. Rs. 16,000 crore are required for connecting habitations with 250+ population in IAP Districts and Rs. 2,400 crore for impact of increase in length of bridges to 75 m., thus a total of Rs. 18,400 crore. A proposal for relaxing norms for IAP Districts for covering 100+ population habitation and construction of small / minor bridges is being initiated. It is also proposed to launch PMGSY-II on sharing basis in 2015-16 – based on 2011 Census for new connectivity and Up-gradation. However, funds for these items of works have not been included in the present proposal.

1.28 When the Committee enquired about advance planning in regard to rural housing, the Department has informed that rural housing shortage for 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is estimated at 4 crore. Based on current trends, it is expected that about half of such households, i.e. 2 crore will be able to access housing through their own efforts and the rest half would require some form of government assistance. The Department has also informed that the budget estimate for rural housing under Twelfth Plan therefore includes grant assistance for 1.5 crore households and subsidy assistance for 0.5 million households. In addition, the budget includes allocation for infrastructure development for cluster of houses under a habitat approach, capacity development of various stakeholders, management support and incentive for States seeking to address rural housing shortage in a time bound manner. Taking all of these factors into account, the proposed budget for rural housing for the XII Five Year plan is Rs 1,50,000 crore.

1.29 The Department has also informed that working Group on Rural housing has recommended for enhancement of per unit assistance for house construction under Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) from Rs. 45,000 for construction of a new house in plain areas to Rs 75,000 and from Rs. 48,500 in hilly/difficult areas to Rs. 80,000. They have also recommended that loan under Differential Rate of Interest be enhanced from the current loan of Rs 20,000 to Rs 50,000 at 4% rate of interest along with extended repayment tenure upto fifteen years. It is imperative that provision of DRI loans for IAY beneficiaries should be made obligatory on the part of the banks given the investment that the Government commits when sanctioning an IAY house.

## **D. BPL Survey**

1.30 BPL survey for 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan which was due in 2007 was not held. The Department has also informed that an expert group had been constituted under Chairmanship of Dr. N.C. Saxena to advise it on the suitable methodology. The Ministry on the basis of pilot studies and discussion with States/UTs had prepared a draft questionnaire for BPL Census and sought approval of cabinet for the methodology for conducting the BPL Census 2011. The modalities for conducting the BPL Census for 12<sup>th</sup> Plan Period in connection with identification of BPL households in rural and urban areas and Caste Census throughout the country have been approved by the Union Cabinet.

1.31 The Department has further informed that Socio-Economic and Caste Census (SECC 2011) has been launched on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2011 in the country which would be carried out by the respective State/Union Territories Governments with the financial and technical support of the Government of India in a phased manner taking into consideration the preparedness of States/UTs and other relevant considerations. The Census is expected to be completed by June, 2012.

1.32 Asked about confidence of the Department regarding completion of SECC 2011 by June-July 2012, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that given the diversity of the country, uniqueness of the SECC 2011, and keeping in view the elaborate and transparent process of hearing and disposal of claims and objections, SECC 2011 is now likely to get extended beyond July, 2012. An exercise is underway to determine a feasible and firm completion date based on District level analysis.

1.33 On the above issue, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development during the evidence stated:-

“...As I have explained, the BPL survey predominantly consists of three parts – exclusion indicators, inclusion indicators and deprivation indicators. I think the crucial issue is that it is under way in many Blocks but it is not completed anywhere. What we have shown is that the enumeration which is the first phase of the survey is the initial collection of data. After data is collected, it has to be validated through a fairly long and transparent process. The draft is published, claims and objections are heard at the Panchayat level and on that basis the appeals including claims and objections are heard at two levels – Block level and the District level. Then, the final list is published. We hope if this entire process is properly done by the States for which we have given training to all the personnel including the enumerators and District level officials will produce a BPL type of list which is distinctly superior to the old list which I think all Members will feel had too many inclusions of the wrong type and too many exclusions. So, we feel that the new list will be a qualitative improvement ...”

1.34 Asked to furnish details on status of Socio-Economic and Caste Census 2011 in different State/UTs, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry of Rural Development has commenced the Socio-Economic and Caste Census 2011 through a comprehensive door to door enumeration across the country to generate information on a large number of social and economic indicators relating to households across the country. The Socio Economic and Caste Census (SECC), 2011 is being carried out by the States/UTs with the technical and financial support of the Government of India. The latest status of Socio-Economic and Caste Census 2011 as on 30.03.2012 is as follows:-

Sl.No	Name of State / Union Territories	Total Enumeration Blocks	Enumeration Blocks enumerated	% of Enumeration Blocks Completed
1	Puducherry	2310	2310	100.00%
2	Daman & Diu	475	444	93.47%
3	Dadar Nagar Haveli	691	691	100.00%
4	Chandigarh	2067	2067	100.00%
5	Tripura	7316	7316	100.00%
6	Haryana	49261	49261	100.00%
7	Punjab	52243	50130	95.96%
8	Himachal Pradesh	25036	25036	100.00%
9	Chhattisgarh	49171	48811	99.27%
10	Maharashtra	221377	77481	35.00%
11	Rajasthan	137734	134992	98.01%
12	Karnataka	126905	102684	80.91%
13	Gujarat	112548	99456	88.37%
14	Meghalaya	9043	5856	64.76%
15	Arunachal Pradesh	6788	4649	68.49%
16	Jammu & Kashmir	25184	17209	68.33%
17	Uttarakhand	27785	19758	71.11%
18	Madhya Pradesh	156169	111491	71.39%
19	Delhi	33167	16292	49.12%
20	Lakshadweep	117	97	82.91%
21	Andhra Pradesh	191140	180284	94.32%
22	Sikkim	1415	1407	99.43%
23	Odisha	96426	10049	10.42%



24	Bihar	205899	299	0.15%
25	Assam	64359	24337	37.81%
26	Nagaland	4078	4078	100.00%
27	A & N Islands	1157	1111	96.02%
28	Jharkhand	71719	5960	8.31%
29	West Bengal	179554	20206	11.25%
30	Mizoram	2250	824	36.62%
31	Kerala	65456	0	0.00%
32	Tamil Nadu	138745	0	0.00%
33	Goa	3166	2295	72.49%
34	Manipur	5978	0	0.00%
35	Uttar Pradesh	380989	0	0.00%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2457718</b>	<b>1026881</b>	<b>41.78%</b>

1.35 The Department has informed that the Expert Group had recommended the methodology for identification of Below Poverty Line families, which includes criterion for automatic exclusion of rural household from the BPL list, automatic inclusion of the BPL list and grading the remaining households on a scale of one to ten. The Expert Group had also recommended the methodology for conducting the Census and appropriate appeal mechanisms. The Committee have been informed that in a joint statement issued by Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission and Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development it has been stated that the Government of India will take into account multiple dimensions of deprivation based on the indicators that are being collected through SECC, 2011 for arriving at specific entitlements that rural households will receive under various central government programmes and schemes.

1.36 When the Committee enquired about status on inclusion of system of grading for identification of BPL families in methodology for conducting BPL census as recommended by the expert group, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the SECC 2011 data being collected from the households relate to the indicators of automatic inclusion, automatic exclusion and the deprivation indicators as approved by the Union Cabinet. Grading or ranking can be done on the basis of the number of deprivation indicators met by a household. However, SECC itself will not do the grading, since the intention is to retain the flexibility of ranking and applying a cut off at the level of the User Department. The criteria for automatic inclusion, automatic exclusion and deprivation indicators are as follows:

2. The exclusion criteria proposed in the SECC would be that any household satisfying any of the following criteria would be excluded:-

- (i) Households owning Motorized Two/Three/Four Wheelers/Fishing boats (which require registration);
- (ii) Households owning mechanized Three/Four wheeler agricultural equipments such as tractors, harvesters etc;
- (iii) Households having Kisan Credit Card with the credit limit of Rs.50,000 and above;
- (iv) Households with any member as Government Employee: gazette and non-gazetted employees of Central government, State government, Public Sector Undertakings, Government-aided autonomous bodies and local bodies. This will exclude incentive and other honorarium based workers;
- (v) Households with non-agricultural enterprises registered with the Government;
- (vi) Households with any member in the family earning more than Rs. 10,000 per month;
- (vii) Households paying income tax;
- (viii) Households paying professional tax;
- (ix) Households with three or more rooms with all rooms having pucca walls and pucca roof;
- (x) Households owning a Refrigerator;
- (xi) Households owning landline phone;
- (xii) Households owning 2.5 acres or more of irrigated land with at least one irrigation equipment such as diesel/ electric operated bore well/ tubewell;
- (xiii) Households owning 5 acres or more of irrigated land for two or more crop seasons;
- (xiv) Households owning 7.5 acres or more of land with at least one irrigation equipment such as diesel/ electric operated borewell / tubewell;

3. The criteria for automatic inclusion proposed in the SECC are:-

- (i) Households without shelter;
- (ii) Destitutes/living on alms;
- (iii) Manual scavengers;
- (iv) Primitive Tribal Groups;
- (v) Legally released bonded labourers;

4. The deprivation indicators proposed in the SECC are:-

- (i) Households with only one room with kucha walls and kucha roof;
- (ii) Households with no adult member between age 16 and 59;
- (iii) Female headed households with no adult male member between age 16 and 59;
- (iv) Households with disabled member and no able bodied adult member;
- (v) SC/ST households;
- (vi) Households with no literate adult above 25 years;
- (vii) Landless households deriving a major part of their income from manual casual labour;

1.37 When the Committee enquired about the proposal of the Department regarding entitlement under different schemes of the Government on the basis aforementioned grading system, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Government will take into account multiple dimensions of deprivation based on the indicators that are being collected through SECC, 2011 for arriving at specific entitlements that rural households will receive under various central government programmes and schemes. The eligibility and entitlements of rural households in the country for different central government schemes will be determined after the SECC, 2011 survey results are available and have been analyzed. An Expert Committee will be appointed to ensure that the methodology is consistent with the range of applications envisaged. When the Committee sought clarification regarding inclusion of households with no literate adult above 25 years as a criterion for grading of BPL households, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...it only means that literate will be ranked lower than illiterate. If someone is literate, it does not mean that he is excluded. But if I have to make a choice between a family which is literate and a family which is illiterate, I will classify that illiterate family as more in need than the literate family. That is the intention of the ranking...”*

#### **E. Revamping Of District Rural Development Agency (DRDA)**

1.38 DRDA Administration', one of the main implementing agency of all rural development schemes at District level was in the process of being restructured with a view to shouldering the increased load of new schemes like MGNREGA and NRLM. The Committee has been informed that task of restructuring of DRDA has been assigned to a Committee headed by Shri V. Ramachandran. The Committee in their twentieth Report (Para 2.22, SI No. 22) have recommended for expeditious completion of study by Ramchandran Committee. The Department in their Action Taken Replies have informed that the V. Ramachandran Committee has already met on 19th January, 28th March, and 6th August, 2011. The Committee is likely to finalise its report by 31st October, 2011. Further follow-up action would be initiated after receipt of the report of the Committee.

1.39 When asked about status of submission of report by Ramchandran Committee, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ramchandran Committee has submitted its report to the Ministry of Rural Development in January, 2012, which is under examination. The Ministry have also stated that the report has been forwarded to the States/UTs for their comments. Secretaries of all States/UTs have been requested to furnish their comments/ suggestions latest by 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2012, so that decision could be taken by the Ministry.

1.40 Asked further about Steps taken by the Department to merge DRDA with District Panchayats in States where this process has not been completed till date as recommended by the Committee in their Twentieth Report, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have been repeatedly requesting the States/UTs to merge the DRDA in the Zila Parishad, in accordance with the DRDA Administration Guidelines. The merger has already been effected in the States of Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal.

#### **F. Involvement of PRIs in Implementation of Rural Programmes**

1.41 Effective devolution of Function, Finance and Functionaries (3Fs) and strengthening the Capacity of Panchayati Raj Institution (PRIs) has been stated objective of the Government of India. When asked about the role of PRIs in implementation of flagship schemes like MGNREGA, PMGSY, IAY etc., the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Section 16(1) of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) provides that Gram Panchayats shall be responsible for identification of projects in the Gram Panchayat area, to be taken up under the schemes as per the recommendations of the Gram Sabha and Ward Sabha. Section 13(1) of MGNREGA provides that the Panchayats at District, Intermediate and Village levels shall be the principal authorities for planning and implementation of the schemes made under the Act. Panchayats have been given a pivotal role in the planning and implementation of projects under MGNREGA.

- (i) Selection of Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) beneficiaries is done by the Gram Sabha from the BPL lists/permanent IAY Waitlist in the order of ranking. Selection of Grama Sabha is final and no further approval of higher authorities is required.
- (ii) The list of Below Poverty Line (BPL) households identified through BPL Census, duly approved by the Gram Sabha form the basis for identification of families for assistance under Swarnjayanti Gram Swarogjar Yojana (SGSY). The Self-Help Groups (SHGs) are also drawn from the BPL list approved by the Gram Sabha.

(iii) PMGSY Core Network and District Rural Roads Plan are to be finalized by the District Panchayat after giving full consideration to the suggestions of the Member of Parliament and Annual proposals are also made by the District Panchayats.

1.42 Further asked about extent upto which PRIs have been able to perform this role, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as reported by States/UTs, under MGNREGA out of total expenditure of Rs. 31,369.89 crore incurred during 2010-11, expenditure of Rs. 26,211.37 crore (84%) was incurred at Gram Panchayat level and out of total expenditure of Rs. 28,148.08 crore incurred during 2011-12 (as on 16.3.2012), expenditure of Rs. 22,712.93 crore (81%) was incurred at Gram Panchayats level.

1.43 Asked about the assessment in this regard, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that based on the reviews and assessment made by the Ministry of Rural Development, the role of Panchayati Raj Institutions is found to be meaningful and effective.

1.44 When asked to furnish details of total number of elected representatives of PRIs in the country, the Department has furnished following details:-

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>State/UTs</b>	<b>No. of elected representatives</b>
1	Andhra Pradesh	261000
2	Arunachal Pradesh	9427
3	Assam	25436
4	Bihar	130091
5	Chattisgarh	160548
6	Goa	1559
7	Gujarat	114187
8	Haryana	68012
9	Himachal Pradesh	27832
10	Jammu & Kashmir	4099
11	Jharkhand	53466
12	Karnataka	96090
13	Kerala	21682
14	Madhya Pradesh	417346
15	Maharashtra	233106

16	Manipur	7535
17	Meghalaya	30530
18	Mizoram	3406
19	Nagaland	0
20	Odisha	100864
21	Punjab	84138
22	Rajasthan	130185
23	Sikkim	1001
24	Tamil Nadu	117716
25	Tripura	5676
26	Uttar Pradesh	771661
27	Uttarakhand	61558
28	West Bengal	51423
29	A&N Islands	876
30	Chandigarh	187
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	125
32	Daman & Diu	97
33	Lakshadweep	110
34	Puducherry	1011
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2991980</b>

1.45 Further asked to furnish details on number of elected representatives trained by SIRDs and ETCs during the last five years, the Department has furnished the following details:-

<b>Year</b>	<b>Elected representatives</b>
2006-07	2,47,694
2007-08	4,34,813
2008-09	7,12,023
2009-10	7,58,266
2010-11	14,78,742
<b>Total</b>	<b>3631538</b>

1.46 When the Committee sought clarification about decision of the Ministry to give one percent of funds available for rural development programmes to the Ministry of Panchayati Raj for capacity building of PRIs, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...If I might say so, our intention of giving that one per cent of our budget, is not to wash our hands with the rest of the Panchayati Raj but actually to help create core capacity, which is not scheme driven but is basic to the Panchayati system. It is not in derogation of additional amounts that go into the Panchayati system driven on top of individual schemes. So, there would be a core capacity creation, which would be independent of the scheme in addition to any scheme we plugged into the Panchayati Raj system. It would have sitting on it, funding to create additional capacity, technical, managerial, financial, physical and capacity for the purpose of that schemes which are currently happening. Though, very rightly as hon. Member has said it may be inadequate both in terms of quality and quantity...”*

#### IV. SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS

##### A. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS)

1.47 The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is a flagship programme of Government of India executed by Ministry of Rural Development w.e.f 02.02.2006. The main objective of the programme is to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the rural households by ensuring a legal right for at least 100 days of unskilled wage employment to willing adult members. Implemented initially in 200 most backward Districts of the Country, this programme was later extended in two phases to all over India. When asked to provide details on projected outlay and budgeted provision under the scheme during the 11<sup>th</sup> plan period and 2012-2013, the Department has furnished following information:-

Year	Projected Outlay in Plan	BE
2007-2008	14463.00	12000.00
2008-2009	20000.00	16000.00
2009-2010	37800.00	39100.00
2010-2011	66000.00	40100.00
2011-2012	64022.00	40000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>202285.00</b>	<b>147200.00</b>
2012-2013	---	33000.00

1.48 When asked to furnish details of labour budget as demanded by the States under MGNREGA schemes, the Department has furnished details of agreed to labour budget in terms of persondays under MGNREGA for the year 2008-09 to 2012-13 (Appendix I). However, the Department has not furnished details of labour budget as demanded by the States.

1.49 When asked about status of convergence of MGNRGA scheme with other schemes of the Government, the Department in their written submission to the Committee has stated that for convergence of MGNREGA with other development programmes of the Government which have similar target groups, convergence guidelines have been developed and disseminated by the Ministry for several other development schemes. Most of the States Governments have started convergence at planning, management and works level. Convergence has two components, (i) works undertaken under MGNREGA and (ii) works under other programmes. MGNREGA component of the work is to be implemented by Gram Panchayat or other implementing agency, as prescribed in the Act. Works component under other programmes follow the norms prescribed in the respective guidelines of the scheme/programme.

1.50 When asked to furnish details of actual expenditure under MGNREGA since inception of Scheme, the Department has furnished following details:-

State/UTs	Actual Expenditure (Rs. in lakh)					
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 as on 16/03/12
ANDHRA PRADESH	68020.32	208374.75	296390.38	450918.00	543938.55	307582.14
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	221.34	303.90	3289.54	1725.74	5057.31	14.56
ASSAM	59252.93	54914.93	95380.73	103389.76	92104.35	58777.31
BIHAR	71276.16	105222.66	131647.97	181687.63	266425.17	65735.63
CHHATTISGARH	66882.16	140183.20	143447.52	132266.65	163397.81	163251.17
GUJARAT	8585.03	8184.24	19600.66	73938.25	78822.00	51496.07
HARYANA	3594.67	5235.01	10988.22	14355.28	21470.43	22826.34
HIMACHAL PRADESH	3940.12	12564.88	33227.64	55655.76	50196.38	37412.19
JAMMU & KASHMIR	3454.44	4200.26	8772.02	18531.34	37776.70	22015.45
JHARKHAND	71155.13	106253.85	134171.70	137970.19	128435.40	87864.69
KARNATAKA	24829.67	23650.54	35787.46	273919.35	253716.51	161255.17



KERALA	2789.73	8336.83	22453.65	47151.35	70434.07	88587.30
MADHYA PRADESH	186268.63	289172.60	355496.21	372228.08	363724.90	243341.46
MAHARASHTRA	17461.18	18907.21	36154.33	32109.32	35811.97	90470.39
MANIPUR	2025.50	6276.15	34965.82	39316.87	44070.51	8959.57
MEGHALAYA	2111.85	5091.18	8945.10	18352.79	31902.39	19082.95
MIZORAM	1643.11	4200.70	16455.70	23823.99	29315.12	10639.36
NAGALAND	1457.62	2397.57	27231.15	49945.76	60537.48	17202.74
ODISHA	73346.62	57956.90	67829.29	93898.37	153314.26	82378.75
PUNJAB	2500.21	3004.29	7177.06	14991.96	16584.21	12830.87
RAJASTHAN	69306.14	147733.72	616439.73	566903.40	328907.14	251409.91
SIKKIM	261.89	1185.76	4275.61	6408.99	8525.72	4163.64
TAMIL NADU	15163.63	51642.38	100406.47	176123.49	232331.96	236124.67
TRIPURA	4507.68	20860.34	49077.13	72940.80	63186.85	76337.92
UTTAR PRADESH	77967.46	189825.13	356887.72	590003.87	563120.10	387518.12
UTTARAKHAND	4849.70	9575.01	13579.33	28309.06	38019.88	27921.32
WEST BENGAL	39462.63	100434.62	94038.47	210898.16	253246.13	196894.87
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR	NA	NA	327.54	1226.12	903.66	1007.89
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	NA	NA	1.03	133.95	123.00	NR
DAMAN & DIU	NA	NA	NR	NR	NR	NR
GOA	NA	NA	249.96	470.12	993.28	672.37
LAKSHADWEEP	NA	NA	178.68	201.48	251.70	213.62
PONDICHERRY	NA	NA	136.10	726.90	1082.11	1019.04
CHANDIGARH	NA	NA	NR	NR	NR	NR
<b>Total</b>	<b>882335.55</b>	<b>1585688.61</b>	<b>2725009.92</b>	<b>3790522.78</b>	<b>3937727.05</b>	<b>2735007.48</b>

1.51 When asked to furnish details on total job card issued, employment demanded, total employment provided to households, total person days employment provided and average person days employment provided per household under MGNREGA schemes, following information was provided by the Department (Appendix II to V):-

Year	Total job card issued (in Crore)	Total HH employment demanded (in Crore)	Total HH employment provided (in Crore)	Total person days employment provided (in Crore)	Average person days employment provided per household(in Days)
2006-2007	3.78	2.13	2.10	90.50	43
2007-2008	6.47	3.42	3.39	143.59	42
2008-2009	10.01	4.55	4.51	216.32	48
2009-2010	11.25	5.29	5.25	283.59	54
2010-2011	11.98	5.57	5.49	257.15	47
2011-12*	12.25	4.97	4.92	206.73	42

\* As on 23.04.2012

1.52 When the Committee sought clarification on the issue of declining trend of employment generation under MGNREG scheme, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...Sir, it is not correct to say that we have lost interest in MGNREGA. Firstly, we have not; and secondly, we cannot afford to lose interest in MGNREGA. It is a legislation, which gives right to certain people. It is our duty to see that whatever right they have acquired, they are not deprived of that right. Financially also, it is not that we have reduced the allocation below what is the demand. As I said, it is very difficult to make a general statement. It depends from State to State; it depends from year to year. There are many States where definitely agricultural wages have gone up and definitely, there is a movement away from unskilled manual work towards other kinds of work. But, there are also many States where the trend is not visible and it is more perhaps a case of people’s demand, people not knowing enough about it, people not being able to access the mechanisms to register their demand, people not being able to actually get to the worksite. So, it is complex; it is State by State, area by area. It is dependent not only on the local conditions but also on local governance conditions. So, it is a multi-prong effort to ensure that the Act works. But at the end of it all, we are not committed necessarily to continuously increasing the expenditure and man-days because if we really succeed in our other anti-poverty programmes to raise livelihoods outside unskilled employment, actually unskilled employment should go down. But if it is going down for this reason that poverty is going down, generally it is a good thing. But if it is going down for other reasons, it is not a good thing; and we certainly have to see to the demand...”*

1.53 When asked to provide details on Average Wage per persondays and Average Earning per household per year, the Department has provided following information for the last three fiscal year:-

	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Average Wage per person days	90	100	117
Average Earning per household per year	4860	4700	4289

1.54 When asked to furnish details on number of works taken during the last three years, The Department has furnished following details:-

(in Lakh)

Year	No. of Works
2009-10	46.17
2010-11	50.99
2011-12	68.27

#### **B. Aajeevika – National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM)**

1.55 The SGSY has been restructured as National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM) in June 2010, to implement it in a mission mode in a phased manner for targeted and time bound delivery of results. NRLM has now been renamed as Aajeevika. The objective of the NRLM is to reduce poverty by enabling the poor households to access gainful self-employment and skilled wage employment opportunities resulting in appreciable improvement in their livelihoods on a sustainable basis, through building strong and sustainable grassroots institutions of the poor. The main features of the NRLM are to bring each BPL household under SHG net, setting up of dedicated implementation structure at various levels, enhanced capital subsidy for the beneficiaries, easy access for multiple doses of credit along with credit to rural BPL from banks at low rate of interest, formation and strengthening of people owned organization such as SHG Federations at various levels and upscale the skill development and placement programmes. For capacity building & training, Rural Self Employment Training institute (RSETIs) in each District of the country will be set up. Special emphasis will be given for convergence with programmes related to technology inputs in order to achieve synergies.

1.56 Asked about number of States which have adopted NRLM, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as on date, 22 States/UTs have set up/designated State level societies as State Rural Livelihoods Missions (SRLMs) for implementation of NRLM in their States and the other States are in the process of setting of State societies under NRLM. The States that have formed their SRLMs are as follows:-

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>S. No.</b>	<b>States</b>
1.	Andhra Pradesh	12.	Odisha
2.	Assam	13.	Punjab
3.	Bihar	14.	Rajasthan
4.	Chhattisgarh	15.	Tamilnadu
5.	Gujarat	16.	Uttarakhand
6.	Haryana	17.	Uttar Pradesh
7.	Jharkhand	18.	Meghalaya
8.	Kerala	19.	Nagaland
9.	Karnataka	20.	Mizoram
10.	Madhya Pradesh	21.	Tripura
11.	Maharashtra	22.	Puducherry

1.57 Further asked about status of furnishing of specific State Action Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have not yet received perspective plans and action plans from all the States and UTs. The States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar & Kerala have submitted their State Perspective plan and Action Plans to the Ministry, which have been approved and funds released to the State missions for the year 2011-12. The following States have submitted their State Action Plan under NRLM which are under examination in the Ministry.

1. Assam
2. Chhattisgarh,
3. Gujarat
4. Haryana
5. Odisha
6. Madhya Pradesh
7. Maharashtra
8. Meghalaya
9. Punjab
10. Rajasthan
11. Tamilnadu

1.58 When asked about preparation of roadmap to achieve the objective set up under the NRLM, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have planned the implementation of NRLM in a phased manner, which is as follows:

- a. Year1: 150 Districts, 600 blocks
- b. Year 3: Additional 150 Districts and additional 1500 blocks

- c. Year 5: balance 300 Districts, and additional 2100 blocks
- d. Year 7: balance 1800 blocks
- e. Year 10 – last village will be covered

1.59 The Department has also informed that from past experience, it is seen that in a Block, it takes about three years to cover 80% of the poor households under the SHG network. Coverage of the remaining 20% who are the poorest of the poor and the most vulnerable takes longer period. Each family organized in SHG network requires 5 to 8 years of continuous handholding support, necessary financial support and knowledge and capability support to have sustainable and viable livelihoods and overcome abject poverty.

1.60 Asked about status of preparation of guidelines for NRLM, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have prepared the 'Implementation framework document under NRLM' for facilitating the States in implementation of the programme. The framework lays down the objective, vision, principles and financial norms of NRLM and also provides guidance to the States for formulating their State specific strategies for poverty reduction within the basic NRLM framework. The Ministry is of the view that each State should prepare its own location and context-specific poverty eradication plan and strategy. Hence, the Ministry have not prepared any prescriptive guidelines, but only the framework for the purpose. The States played an active part in the evolution of the framework. Under NRLM the Ministry have also prepared the Financial Management and Procurement Manuals for smooth implementation of the programme.

1.61 When asked about status of establishment of dedicated implementation unit at various levels under NRLMP, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in the Ministry, a National Mission Management Unit (NMMU) has been set by hiring professionals with the relevant experience. The States, where the missions have been set up are in the process of recruiting key professionals, having the requisite qualifications and experience, from within the Government and from the development sector. Wherever these teams are in place, they are facilitating the State mission in the preparation of the State Perspective Implementation Plan (SPIP) and Annual Action Plan (AAP). The States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Bihar have set up their complete State Project Management Units (SPMUs). Most of the other States are in the process of setting up their SPMUs, District Programme Management Units (DPMUs) and Block Programme Management Units (BPMUs) in the first phase Districts and Blocks. The NRLM is in its initial stages of roll out in most States and once the implementation of programme progresses, complete implementation structures will be put in place by all States and UTs.

1.62 Further asked about status of establishment of SHGs federations at different levels, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that progress of establishment of SHG federations is not evenly distributed in the country. The formation of federations requires dedicated machinery at all levels – Block, District and State. This is not present in most of the States.

1.63 The Department has also informed that in Andhra Pradesh, SHG federations have been set up at village, Mandal & District levels covering all the villages of the State. In Kerala, federations have been set up at the ward and panchayat levels and they cover all the Panchayats of the State. In other States like Odisha, Bihar, Tamilnadu and Madhya Pradesh, SHG federations have been set up at some places at village and cluster levels under the State Rural Livelihoods Programmes. Federations have also been set up in some pockets in the country by NGOs under programmes being implemented by them. Under NRLM, focus will be on formation and strengthening SHGs and formation and strengthening of federations of SHGs at various levels. This is a very important support structure of the poor and they are essential for providing continuous handholding support to their members. However, this will be done in a phased manner across the country to cover all the villages.

1.64 When asked to furnish details on financial progress under SGSY/NRLM during 11<sup>th</sup> plan, following information was provided by the Department:-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Central allocation (RE)	Central Release	% Release	Credit Mobilization		
				Target	Ach.	%age
2007-08	1800.00	1697.70	94.32	3743.65	2760.31	73.73
2008-09	2350.00	2337.89	99.48	3929.80	3530.07	89.83
2009-10	2350.00	2230.00	94.89	4443.91	4447.03	100.07
2010-11	2984.00	2665.18	93.73	5210.63	4585.98	88.01
2011-12 (Jan'12)	2914.00	2230.14 (up to 15.03.12)	76.53	6020.00	3032.12	50.37
<b>Total</b>	<b>12398.00</b>	<b>11160.91</b>	<b>91.75</b>	<b>23347.99</b>	<b>18355.51</b>	<b>80.42</b>

1.65 When asked about State-wise repayment ratio of loans provided under SGSY/NLRM in the entire country, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that data on repayment ratio is not maintained in the Ministry of Rural Development. However, the repayment position under SGSY scheme in States can be assessed by Non Performing Assets (NPAs) status of loans under SGSY in respective States, which is being compiled by the NABARD. It is published by them annually as "Status of

Microfinance in India". The NPA figures for loans under SGSY are available for the last four years (Appendix VI).

1.66 When asked about cases of financial irregularities brought to the notice of the Department by regular audit reports or from other sources, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that no case of financial irregularities have been brought to the notice of the Ministry by audit reports or implementing agencies.

1.67 When asked to furnish details on physical targets and achievements under SGSY/NRLM during 11<sup>th</sup> Plan (2007-12), following information was provided by the Department:-

Particulars	11 <sup>th</sup> Plan									
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 (Jan'12)	
	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.
No. of SHGs swarozgaris assisted (Assuming 10 members per Group)	1155000	1154269 (100%)	1381689	1470032 (106%)	1552884	1736214 (112%)	1855250	1743726 (94%)	1878210	1014061 (54%)
Total number of individual swraozgaris assisted*	481250	545026 (113%)	380981	391843 (103%)	269598	348963 (129%)	322093	366260 (114%)	102972	149045 (145%)
Total number of swarozgaris assisted **	1636250	1699295 (103%)	1762670	1861875 (106%)	1822482	2085177 (114%)	2177343	2109986 (97%)	1981182	1162106 (59%)

\* Assisted Swrozaris are those who get Bank credit linked subsidy.

\*\* Including special projects.

1.68 When asked to furnish details of SHGs who have been able to convert their venture successful since inception of the scheme, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that during 2011-12 (up to Feb 2012) 2,07,067 SHGs (Appendix VII) have been assisted with bank credit and subsidy for taking up economic activities. Under SGSY, progress of ventures of the beneficiaries was not being tracked.

1.69 On the query of the Committee about the maintenance of database of beneficiaries under SGSY/ NRLMP, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry, with the

help of NIC, has designed a software for preparing a database of SGSY beneficiaries. The software has been rolled out and training provided to the State officials in the software use by NIC. States have been asked to upload relevant information in the SHG database.

1.70 Further asked about provisions made to track progress of beneficiaries who have availed subsidy/loan under SGSY/NRLM, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that under SGSY progress of beneficiaries who have availed subsidy/loan under SGSY was not being tracked. Under NRLM an elaborate monitoring system is planned. The first one is community monitoring-the institutions of the poor like the SHGs and their federations will ensure community centric monitoring of the beneficiaries who receive loans. In addition, the dedicated professional staff under NRLM at the SPMU, DPMU and BPMU levels will also monitor the economic activities of the beneficiaries and provide necessary support, wherever required. The Ministry have also initiated steps for putting in place a comprehensive ICT platform under NRLM which will include, inter alia, a Management Information System (MIS), Decision Support System (DSS) and a Monitoring and Evaluation System (M&E), which will track all relevant information to support programme implementation. It is also proposed to enable SHG members to acquire ICT knowledge and improve their monitoring capability.

### **C. Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)**

1.71 Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) was launched on 25<sup>th</sup> December, 2000 as a 100% Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The programme seeks to provide connectivity to all unconnected habitations in the rural areas with a population of more than 500 persons through good All-weather roads. In respect of Hill States (North-East, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand), Tribal (Schedule-V) areas and the Desert (as identified in the Desert Development Programme) areas, the objective was to connect habitations with a population of 250 persons and above. Last year, the programme guidelines have been amended to extend the coverage under the programme to habitations having population of 250 persons and above in the 60 Districts identified by Planning Commission for implementation of Integrated Action Plan (IAP) for selected Backward and Tribal Districts. A total of 1,58,891 habitations are targeted for providing road connectivity under PMGSY. The programme also has an Upgradation component with a target to upgrade 3.75 lakh km of existing rural roads (Including 40% renewal of rural roads to be funded by the States) in order to ensure full farm to market connectivity.

1.72 Rural roads has also been identified as one of the six components of Bharat Nirman with a goal to provide connectivity to all habitations with a population of 1,000 persons and above (500 persons and



above in the case of hill States or Schedule V tribal areas) with all weather road. The Bharat Nirman programme also has an 'Upgradation' component with a target to upgrade 1.94 lakh km of existing rural roads (Including 40% renewal of rural roads to be funded by the States) in order to ensure full farm to market connectivity. Based on ground verification by States, a total of 63,940 habitations are targeted to be connected under Bharat Nirman.

1.73 When asked to furnish details on plan allocation/release under PMGSY during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, following information was provided by the Department:-

(Rs. in crore)

Plan/Year	Plan funds proposed by Department	Approved Plan outlay	Total allocation	Total release by center
10 <sup>th</sup> Plan	55,000	12,500	17,767	17,760
11 <sup>th</sup> Plan	81,801	59,751*	86,120 @	76,099.51 (upto February, 2012.)
2007-2008	12,292.50	11,000**	11,000 **	11,000**
2008-09	15,548.50	15,030***	15,280.15 ***	15,280.15 ***
2009-10	17,042.50	18,500#	17,840#	17,840 #
2010-11	18,114	12,000	22,000	22,399.80##
2011-12	31,500	20,000		16,695.80 (upto 29.2.2012)

\* Includes NABARD Loan of Rs. 16,500 crore

@ Includes NABARD Loan of Rs.18,500 crore

\*\* Includes NABARD Loan of Rs.4,500 crore

\*\*\* Includes NABARD Loan of Rs. 7,500 crore

# Includes NABARD Loan of Rs.6,500 crore

## Includes Rs.399.80 crore received from Internal Savings and re- appropriation from other Schemes.

1.74 When asked to provide details on physical achievement under PMGSY scheme including 'Road component' of Bharat Nirman, The Department has furnished following details:-

PMGSY (Including Bharat Nirman)	Total Eligible Habitation	Projects Sanctioned	Completed (upto Feb, 2012)
Habitation (in No.)	1,58,891	1,14,433 (72%)	82,478 (52 %)
New Connectivity (km)	3,65,094	2,76,774 (75%)	2,05,927 (56%)
Upgradation (km)	3,74,844 2,24,000 (UG per se by GOI funds)	1,64,096 (73%)	1,37,634 (61%)

1.75 Asked about reasons for non-achievement of target for coverage of 15,226 habitations during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that implementation of PMGSY is carried out through States. Some of the reasons for non- achievement of Targets are as below:-

- (i) Inadequate implementation capacity of some of the major States.
- (ii) Balance new connectivity targets concentrated in a few States, leading to localized inadequate contracting capacity.
- (iii) Delays in award of tenders especially in "Selected Tribal and Backward Districts" (under IAP).
- (iv) Non availability of land including land falling under forest areas (delay in forest clearances).

1.76 The Department has also informed that during 2009-10 and 2010-11 availability of funds was not streamlined. For instance NABARD loan of Rs. 2,000 crore in 2009-10 was made available on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010 and during 2010-11 initially an amount of Rs.10,000 crore was indicated as NABARD loan, though adequate headroom was not available in likely cess collections to approach NABARD for a loan.

1.77 When asked to furnish details on total number of uncovered habitations with population of above 1000, below 1000 and below 500 in the country at the start of 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the total number of habitations yet to be sanctioned under PMGSY with population of above 1000, 500-999 and 250-499 (as per 2001 Census) are 562, 17,204 and 27,774 respectively.

1.78 When the Committee sought clarification on the issue of change of focus from PMGSY scheme to the rural road component of Bharat Nirman, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that through Circular no. 14/2011 dated 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2011 and Circular no. 2/2012 dated 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2012, the States have been advised to send proposal to cover habitations having population of 500-999 (2001 Census) in plain areas and 250-499 population (2001 Census) in special areas. This would enable coverage of the entire target habitations as envisaged at the time of approval of PMGSY.

1.79 The Department has further informed that project proposals of following categories are being covered:-

- (i) In respect of Plain Areas:
  - (a) Such States which furnish a certificate that works have been awarded for over 90% of their eligible unconnected habitations having population of 1,000 persons and above (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, can send proposals for eligible unconnected habitations having population between 800-999 persons (2001 census).

- (b) Once work is awarded for over 90% of eligible unconnected habitations having population between 800-999 persons (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, then States after furnishing such certificate, can send proposals for eligible unconnected habitations having population between 600- 799 persons (as per 2001 census).
  - (c) Once work is awarded for over 90% of eligible unconnected habitations having population between 600-799 persons (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, then States after furnishing such certificate, can send proposals for eligible unconnected habitations having population between 500 to 599 persons (as per 2001 census).
- (ii) In respect of Hill States (North-East, Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand), Desert Areas (as identified in Desert Development Programme) and Tribal (Schedule V) areas other than Selected Tribal and Backward Districts covered under Integrated Action Plan (IAP):
- (a) Such States which furnish a certificate that works have been awarded for over 90% of their eligible unconnected habitations having population of 500 persons and above (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, can send proposals for eligible unconnected habitations having population between 400-499 persons (as per 2001 census).
  - (b) Once work is awarded for over 90% of eligible unconnected habitations having population between 400-499 persons (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, then States after furnishing such certificate, can send proposals for eligible unconnected habitations having population between 300-399 persons (as per 2001 census).
  - (c) Once work is awarded for over 90% of eligible unconnected habitations having population between 300-399 persons (as per 2001 census) under PMGSY, then States after furnishing such certificate, can send proposals for eligible habitations having population between 250-299 persons (as per 2001 census).

1.80 When asked about target for coverage of habitation under PMGSY during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the target proposed for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is to connect a total of 44,458 estimated balance eligible unconnected habitations subject to implementation capacity of the States.

1.81 Further asked about funds proposed for PMGSY works to the Planning Commission during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as per the revised assessment included in the Working Group Report for 'Rural Connectivity', an amount of Rs. 2,12,000 crore has been proposed for PMGSY for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.

1.82 Having observed that population criteria for classifying habitation being used by the Department is based on 2001 census, the Committee enquired about plan of the Department to allow for use of population criteria for classifying habitation as per census 2011, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that PMGSY programme as approved in 2001 by the Union Cabinet was as per 2001 Census.

1.83 The Department has informed that programme guidelines have been amended to include the habitations having population of 250 persons and above in Left Wing Extremism (LWEs) affected Districts, as identified by the Ministry of Home Affairs, for coverage under PMGSY.

1.84 When asked to furnish details on total number of habitations having population of 250 persons and above in affected Districts, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in the 78 Selected Tribal and Backward Districts (under IAP) as identified by Planning Commission and Ministry of Home Affairs, total number of eligible habitations as reported by States are 46,397.

1.85 Asked further about coverage of habitation under PMGSY in LWEs affected Districts and target for coverage of rest habitation during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that till end of Feb, 2012, number of habitations sanctioned and connected under PMGSY in 78 Selected Tribal and Backward Districts (under IAP) are 27,303 and 16,446 respectively. The completion of providing connectivity to the balance habitations is subject to implementation capacity of the States and timely award of tenders.

1.86 When asked about funds proposed for connecting habitation in LWEs affected Districts during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan and financial year 2012-13, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that an amount of Rs. 20,747 crore has been projected for 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan before Planning Commission for providing connectivity to balance habitations including left out habitations and for bridges upto 75 meter in the aforesaid 78 Selected Tribal and Backward Districts (under IAP).

1.87 When asked to furnish details on financial and physical performance of PMGSY works in Union Territories (UTs), following information has been furnished by the Department:-

UTs	Value of proposal cleared (in Rs.crore)	Amount released (in Rs.crore)	No. of road works	Length of road works cleared	No. of road works completed	Length of road works completed	% Completed road works	% length completed	expenditure
A& N Islands	32	11	18	0	0				0
Dadar & Nagar Haveli	37	14	156	182	0				0
Daman & Diu	10	10	0	0	0				5
Delhi	5	5	1	0	0				0
Lakshdweep	5	5	0	0	0				0
Pondicherry	12	5	78	88	77	69	99	78	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>15</b>

1.88 When the Committee sought clarification on the issue of non-completion of PMGSY works in A&N Islands, the representative of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...you have rightly said that we have allocated funds to Andaman, we have allocated Rs. 10.59 crore for 18 roads to Andaman. We have communicated many times with Andaman Administration on this issue...”*

1.89 On the query of the Committee on status of utilization of funds released under PMGSY to A&N Islands, the Secretary of the Department of Rural Development stated during the evidence:-

*“...As for the last many years no direct funding was done. Therefore, it is correct that in the first year, perhaps during initial years in 2001 or 2002, some money has been released. After that, no funds have been released to Union Territories, for this reason we do not have ready data in this regard, but I will submit detailed information to the Committee...”*

1.90 The Secretary of the Department of Rural Development further added:-

*“... I will certainly give the full details. Let me clarify here about the system. The Central Government gives funds to State Governments and Union Territory Administration within the guidelines of the scheme. Funds are spent, the expenditure is audited at that point and if there is a deviation from that scheme, the Audit has to point it out and the results of that Audit are indicated to the Ministry....”*

1.91 The Department has informed that for ensuring high level of quality in works, PMGSY programme guidelines have the provision for three tier Quality Control Mechanism. The first two tiers of the Quality Control Structure are overseen by the State Quality Coordinators, appointed by the State Governments. The first tier of quality control mechanism is in-house quality control at the level of executing

agencies. SQMs are deployed to ensure that quality issues are properly being attended to at the first tier. The third tier of this arrangement consists of quality monitoring of works through random inspections by independent National Quality Monitors (NQMs). Observations of National Quality Monitors are handed over to the PIUs immediately after inspection for taking appropriate action. The Action Taken Reports (ATRs) are prepared and sent to the NRRDA (National Rural Road Development Agency) through State Quality Coordinator. If defects in the work are rectified and the action of rectification is verified by independent quality monitors in the subsequent inspections, the 'Unsatisfactory' grading of the work is improved to 'Satisfactory' grading. NRRDA monitors the submission of ATRs and States are appraised of the status of ATRs.

1.92 When asked to provide details of inspections of roads under PMGSY carried out by the independent State Quality Monitors (SQMs) and National Quality Monitors (NQMs) during the last five years, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that total number of 21,222 inspections of roads under PMGSY have been carried out by National Quality Monitors (NQMs) during January, 2007 to February, 2012 (Appendix VIII). The numbers of inspections of roads under PMGSY which have been carried out by State Quality Monitors (SQMs) during November, 2010 to February, 2012 are 17,606 (Appendix IX).

1.93 Asked about mechanism established by the Department to receive complaints from public regarding faulty work being done under PMGSY, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the various mechanisms adopted by the Ministry of Rural Development to receive complaints from public regarding quality of works under PMGSY are:-

- (i) Vigilance and Monitoring Committee of Districts
- (ii) Electronically on URL <http://pgportal.gov.in> and [www.omms.nic.in](http://www.omms.nic.in) (under icon feedback module)
- (iii) In writing through post.

1.94 When asked to furnish details on number of complaints received by the Department regarding irregularities in PMGSY works during 2010-11 and 2011-12 and action taken on these complaints, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that total number of complaints including suggestions and comments received in the Ministry during 2010-11 and 2011-12 are 401 and 242 respectively. Out of these, a total of 540 complaints have been addressed, where necessary, by deputing NQMs/enquiry through State Governments.

#### D. Indira Awas Yojana ( IAY )

1.95 The objective of Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) is primarily to provide assistance for construction of dwelling units and upgradation of existing unserviceable kutcha houses for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and non-SC/ST rural families living below the poverty line. From 1995-96, the IAY benefits have been extended to the families of the members of armed and paramilitary forces killed in action. A minimum of 60% of the funds under the scheme are earmarked for assistance to SC/ST families living below the poverty line. 3% of funds are reserved for disabled living below the poverty line in rural areas. The IAY funds and physical targets are also earmarked for the BPL Minorities (15%).

1.96 When asked to furnish details on financial and physical achievements during the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, following information has been furnished by the Department:-

Year	Budgetary Outlay (Rs. in Crore)	Expenditure (Rs. in Crore)	Target	Achievement (Houses constructed)
2007-2008	4040.00	3885.53	2127184	1992349
2008-2009	8800.00	8800.00	2127165	2134061
2009-2010	8800.00	8800.00	4052243	3385619
2010-2011	10337.50	10337.50	2908697	2715433
2011-2012	10000.00	7996.08**	2726702	1288418*
<b>Total</b>	<b>41977.5</b>	<b>39819.11</b>	<b>13941991</b>	<b>11515880</b>

\* As per On-Line MPR uploaded upto the month of January, 2012 (17 Feb., 2012)

\*\* Release as on 17-02-2012

1.97 When asked to furnish details of State-wise shortage of rural housing in the country at the start of 11<sup>th</sup> plan period, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that according to the estimates made by the RGI based on 2001 Census, the total housing shortage in rural areas throughout the country (excluding Delhi and Chandigarh) was 148.25 lakh families which includes houseless families and those living in non-serviceable kutcha houses. A statement of State-wise shortage of rural housing in the country as per Census 2001 is at Appendix X. Under IAY, funds and physical targets are allocated to States/UTs in accordance with pre-determined criteria assigning 75% weightage to housing shortage and 25% weightage to poverty ratio. For the sake of uniformity, the housing shortage as intimated by the Registrar General of India (RGI) based on 2001 Census is taken into account.

1.98 When asked about reasons behind failure to achieve physical targets for construction of houses during financial year 2007-08, 2009-10, and 2010-11 even after utilisation of total budgetary outlay, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in the financial year 2007-08, against a target of 21.27 lakh houses, 19.92 lakh houses were constructed which comes to 93.66%. Some houses remaining incomplete at the end of the year are completed in the next year. In the financial year 2008-09, against a target of 40.52 lakh houses, 33.85 lakh houses were constructed (83.54%). This was due to the fact that the stimulus package of Rs. 3050 crore was received in Feb. 2008 and due to imposition of model code of conduct from March to Mid May 2009, because of General election to the Lok Sabha. In the financial year 2010-11, the target was for construction of 29.08 lakh houses against which 27.15 (93.36%) houses were completed. Houses sanctioned during the year get completed in the next year.

1.99 The Department has informed that release of funds to implementing agencies is considered expenditure at the Central level. Utilisation of funds is calculated on the basis of expenditure reported by the implementing agencies the Department has furnished following details on year-wise utilization of funds during the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan:

<b>Year</b>	<b>TAF* (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Utilisation (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>%age of Utilisation</b>
2007-2008	6527.17	5464.54	83.72
2008-2009	14460.33**	8348.34	57.73
2009-2010	15852.35	13292.46	83.85
2010-2011	17956.54	13465.73	74.99
2011-2012	18911.94	10335.43***	54.65

\* Total Available Funds(TAF) includes Opening Balance, Center & State Releases

\*\* Total Available Funds (2008-09) includes Rs. 4050 crore (both Centre & State share) released as economic stimulus package in the month of February 2009

\*\*\* Utilization upto Feb. 2012 as per progress report received till 31/03/2012

1.100 The Department has also informed that unspent funds at the end of the financial year are carried forward to the next year. However, to ensure that States incur expenditure on the scheme efficiently and timely during the year, there is provision of deduction, if more than 10% of the available funds are carried forward. However, such deductions are restored when performance improves.

1.101 Further asked about States which have failed to achieve the targets set under the scheme, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in 2009-10, Bihar, Kerala, Tripura, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur could sanction less than 90% of target number of houses, while in 2010-11 only Manipur failed as per this criteria. (Appendix XI)



1.102 The Committee have been informed that rural housing shortage for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is estimated at four crore. Based on current trends, it is expected that about half of such households, i.e. 2 crore will be able to access housing through their own efforts and the rest half would require some form of Government assistance. The budget estimate for rural housing under Twelfth Plan therefore includes grant assistance for 1.5 crore households and subsidy assistance for 0.5 million households. When asked to furnish details on State-wise shortage of houses in rural areas of the country at the start of 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Working Group for Rural Housing for the Twelfth Five Year Plan generated data for rural housing shortage by projecting the growth trends of housing stock, households, pucca and semi-pucca houses based on the methodology of Working Group for Rural Housing for the Eleventh Five Year Plan, as the figures of Census 2011 were not available. The factors taken into account for assessing housing shortage were number of households not having houses in 2012, number of temporary houses, shortage due to congestion, shortage due to obsolescence in 2012 and additional housing shortage arising between 2012-2017. The Working Group did not work out the State-wise shortage of data. Data from Census 2011 is yet to be released.

1.103 Asked further about year-wise target set up by the Department for construction of houses in rural areas during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that for 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the target has not been fixed by the Ministry. However, the Working Group on Rural Housing for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan has recommended the year-wise target for the XII Five Year Plan as below:-

		Proposed allocation (in crore)	2012-13 Target (Million)	2013-14 Target (Million)	2014-15 Target (Million)	2015-16 Target (Million)	2016-17 Target (Million)
Construction of Houses (Grant and Subsidy)							
Grant for 15 million houses @ Rs 75,000 per house	Av Gol share @ Rs 57225 per unit	85,837.50	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.75
Subsidy for 5 million houses @Rs 45,000 per house	Av Gol share @ Rs 34335 per unit	17,167.50	0.30	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.60
Total for construction component		103,005.00					

1.104 The Department has also informed that final target depends upon the fund allocation. For the year 2012-13, Rs. 11075 crore have been allocated for construction of approximately 30 lakh houses.

1.105 The Committee have been informed that it has been decided by the Department that every State may prepare its own annual plan for the year 2012-13 in respect of IAY in order to take care of local issues. When asked about status of preparation of State plan for IAY for the year 2012-13, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that eight States have prepared and submitted Annual State plan for IAY for the year 2012-13. These are Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Lakshadweep and Uttarakhand.

1.106 The Department in their Action Taken Replies on the recommendation contained in Twentieth Report of the Committee have stated that working group for rural housing for 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan have recommended the Planning Commission for enhancement of financial assistance given under IAY from Rs. 45000/- to Rs. 75000/- along with loan facility of Rs. 50000/- at the DRIs with repayment period of 15 years. When asked about response of the Planning Commission on the above proposal of the Working Group, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the final report of the Working Group for Rural Housing for the Eleventh Five Year Plan has been submitted to the Planning Commission on 13/10/2011. A Committee on Group of Officers on IAY (GOIAY) has been constituted by the Planning Commission to examine the recommendations of the Working Group on Rural Housing for the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan and to suggest changes in IAY in the Twelfth Five Year Plan.

1.107 The Department has informed that a Homestead Scheme has been launched on 24.8.2009, as part of IAY, for providing Homestead sites to those rural BPL households, whose name have been included in the Permanent IAY Waitlists but who do not have either agricultural land or a house site. Under the Scheme, Rs. 10000/- per homestead site is provided which is shared by the Centre and the States in the ratio of 50:50. The area of Homestead site is 100-250 sq. mt.

1.108 When asked to furnish State-wise details of rural BPL households who do not have Homestead sites as per Census 2001 and 2011, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Census does not publish data regarding BPL households not having land. Therefore, this data was not available in Census 2001. Figures of Housing Shortage of 2011 are not yet released. However, as per estimates made on the basis National Sample Survey Organization report of 58<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> round, there are 7.7 million rural BPL households who do not have a house-site. The Department has provided following estimates regarding housesiteless rural BPL households as per NSSO Report and as intimated by the States:-

<b>Name of the State</b>	<b>NSSO Report</b>
Andhra Pradesh	13.73
Arunachal Pradesh	0.35
Assam	2.14
Bihar	0.66
Chhattisgarh	1.50
Gujarat	5.22
Haryana	0.81
Himachal Pradesh	1.01
J &K	0.34
Jharkhand	0.62
Karnataka	7.38
Kerala	3.51
M.P	1.86
Manipur	0.06
Maharashtra	9.30
Megalaya	-
Odisha	2.38
Punjab	0.91
Rajasthan	1.56
Tamil Nadu	13.45
Tripura	0.22
Uttar Pradesh	3.71
Uttarakhand	-
West Bengal	4.27
NE States	1.0
UTs	0.94
<b>All India</b>	<b>76.93</b>

1.109 Asked to furnish details on beneficiaries who have been given homestead sites under the scheme, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that nine States have requested for funds to purchase land under homestead site scheme. Rs. 347.46 crore has been released to these States for purchase of land sites. Only Government of Kerala has reported that 5,288 sites have been purchased. In addition, States have allotted /regularized land to 9,93,205 landless rural BPL households.

<b>States</b>	<b>No. of Sites allotted /Regularized</b>
Gujarat	51496
Madhya Pradesh	138575
Tripura	117000
Jharkhand	6000
Chattishgarh	213728
Odisha	295246
West Bengal	22318
Karnataka	31806
Rajasthan	117036

<b>Total</b>	<b>993205</b>
--------------	---------------

1.110 When asked about estimate made by the Department for expenditure to be incurred on this scheme during 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that no estimate has been made by the Ministry because demand for funds under this component depends on the demand from the States which is not high and can be met from the normal allocation under IAY. However, as per estimates made on the basis National Sample Survey Organization report of 58<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> round , there are 7.7 million rural BPL households who do not have a house-site .

1.111 The Department has informed that IAY have provision for loan of Rs. 20000/- per unit by Nationalized banks under differential rate of issues (DRIs) scheme at an interest rate of 4% in addition to financial assistance provided under IAY. When asked to furnish details on number of beneficiaries who have availed the loan under IAY, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the scheme was started in 2008-09 and as per available information, 1,38,687 IAY beneficiaries have availed loan under DRI till date (Appendix XII).

1.112 Further asked to furnish details on repayment ratio for loan under IAY, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that loan to IAY beneficiaries under DRI is only one small component of DRI scheme. The data on this is being maintained by RBI and Finance Ministry.

1.113 When asked to explain difficulties being faced by the beneficiaries to avail loans under the scheme, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that following difficulties have been brought to the notice of the Ministry:-

- (i) Only SC/ST category of IAY beneficiaries are being considered for loan under DRI
- (ii) The eligibility in respect of income ceiling and land-holdings applicable to other beneficiaries of DRI is also being applied for IAY beneficiaries desirous of taking loan under DRI.

1.114 The Committee have been informed by the Department that in order to ensure that IAY beneficiaries are able to access benefit under other Government schemes, IAY has been converged with Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC), Rajiv Gandhi Gramin Vidhutikarn Yojana (RGGVY), Drinking Water Supply (DWS,) Aam Aadmi Bima Yojana, Health Insurance, Swaranjyanti Gramin Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) and Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA). When asked to list specific benefits extended to the IAY beneficiaries under afore-mentioned schemes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that under TSC, an IAY beneficiary can avail financial assistance for construction of a sanitary latrine, under RGGVY one free electricity connection can be given. Under Aam Admi Bima Yojana and health insurance, an IAY beneficiary can get insurance cover for life and health respectively. IAY beneficiary can acquire membership of SHGs and the beneficiary is eligible

for a job card under MGNREGA.

1.115 When asked to furnish State-wise details of beneficiaries who have availed benefits under aforementioned schemes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as per the data uploaded by the implementing agencies, State-wise details of beneficiaries who have availed benefits under TSC, RGGVY, DWS, Aam Aadmi Bima Yojana, Health Insurance, Swaranjyanti Gramin Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY) and Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) are as per Appendix XIII. The numbers given may be an under estimate as in most cases uploaded data is not exhaustive.

1.116 Asked further about efforts made by the Department to educate IAY beneficiaries about the benefits extended to them under different Government schemes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have put all the information about convergence of IAY with other schemes on the Ministry's website. Booklets on entitlement of IAY beneficiaries have been printed and distributed. Audio and video spots have been prepared on IAY and are being circulated and publicized. Informative programmes have also been broadcasted on radio. Training has been imparted to field level Officers so that they in turn can disseminate information to the beneficiaries.

#### **E. Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)**

1.117 The Provision for Urban amenities in Rural Areas (PURA) aims to meet gaps in physical and social infrastructure in identified rural cluster to further their growth potential to stem rural urban migration. The Department has informed that the Government has approved Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA) scheme for implementation on pilot basis in 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan with the budgetary provision of Rs.248 crore. The scheme proposes holistic and accelerated development of compact areas around a potential growth centre in a Gram Panchayat (or a group of Gram Panchayats) through Public Private Partnership (PPP) framework for providing livelihood opportunities and urban amenities to improve the quality of life in rural areas. The primary objectives of the scheme are the provision of livelihood opportunities and urban amenities in rural areas to bridge the rural – urban divide.

1.118 The Committee have been further informed that scheme is being restructured in consultation with various Central Government Ministries, some of the State Governments, representatives of the private sector besides Asian Development Bank (ADB). It has been stated in Outcome Budget that under the restructured PURA scheme concerned schemes administered by the Ministry of Rural Development will be converged in Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) provision of PURA projects. The private

developer shall also access the support under relevant schemes of other Departments/ Ministries and dovetail into PURA for delivering the identified urban amenities. The implementation will be done within the guidelines for each of the identified schemes. However, it is expected that the developer shall invest some capital on his own to fund the essential infrastructure and meet operations & maintenance costs. The viability gap that may still exist will be met from a capital grant limited to a maximum of 35% of the project cost. Through capital grant will be limited to a maximum of 35% of project cost, the actual capital grant admissible will vary from project-to-project. During this pilot phase, the cost of each PURA project shall be limited to maximum of Rs. 120 crore.

1.119 Asked about eligibility criteria fixed for private developers to apply for PURA projects, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that private Sector Entities having experience in development / construction and management of community-oriented infrastructure projects, either as a single entity or as a consortium who meet the following qualification criteria are eligible to apply:-

- (i) A minimum net worth of Rs.25 crore;
- (ii) Experience of developing infrastructure projects having cumulative value of at least Rs.50 crore.

1.120 The Department has also informed that at the Request for Proposal (RfP) Stage, while evaluating the proposals, the Private Developers are required to demonstrate the following experience:-

- (i) Having undertaken infrastructure projects in the past, preferably on a PPP mode;
- (ii) Ability and resources to engage with the stake holders concerned to create a sustainable project, including experience in implementing community oriented projects.
- (iii) Ability to raise finances to meet capital and operating expenses (as required) for the project.

1.121 When the Committee enquired about responsibility to meet expenditure to be incurred on operation and maintenance, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that expenditure incurred on operation and maintenance will be met from the project cost.

1.122 Asked further about time limit for completion of projects under restructured PURA scheme, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that under the scheme, there is a time period of 3 years to complete the project activities from the date of signing of Concession Agreement and the Private Developer is mandated to operate and maintain the amenities for ten more years from the commercial operation date or the date of completion of construction.

1.123 When asked to furnish details on Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditure under the scheme during 11<sup>th</sup> Five year Plan, the Department has provided following details:

(Rs. in crore)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Budget Estimate</b>	<b>Revised Estimate</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>
2007-2008	10	--	Nil
2008-2009	30	--	Nil
2009-2010	30	--	Nil
2010-2011	124	74	66.2
2011-2012	100	90	90

1.124 The Department has further informed that funds were not released in 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 as the scheme was being restructured. The restructured PURA scheme was approved for implementation by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) on 21.01.2010. The Budget Estimate (BE) for the year 2010 – 11 was Rs. 124 crore and Revised Estimate (RE) was Rs. 74.00 crore. An amount of Rs.66.20 crore was released to DRDAs. During 2011-12, BE was Rs.100 crore and RE was Rs.90 crore. Rs. 90 crore was released to the DRDAs in 2011-12. The Department has also informed that Rs. 30 crore were released in 2009-10 for pilot projects undertaken during 2004-05 to 2006-07.

1.125 When asked to furnish details on number of pilot projects undertaken during 11<sup>th</sup> Five year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that a notice was issued inviting Expression of Interest (EoI) from private sector entities on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2010 in leading national and financial Dailies. In response to the notice, ninety three (93) Eols were received. These Eols have been examined and 45 organizations qualified at the Eol Stage. These 45 organizations were asked to submit the detailed bid alongwith concept plan by 07<sup>th</sup> October 2010. Nine organizations had submitted 14 proposals. These proposals were evaluated and 11 proposals were qualified. The concerned private entities were asked to submit Detailed Project Report (DPR) to the Ministry of Rural Development by 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011. In response, 6 organizations have submitted 9 DPRs which include the locations identified by the private party for the projects. The 9 projects are located at:-

- (i) Malapuram District, Kerala
- (ii) Thrissur District, Kerala
- (iii) Krishna District , Andhra Pradesh
- (iv) Warangal District, Andhra Pradesh
- (v) Jaipur District, Rajasthan
- (vi) Rajsamand District, Rajasthan
- (vii) Dehradun District, Uttarakhand
- (viii) Sangli District, Maharashtra
- (ix) Karaikal District, Puducherry

1.126 The Department has further informed that of the 9 projects, 2 projects in Kerala have been approved by an Empowered Committee comprising representatives of the Central and State Governments and the projects have been launched on 24.2.2012 and the Concession Agreements have been signed between the Panchyats concerned, DRDA and the private party. The remaining projects are at advanced stage of evaluation.

1.127 When asked to furnish details on kind of infrastructure envisaged under these pilot projects, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Concession Agreements between the Panchayats concerned, DRDA and the private party and State Support Agreement between the Central Government, State Government, DRDA and the private party have been signed on 24.2.2012 for two pilot projects in Malapuram and Thrissur and the project activities are yet to commence.

#### **F. National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)**

1.128 The Department has informed that National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) was launched on 15<sup>th</sup> August, 1995 as a Centrally Sponsored scheme. In 2002-03, NSAP, consisting of National Old Age Pension scheme (NOAPS), National Family Benefit scheme (NFBS) and Annapurna were transferred to State Plan. Indira Gandhi Old Age Pension scheme (IGNOAPS) was launched on 19-11-2007 by modifying the eligibility criteria under NOAPS. Two new schemes, namely, Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension scheme (IGNWPS) and Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension scheme (IGNDPS) have been launched in February, 2009. The funds for NSAP are released as Additional Central Assistance (ACA) by the Ministry of Finance as a combined allocation for all the five schemes together namely, IGNOAPS, IGNWPS, IGNDPS, NFBS and Annapurna, on the recommendation of the Ministry of Rural Development. When asked to provide details on allocation/release and actual expenditure under the scheme during 11<sup>th</sup> Five year Plan, the Department has provided following details:-

(Rs. in crore)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allocation/Release</b>	<b>Total expenditure</b>
2007-08	2891.48	3118.59
2008-09	4500.00	3801.70
2009-10	5200.00	4718.83
2010-11	5162.00	5347.63
2011-12	6596.11	4599.10
<b>Total</b>	<b>24349.59</b>	<b>21585.85</b>



1.129 Asked about criteria used for allocation under the scheme for different States, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the funds are allocated to different States based on the number of beneficiaries covered/estimated to be covered by them under various schemes of NSAP.

1.130 Asked further about number of states contributing funds from their own sources to augment assistance under the schemes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as per the information available, thirty States are contributing varying amounts to pension schemes under NSAP.

1.131 Asked about complaints received regarding irregularities under the scheme and action taken on these complaints, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that implementation of schemes under NSAP is the responsibility of the State Governments. Therefore, complaints/grievances received are forwarded to the concerned State Governments for taking appropriate action.

1.132 Asked to furnish State-wise details of number of Old Age People, Widows and Disabled persons in the country, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as per Census of India 2001, the total number of old age persons, widows and disabled persons State-wise is 7,66,22,321, 3,42,89,729 and 2,14,67,478 respectively (Appendix XIV).

## **G. Management Support to Rural Development Programmes and Strengthening of District Planning**

1.133 The Department has informed that 'Management Support to Rural Development Programmes and Strengthening of District Planning Process' scheme was introduced from 2007-08 by integrating the earlier scheme namely Monitoring Mechanism, IEC, Training, Information Technology and International Cooperation. When asked to provide State-wise details on budgetary provisions (BE and RE) and actual expenditure under different heads of the scheme since 2007-08, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that allocations are made by the Department for different sub-schemes from within BE/RE provisions of the Central Sector scheme 'Management Support to Rural Development Programmes and Strengthening of District Planning Process'. State-wise allocation is not made, but requirements of States are met subject to availability of funds. The break-up of allocations for different sub-schemes since 2007-08 is as under:-

(Rs. in crore)

Name of scheme	2007-08		2008-09		2009-2010		2010-11		2011-12	
	Allocation*	Actual	Allocation*	Actual	Allocation*	Actual	Allocation*	Actual	Allocation*	Actual
Monitoring Mechanism	13.00	11.60	11.65	7.19	6.00	2.59	3.36	3.36	4.00	2.00
IEC	18.00	18.00	19.00	19.00	20.00	20.00	31.23	31.23	35.00	35.00
SIRD/ETC	35.00	26.50	38.00	39.71	40.00	43.00	75.36	75.36	55.00	62.00
OTC	0.50	0.47	0.50	0.62	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	15.00	15.00
IT	0.50	0.55	2.00	1.85	3.00	2.38	1.10	1.10	3.00	1.00
IC	1.00	0.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.30	3.30	5.50	3.00
Management Cell	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.44	2.00	2.00	1.52	1.52	2.50	2.32
<b>Total</b>	<b>68.00</b>	<b>57.72</b>	<b>74.65</b>	<b>71.81</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>73.97</b>	<b>119.87</b>	<b>119.87</b>	<b>120.00</b>	<b>120.32</b>

\* No BE/RE for the Sub-heads under Management Support to Rural Development Programmes and Strengthening of District Planning Process.

1.134 The Department has informed that they support the training activities of States for effective implementation of rural development programmes by providing financial support to State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRDs) and Extension Training Centres (ETCs). The SIRDs and ETCs are State institutes for imparting training in the field of rural development to rural development functionaries and elected representatives of Panchayati Raj Institutions and others at State level and at District/Block level respectively. The Department also provides financial assistance for organizing training courses/seminars/workshops under the scheme "Organization of Training Courses".

1.135 When asked to furnish details on Extension Training Centres (ETCs) established in the country, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that ninety three Extension Training Centres have been established in the country till date. The State-wise details are given below:-

State	Places where the ETCs are functioning
Andhra Pradesh	Srikalahasti, Warangal, Bapatla (Guntur), Samalkota (East Godavari and Rajendranagar (Hyderabad) – 5
Arunachal Pradesh	Pasighat – 1
Assam	Jorhat, Joysagar, Kahikuchi, Amoni and Hailakandi – 5
Bihar	Gaya, Saharsa and Muzaffarpur – 3
Chattisgarh	Chandkuri (Raipur) – 1
Gujarat	Junagarh, Disa and Navasari – 3
Haryana	Nilokheri and Bhiwani – 2
Himachal Pradesh	Mashobra – 1
Jammu & Kashmir	R. S. Pura (Jammu) and Budgam (Srinagar) – 2
Jharkhand	Jasidih (Santhal Pargana) and Hazaribagh – 2
Karnataka	Gulbarga, Sirsi, Mysore, Gowripet (Kolar) and Mandya – 5

Kerala	Kottarakara, Mannuthy (Thrissur) and Taliparamba (Kannur) – 3
Madhya Pradesh	Ujjain, Bhopal, Multai, Jabalpur, Indore, Nowgaon (Chattarpur) and Gwalior – 7
Maharashtra	Parbhani, Jalna, Buldana, Kosbad Hill (Thane), Gargoti (Kohlapur), K. Bamda (Kolhapur), Manjri Farm (Pune) and Amaravati – 8
Meghalaya	Nongsder and Tura – 2
Mizoram	Pukpui and Thingsulthiah – 2
Nagaland	Tuensang and Phek – 2
Odisha	Bhubaneswar, Keonjhar and Bhawanipatna – 3
Punjab	Batala and Nabha – 2
Rajasthan	Dungarpur, Ajmer and Mandore – 3
Tamilnadu	T.Kullupatty, S.V. Nagaram, Bhavani Sagar, Pattukkottai and Krishnagiri – 5
Uttarakhand	Rudrapur, Hawalbagh, Dehradun, Haridwar and Pauri Garhwal – 5
Uttar Pradesh	Lucknow, Bakewar, Baraut, Bichpuri, Chirgaon, Dhorigat, Bulandshahar, Fizabad, Kalakankar, Mainpuri, Lakhaoti, Chargaon, Raibareilly, Ghazipur, Badaun, Rampurmaniharan (Saharanpur) and Afim Ki Kothi – 17
West Bengal	Cooch Bihar, Burdwan, Digha and Raiganj – 4
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>

1.136 When asked about proposal received by the Department for establishment of more number of ETCs by the States, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that keeping in view several requests sent by State Governments, such as Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Haryana, Assam etc. for establishing new ETCs, the Ministry have included establishment of Extension Training Centres at District level in Twelfth Plan proposals on Training. Setting up of new ETCs will be a major step forward in coping with the need for imparting training to greater number of RD functionaries, PRI members and other stakeholders.

## **V. PERFORMANCE OF AUTONOMOUS BODIES**

### **National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)**

1.137 National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) is an apex institute for training and research in rural development in India. Besides, organizing courses on developmental issues, capacity building of rural development and Panchayati Raj functionaries is key concern of NIRD. the vision of NIRD is to focus on training in the field of policies and programmes that benefit the rural poor, energize the democratic decentralization process, improve the operational and efficiency of rural development personnel, promote transfer of technology through its social laboratories, Technology Park and create inclusive environmental awareness.

1.138 Asked to furnish details on funds allocated for training programmes to NIRD during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that under the scheme of 'Grants to NIRD' funds are released to NIRD to meet the expenditure on training programmes, research and other activities. The break up of allocation and release to NIRD during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Release</b>
2007-2008	10.00	10.00
2008-2009	15.00	16.81
2009-2010	15.00	30.00
2010-2011	105.00	105.00
2011-2012	105.00	81.00

1.139 When asked about complaints received regarding financial irregularity under training programmes of NIRD, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have not received any complaints of financial irregularity under training programme. No financial irregularity under training programmes has also been reported by the Accountant General, Andhra Pradesh during its Audit of accounts of NIRD.

1.140 The Department has informed that Institute's research, training and consultancy services are availed by departments of the Central and State Governments, public sector undertakings, international agencies as well as voluntary agencies and training institutions involved in rural development. Asked to furnish details on consultancy services provided by the NIRD during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, NIRD had conducted a total of 1667 training programmes as part of their consultancy services sponsored by the Departments of the Central and State Governments, Public Sector Undertakings, International Agencies as well as Programme Divisions of the MoRD (Watershed, RWS/TSC, SGSY/NRLM, PMGSY, IAY, MGNREGA). The details of sponsored programmes conducted by NIRD during 11<sup>th</sup> Plan are as under:

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. of Sponsored Programmes Conducted</b>
2007-08	29
2008-09	30
2009-10	345
2010-11	734
2011-12	529
<b>Total</b>	<b>1667</b>

1.141 Asked further about details of fee charged by the NIRD for providing research / training /consultancy services to other agencies during the last five years, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that in case of sponsored programmes, NIRD charges Rs. 1,700/- per day per participant plus one day extra which meets Boarding and Lodging plus training cost. In case of consultancy research projects, NIRD charges for the time cost of faculty and supporting staff and 10% administrative cost. However, the Department has not provided any details on fee received by the NIRD as asked by the Committee.

1.142 The Ministry have also provided following information on physical achievement under training programme during the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan:-

Year	Physical training Programmes	
	Target	Conducted
2007-08	300	286
2008-09	280	367
2009-10	475	554
2010-11	906	975
2011-12	950	950
<b>Total</b>	<b>2911</b>	<b>3132</b>

1.143 Asked about training programme for PRIs representatives conducted by the NIRD, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, NIRD had conducted a total of 98 training programmes for PRIs and trained 2941 elected representatives of PRIs in the country. The PRIs have attended the training programmes along with other category of participants in the training programmes like Govt. Officials (RD and Other Departments), Bankers, NGOs, etc., The details of number of training programmes conducted and number of elected representatives of PRIs who have attended training programmes during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan are as under:

Year	No. of PR Programmes Conducted	No. of PRI members Attended
2007-08	21	144
2008-09	9	365
2009-10	15	456
2010-11	26	982
2011-12	27	994
<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>2941</b>

1.144 When asked to furnish details on physical achievement under research activities, the

Department has furnished following information:-

Year	Research Activities	
	Target	Achievement
2007-08	31	31
2008-09	16	16
2009-10	43	39*
2010-11	45	39*
2011-12	49	1**

\* There is no short fall in the achievement of target as these studies are long term studies and are in progress.

\*\* Remaining studies will completed as per schedule.

1.145 When asked to furnish details on target fixed for research activities for 2012-13, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Institute has fixed 50 research activities for the year 2012-13.

## **VI. MONITORING MECHANISM**

### **A. Vigilance and Monitoring Committees (VMC)**

1.146 Vigilance & Monitoring Committees (VMCs) are constituted at State as well as District level to function as an important instrument for effective monitoring of implementation of the programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development. They provide a crucial role for the Members of Parliament and elected representatives of State Legislatures and Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in reviewing the implementation of the rural development programmes. Meetings of the Vigilance and Monitoring Committees at State and District level are required to be held every quarter.

1.147 The Committee have been informed that after the constitution of the XV Lok Sabha, the Ministry issued guidelines for reconstituting State and District level VMCs and nominated members for State level VMCs and Chairmen / Co-Chairmen for District level VMCs and advised State Government/District authorities to reconstitute State/District level VMCs accordingly.

1.148 Asked about status of constitution of all States/UTs and Districts across the Country, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the State/Union territory level Vigilance and Monitoring Committees (VMCs) for monitoring the implementation of the programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development are constituted by the concerned State/Union territory. The District level VMCs are constituted by the District Administrations. This Ministry have advised all the States/Union territories to constitute VMCs at all these levels, on 26<sup>th</sup> August, 2009. The status of re-constitution of these committees

constituted after the general election to the XV Lok Sabha, as reported to the Ministry upto 31.03.2012, is at Appendix-XV.

1.149 Asked further about States/UTs who have failed to reconstitute the State or any District level VMCs and remedial action taken in this regard, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry have not received any intimation regarding re-constitution of these Committees in 4 States/UTs and 71 Districts upto 31.3.2012. The States/UTs have been impressed upon the need to re-constitute the Committees at State and District levels *vide* letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009. Subsequently, the Ministry have, from time to time, reminded all the States and Districts to convene Meetings.

1.150 Guidelines for the Vigilance and Monitoring Committees (V&MCs) provide that meetings of the VMCs at each level are to be held at least once in every quarter, after giving sufficient notice to the Hon'ble MPs/NGOs and all other members. When asked to furnish State-wise details of such meetings for the last five year, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the State and District level VMC meetings are not being held as frequently as stipulated in the guidelines. The State and District level meetings held, as reported to the Ministry, for the last five years are indicated at Appendix XVI to XVIII.

1.151 When asked to furnish details on State and District VMCs who have not held quarterly meetings as provided in the guidelines and reasons for not holding these meetings, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that reports received in the Ministry indicate that no State has held the stipulated number of meetings during the year 2011-12, while only 6 Districts have held the stipulated 4 meetings. The reasons for less number of Meetings, as reported by the States/Districts, include delays on the part of Chairman in indicating the date for the Meeting, postponement due to inability of the Chairman to attend the Meeting, elections, preoccupation of Member Secretary etc.

1.152 Asked further about withholding of release of funds to any District where regular meetings of VMCs were not held, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that they have not withheld funds to any District.

1.153 When asked about complaints received from Hon'ble Members about non-cooperation of the officials to hold regular meetings of the VMCs and action taken on these complaints, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the Ministry of Rural Development has received a

few complaints from Hon'ble Members of Parliament about non-cooperation of the officials in holding regular meetings of the VMCs. Member Secretary is the Secretary in-charge of the implementation of rural development programmes for the State VMC and District Collector/District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner/CEOs of Zilla Panchayat for the District VMC. In all the complaints received, the Ministry have taken up the matter with the concerned District Collectors reminding them of their personal responsibility in convening the district level VMC meetings in their capacity as Member Secretary, in accordance with the guidelines and urging them to convene meeting immediately.

1.154 The Department has informed that terms of Reference to the State level VMCs provides that the Committee would look into complaints received in respect of the implementation of the programmes including complaints of misappropriation/diversion of funds and recommend follow-up actions. Similarly, Terms of Reference to the District level VMCs state that "the Committee should look into complaints/alleged irregularities received in respect of the implementation of the programmes, including complaints of wrong selection of beneficiaries, misappropriation/diversion of funds and recommend follow-up actions. The Committee shall have the authority to summon and inspect any record for this purpose. The Committee may refer any matter for enquiry to the DC/CEO/PD or suggest suitable action to be taken as per rules which shall be acted upon by him within 30 days. If such action is not initiated within this time, the relevant programme funds to which the direction pertains to, may be withheld.

1.155 Asked about system available for ordinary people to lodge complaints with the VMCs at State and District levels regarding irregularities during implementation of the programmes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that no specific mechanism has been devised for lodging complaints to VMCs.

1.156 When asked to furnish status on remedial action suggested by different State & District level V&MCs on the complaints/alleged irregularities, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as stipulated in the guidelines only irregularities of a serious nature are reported by these Committees to the Ministry. However, no such case has been reported by any VMC.

1.157 Asked further about status completion of inquiry or suitable remedial action as suggested by the VMCs by the concerned agency within stipulated time limit of 30 days, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that this Ministry receives only gross violation noticed by VMCs. This Ministry does not receive the Action Taken Report (ATR) from the State/District authorities.



## **B. National Level Monitors (NLMs)**

1.158 National Level Monitors (NLMs) are deployed by the Ministry to ensure effective implementation of rural development programmes in a transparent manner and according to programme guidelines, the Ministry has a panel of National Level Monitors (NLMs), who are retired Defence/ Civil service officers. The NLMs are generally deputed by the Ministry for following three types of monitoring assignments:-

- (i) Regular monitoring : The NLMs are deputed to visit Districts periodically, generally twice a year, to monitor and report on various aspects of implementation of major RD programmes.
- (ii) Special Monitoring of individual programmes : NLMs are deputed to cover a particular programme or some specific aspects of it and make a report on the issues / processes in detail.
- (iii) Complaint / Enquiries: In case of complaints of serious nature from people's representatives, NGOs, etc. regarding mis-utilization of funds, irregularities etc., NLMs are deputed to verify the facts or for a preliminary enquiry.

1.159 When asked to furnish details on regular monitoring/special monitoring of the schemes undertaken by NLMs during the last five years, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that NLMs have undertaken 1910 visits of regular and special monitoring of rural development programmes during the last five years.

1.160 Asked to furnish details of complaints of serious nature investigated by NLMs during the last five years and action taken on report of NLMs in these cases, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that during the last five years, 404 complaints of serious nature regarding implementation of rural development programmes were enquired by NLMs. The Ministry deutes National Level Monitors to enquire into the serious complaints regarding implementation of the programmes of the Ministry. Reports of the NLMs are shared with the concerned State Governments for taking corrective action, as all the programmes of the Ministry are implemented by the State Governments.

1.161 The Department has informed that scheme has recently been revamped and guidelines have been issued. The Ministry has decided to engage Institutional NLMs for conducting enquiries into the

complaints regarding irregularities in the implementation of rural development programmes. Wide publicity to the visit of NLMs would be given so as to give an opportunity to the public to meet NLMs and report grievances if any. Asked to furnish details of engagement of organizations for deputing institutional NLMs, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Non-Governmental Institutions, except Government/Government supported Institutions, having sufficient experience in social work, preferably in the rural development sector have been considered for empanelment as Institutional NLMs. Out of 321 applications received from various Institutions against invitation published in news papers and website of the Ministry, 92 Institutions have been empanelled, as recommended by the Expert Group constituted under the Chairmanship of Director General, National Institute of Rural Development, for selection of NLMs. Views of the Government of the States where these Institutions are located have also been sought before empanelling. Representatives of the empanelled Institutions have subsequently been trained for undertaking the monitoring tasks. The Institutional NLMs will be deputed for enquiry into complaints regarding the implementation of the programmes of the Ministry, in addition to regular monitoring in States, outside their home States.

1.162 Asked further about criteria fixed for selecting institutional NLMs, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that Non Government Institutions having minimum of 5 years existence/experience and having done minimum two rural development projects during the last five years have been considered for empanelment.

## **VII. INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION (IEC)**

1.163 The Department has informed that IEC activities assume more significance in the context of the programmes of the Department which aim at improving the socio-economic conditions and which need to be implemented effectively in a time bound manner. The Department has also stated that they have a well laid IEC strategy and has been endeavoring for the past few years to disseminate information through both the traditional as well as modern mediums of communication viz press, radio, TV, printed material, outdoor contact programmes, folk & traditional mediums grassroots level social mobilization for community development through Bharat Nirman Volunteers etc.

1.164 When asked to furnish details on allocation (BE and RE) and actual expenditure under different heads of the scheme during the last five years, the Department has submitted following information: -

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Head	BE	RE	Actual Expenditure
2007-08	Communications	18.00	18.00	18.00
	NREGA	2.80	2.80	2.80
	SGSY	2.00	2.00	2.00
	IAY	2.00	2.00	2.00
	SGRY	1.40	1.40	1.40
2008-09	Communications	19.00	19.00	19.00
	NREGA	2.00	2.00	2.00
	SGSY	2.00	2.00	2.00
	IAY	2.00	2.00	2.00
2009-10	Management Support	20.00	19.00	20.00
	NREGA	2.00	2.00	2.00
	SGSY	2.00	2.00	2.00
	IAY	2.00	2.00	2.00
2010-11	Management Support	40.00	40.00	40.00
	NREGA	2.00	2.00	2.00
	SGSY	5.00	5.00	5.00
	IAY	5.00	5.00	5.00
2011-12	Management Support	35.00	35.00	35.00
	NREGA	2.00	2.00	2.00
	SGSY	1.00	1.00	1.00
	IAY	5.00	5.00	5.00

1.165 When asked to furnish details on grass root level IECs activities and mobilization through Bharat Nirman volunteers undertaken in Lab to Land Blocks, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that as on date, 63,073 BNVs are enrolled in 123 Districts, 500 Blocks and 4560 Village Panchayats. These volunteers function as frontline IEC communicators and undertake grassroots level IEC activities like door to door contact with household to determine their requirements under various schemes, dissemination of information regarding their entitlements and the processes, generating awareness regarding roles and responsibilities of Gram Sabha in working out village development plans and monitoring by Gram Sabha of the implementation of programme by the PRIs. 25 villages from 13 states were awarded with Bharat Nirman Gram Ratna Puruskar for enhancing democratic participation of the community and facilitating Government institutions for the effective implementation of flagship programmes of the Government and achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

1.166 When asked about efforts made by the Department for wider publicity of good works being done under Rural Development schemes in different parts of the country, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that IEC activities are undertaken to generate awareness among the beneficiaries regarding entitlements under various schemes and programmes and processes involved in

obtaining the benefits under each scheme, efforts are also made to give wide publicity to best practices / good works and inspirational stories in the field of implementation of the programmes. Various modes of communication like Television, Radio, Print, Outdoor outreach activities, contact programme, folk and traditional medium and screening of films in villages have been extensively used for the purpose. Films/documentaries showcasing good works have been produced and telecast over Doordarshan in weekly programmes like Gaon Har Hafte and in and in other channels of Television in the 9 BPL dominated States through Video Magazine named 'Grameen Bharat'. During 2010-11, 378 episodes of 'Grameen Bharat' video magazine were produced on best practices and good works and telecast. These documentaries have also been screened through field units of Directorate of Field Publicity up to Gram Panchayat level. The CDs / DVDs of these films were also provided to SIRDs/ETCs/State Governments for replication and wider dissemination. Besides, publicity is also done through radio by broadcast of weekly radio magazines, spots and jingles on different schemes and programme. In the print media, newspaper advertisements, printed IEC material like leaflets, brochures, FAQs, Folders etc were used. Similarly, 100 films have been produced during 2011-12 through NFDC in coordination with the SIRDs on various success stories and best practices.

1.167 Asked to furnish details of funds being provided to the States for IECs activities during last five years, the Department has furnished following information:-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	2007-08	2008-09#	2009-10#	2010-11#	2011-12
SIRD/State	Release	Release	Release	Release	Release
Andhra Pradesh	-	-	-	-	0.60
Arunachal Pradesh	0.26	-	-	-	0.10
Assam	0.78	-	-	-	0.30
Bihar	-	-	-	-	0.30
Chhattishgarh	0.02	-	-	-	0.30
Goa	0.04	-	-	-	-
Gujrat	0.32	-	-	-	0.25
Haryana	0.32	-	-	-	0.05
Himachal Pradesh	0.16	-	-	-	0.25
Jammu & Kashmir	0.18	-	-	-	0.10
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	0.30
Karnataka	0.36	-	-	-	0.30
Kerala	0.20	-	-	-	0.10
Madhya Pradesh	0.34	-	-	-	0.30
Maharashtra	0.30	-	-	-	0.30
Manipur	0.12	-	-	-	0.10
Meghalaya	0.04	-	-	-	0.10
Mizoram	0.08	-	-	-	0.10
Nagaland	0.12	-	-	-	0.10
Odisha	0.12	-	-	-	0.30

Punjab	0.32	-	-	-	0.05
Rajasthan	0.40	-	-	-	0.60
Sikkim	0.02	-	-	-	0.10
Tamilnadu	0.40	-	-	-	0.45
Tripura	0.02	-	-	-	0.10
Uttar Pradesh	0.62	-	-	-	0.60
Uttarakhand	0.16	-	-	-	0.25
West Bengal	0.02	-	-	-	0.30
<b>Union Territories</b>					
A&N Islands	0.08	-	-	-	-
D&N Haveli	0.02	-	-	-	-
Daman & Diu	0.04	-	-	-	-
Lakshadweep	0.02	-	-	-	-
Pondicherry	0.02	-	-	-	-
Chandigarh	0.02	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.92</b>	-	-	-	<b>6.70</b>

# No allocation were made as IEC expenses were required to be met out of administrative component of the programmes.

### VIII. UTILIZATION CERTIFICATES AND UNSPENT BALANCES

1.168 Unspent balances under various schemes of the Department during 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan were as follows:-

(Rs. in crore)						
Sl.No.	Year(as on)	NRLM/SGSY	IAY	MGNREGA	PMGSY	Total
1	01.04.2008	438.80	2373.62	4226.00	281.25	7319.67
2	01.04.2009	857.17	4231.02	11636.00	-313.01	16385.59
3	01.04.2010	905.55	4321.80	13105.00	-1933.10	16402.59
4	01.04.2011	798.08	5826.20	14792.00	5455.06	26871.34
5	31.12.2012	1204.04	7703.77	17968.59	8713.00	35589.40

1.169 The Department has informed that there were 371 utilization certificates involving an amount of Rs. 578.89 crore pending up to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2010. The Committee have also noted that against budget allocation of Rs. 76378.15 crore (RE), the actual expenditure during the financial year 2010-11 was only Rs. 72109.38 crore indicating under spending of Rs. 4268.77 crore. Similarly, the actual expenditure during the financial year 2011-12 is Rs. 48068.13 crore (as on 31.01.2012) against allocation of Rs. 67183.32 crore (RE) indicating a shortfall of Rs.19115.19 crore. When asked about reasons for under spending of the order of Rs. 19115.19 crore during financial year 2011-12 even after notionally taking into consideration of Q4 spending and its effect on performance deliverables of various schemes, the Department stated in their written submission to the Committee that the final expenditure during 2011-12 was Rs. 64245.13 crore. The Department has also provided following details on surrenders at the end of the year under the major programmes:-

(Rs. in crore)

<b>Name of Scheme</b>	<b>Surrender against BE 2011-12</b>	<b>Surrender against RE 2011-12</b>
MGNREGA	10784.95	1784.95
PMGSY	657.68	639.05
IAY	127.94	127.94
NRLM/SGSY	519.62	286.40

1.170 The Department has stated that the final expenditure and saving under MGNREGA is based on actual demand. While explaining the reason for surrender in the case of NRLM/SGSY, the Department has stated that the proposals for releases of 2<sup>nd</sup> installment with necessary financial documents after reaching the prescribed expenditure level of 60% of total available funds were not received from certain States/Districts. Savings had also resulted due to deductions on account of excess carryover of funds and short release of State share, as per provisions of the guidelines. In the case of IAY, the surrender was mainly due to inadequate expenditure in few States. Under PMGSY, the total release had to be curtailed due to unspent balances lying with the Implementing Agencies.

## **PART II**

### **OBSERVATIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE**

#### ***Eleventh Five Year Plan – Review of performance***

**2.1 Rural Development is the core to sustainable and inclusive growth through a multi-pronged strategy for eradication of poverty by increasing livelihood opportunities, providing social safety net and developing infrastructure for growth and improvement of quality of life of rural populace. For inclusive growth, participative development through Panchayati Raj Institutions as mandated by Part IX of the Constitution is essential. Under this backdrop, the Committee note that various schemes/ programmes of rural development have not received the desired level of allocation of funds from the Planning Commission during the Eleventh Plan period (2007-12). For instance, as against the proposal of about Rs. 3.97 lakh crore for Eleventh Plan, the Ministry received only Rs. 2.90 lakh crore. Coming to the utilization, the Committee are concerned to note that the overall performance of the Department has not been encouraging. For instance, against the available allocation of around Rs. 2.90 lakh crore, the total expenditure during Eleventh Plan was around 2.78 lakh crore leaving about Rs. 12000 crore unutilized. Considering the importance of rural development, the Committee feel that there should be higher allocation for the flagship programmes provided that the Department is able to properly plan their priorities and strategize their work programmes. They, therefore, recommend that the Department should work out a two-pronged strategy i.e., to increase their financial-absorption capacity and thereafter again take up the matter with the Planning Commission for a realistic higher allocation for the Twelfth Five Year Plan.**

**(Recommendation Sl. No. 1, Para No. 2.1)**

#### ***Allocation of funds for 2012-13***

**2.2 The Committee observe that the outlay for the fiscal year 2012-13 is Rs. 73,175 crore, which is around Rs. 925 crore lower than that of the previous fiscal year. The Committee also note that during this fiscal year, though there is increase in allocation of**

funds for various schemes like Aajeevika (NRLM), Indira Awaas Yojna and Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojna, there is significant reduction of funds to the tune of Rs. 7000 crore under MGNREGA. The Committee regret to note that reduction of 17.5 percent funds for MGNREGA will retard the momentum of progress in the vital area of employment and therefore would adversely impact the rural populace. The increase in allocation of funds for other schemes is also to be viewed in the context of inflation, wherein, the funds may not have enhanced in real terms. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the issue of additional funds for these schemes, especially the MGNREGA, be vigorously pursued with the Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance. The inclusive growth and overall development of 740 million rural people spread over 625 Districts, especially in view of India's static position in the UN Human Development Index over the last two decades inspite of GDP growth, would only be possible when adequate funds are allocated for rural schemes.

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

### ***BPL Survey***

2.3 The Committee have been informed that in June, 2011, the Ministry of Rural Development commenced the Socio Economic and Caste Census (SECC) through a comprehensive door to door enumeration across the country. The Committee have also been informed that the shortcomings of the 2002 BPL survey are being addressed comprehensively in the SECC, 2011 with the threefold objectives, namely (i) to enable households to be ranked based on their socio-economic status thereby enabling the State Governments to prepare a list of families living below the poverty line; (ii) to make available authentic information that will enable caste-wise population enumeration of the country; and (iii) to make available authentic information regarding socio-economic condition, and education status of various castes and sections of the population. The Secretary, Rural Development in his deposition before the Committee spelt out various facets of delivery mechanism of the programme viz., automatic inclusion/ exclusion criteria, deprivation indicators, incremental weightage to indicators, enumeration blocks etc. The Committee



find that the pace of Census is not progressing as per pre-defined targets. Out of total 24.57 lakh enumeration blocks initially identified by the Government, so far, the enumeration has been completed only in respect of 10.26 lakh Blocks i.e., about 42% of the overall target. The Committee are also unhappy to note that the process of enumeration is still to commence in States like Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Manipur and Uttar Pradesh. With the current pace of Census and its uneven coverage, the Committee are not very sure that the entire exercise which was scheduled to be completed by June, 2012 would be completed in stipulated time. The Committee, therefore, are not satisfied with the pace of this programme and recommend that more action oriented approach including regular monitoring of the progress made is called for in co-ordination with the concerned States so that survey could be completed in the right earnest.

(Recommendation SI. No. 3, Para No. 2.3)

2.4 The Committee find that under the Socio Economic and Caste Census, 2011, the eligibility and entitlements of households will be determined only after the survey is completed and the Expert Committee have given their recommendations on the methodology. The Committee are unhappy to note that there is an element of ambiguity on the part of Department in making available the BPL list soon after the completion of survey under SECC. In this connection, the most vital aspect with regard to BPL was identification of genuine poor in the BPL list. Though the Department has informed that under the SECC, the margin of inclusion/exclusion has been significantly reduced and the automatic exclusion criteria also reduces the possibility of trespass of ineligible households into the BPL list. The Committee would like to be ensured that through proposed exclusion mechanism no genuine BPL family is left out from the list. The Committee, therefore, recommend that appropriate checks and balances should be ensured by the Department so that the entire exercise would facilitate the formulation of improved social welfare schemes for the needy rural populace of the country.

(Recommendation SI. No. 4, Para No. 2.4)

### ***Revamping of District Rural Development Agency (DRDA)***

2.5 The Committee find that the task of restructuring of DRDA was assigned to a Committee headed by Shri V. Ramachandran which was to submit its Report by May, 2011. However, the Ramachandran Committee have submitted its Report to the Ministry of Rural Development in January, 2012 and the Report is under examination by the Government. Considering the importance of functioning of DRDA, the Committee are unhappy to note that the scheme of restructuring of DRDA, which is one of the main implementing agencies of all rural development schemes at District level, is still at the infancy stage and any further delay in implementation of the Ramachandran Committee Report, the process of merger of District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) with District Panchayats has not been completed in majority of States in the country. The Committee recommend that urgent steps be taken to examine the Report and to implement the recommendations of Ramachandran Committee Report followed by necessary follow-up action to expedite the crucial reforms in DRDA Administration Scheme.

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

### ***Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)***

2.6 The Committee find that MGNREGA is a flagship programme of the Government which aims at providing livelihood security of people in rural areas by guaranteeing at least 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. The Committee note with concern that as against the minimum of 100 days of work, the Department could provide an average of 42 days of work during the fiscal year 2011-12. They further find that during the previous years, the number of days of work provided under the scheme was 47 days in 2010-11 and 54 days in 2009-10. The Committee are constrained to believe that the basic methods of assessment of demand are flawed due to which the number of days of employment are receding. The Committee are further dismayed to note that number of work days in States like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh was as low as 31 as if people did not need any work. Similarly, in populated States like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, the percentage of families who got 100 days work was less than 10 per cent. It appears that in the name of 'demand driven',

no real efforts are made at local level to ensure that work is given to the people. The Committee are also not very sure about the involvement of Panchayats/ Gram Sabhas in the matter. The Committee, therefore, would like the Government to re-examine the entire implementation process including creation of durable assets to take remedial measures.

(Recommendation SI. No. 6, Para No. 2.6)

2.7 The Committee are also deeply disturbed that Government is yet to effectively implement Section 7 of MGNREGA which stipulates the provision of unemployment allowance to households if the work they seek is not given. In cases where work is not given, the unemployment allowance should be provided by the State Government and Central Government should also contribute for the purpose.

(Recommendation SI. No. 7, Para No. 2.7)

2.8 In view of less number of days of work, it is not surprising to the Committee that as against Rs. 40,000 crore that was allocated during 2011-2, the actual utilization of fund was to the tune of around Rs. 27,350 crore. The Committee are not happy over the dismal financial performance of the scheme, particularly when the implementation of MGNREGA is the joint responsibility of the Central as well as the State Governments. They find it disappointing and deplorable that, on the one hand, the Ministry pleads helplessness on account of lower allocation of funds, while, on the other hand, they are unable to utilize the available resources by observing strict financial discipline. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should draw a realistic plan of action to ensure that funds available to MGNREGA do not remain unutilized.

(Recommendation SI. No. 8, Para No. 2.8)

2.9 The Committee's examination of the works taken up under MGNREGA, average wage per day person and average earning per household per year has revealed that there is a mis-match in the deliverables. For instance, during 2009-10, 46.17 lakh works were taken up by the implementing agencies and on the basis of average wage of Rs. 90 per day per person, the yearly earning per household was Rs. 4860. Similarly, during the fiscal year

2011-12 (upto 15 March, 2012), 68.27 lakh works were taken up under MGNREGA i.e., an increase of around 48 percent and the average wage has also increased to Rs. 117 per day per person. However, the yearly earning per household has decreased to Rs. 4289 and taking into inflation, this would be even much less in real terms. The Committee are unhappy to find that MGNREGA is beset with fundamental problems with regard to attainment of objectives for which the scheme was launched as a major programme of the Department to give work for minimum 100 days to a family. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should find ways and means to ensure that there is not only yearly increase in the works to be taken up under the scheme but also appreciation in the average earning per household by increasing the number of work days.

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

#### ***Aajeevika - National Rural Livelihood Mission***

2.10 The Committee note that SGSY has been rechristened as Aajeevika- NRLM to implement it in mission mode in a phased manner for targeted and time bound delivery of results. However, the Committee observe that ambitious mission of the Department is running behind the schedule. The Committee find that so far twenty-one States and one UT have set up state level society as SRLM for implementation of NRLM, whereas, only Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Kerala have submitted State Perspective Plans and Action Plans for which fund have been released by the Department during the year 2011-12. The Committee also note that most of the States except Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Kerala are yet to set up dedicated State Project Management Units (SPMUs), District Programme Management Units (DPMUs) and Block Programme Management Units (BPMUs). The Committee also observe that federation of SHGs have not been established at any level in States/UTs except in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Odisha, Bihar, Tamilnadu and Madhya Pradesh. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should take immediate steps in coordination with State Governments concerned for establishment of necessary mechanism for time bound achievement of objectives of NRLM.

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

2.11 The Committee also note that during the Eleventh Plan, about Rs. 11,160 crore were released under SGSY/NRLM by the Central Government and about Rs. 18,000 crore was provided as loan to SHGs. However, the Committee are surprised to find that even after incurring huge expenditure under the scheme, the Department does not have any mechanism to track the progress of beneficiaries of who have availed loan/subsidy under the scheme. The Committee feel that in the absence of any mechanism to track the progress of beneficiaries, there would not be any accountability with regard to enormous expenditure incurred by the Ministry. The Committee are of considered view that tracking and monitoring of progress of beneficiaries should be a fundamental requirement for assessing the utility of expenditure made by the Government for reduction of poverty which is one of its stated objectives. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Department should expedite the process of completion of online monitoring system for tracking the progress of beneficiaries as planned under NRLM without further loss of time.

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

*Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)*

2.12 The Committee find that under PMGSY (including Bharat Nirman), the physical performance was not at all satisfactory. For example, regarding habitations under new connectivity, the Department could achieve 52 per cent of the targets, regarding length of new connectivity, the Department could achieve 56 per cent of the target. Further, for upgradation, against the target of 3,74,844 habitations, only 1,37,634 habitations have been achieved till February, 2012. The Committee apprehend that with the current pace of implementation of PMGSY, the Department may not be able to achieve the objective of providing all-weather road connectivity to the rural areas of the country in the near future. They, therefore, recommend that immediate corrective steps be initiated by the Government in this regard and the Committee be apprised accordingly. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry should also address the specific problems of States like Kerala where the existing guidelines are hampering the progress of work so that unconnected habitations are appropriately connected.

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

2.13 On the issue of availability of funds for PMGSY, the Committee find that during the Tenth and Eleventh Plan periods, the Department has not been able to get the requisite support from the Planning Commission. For instance, for the Tenth Plan (2002-07), the Department proposed an allocation of Rs. 55,000 crore, whereas, the Planning Commission had approved a plan outlay of Rs. 12,500 crore only. Similarly, for the Eleventh Plan (2007-12), the Department proposed an allocation of Rs. 81,801 crore, whereas, the Planning Commission had approved a plan outlay of Rs. 59,751 crore. For the the Twelfth Plan and the funds allocated for the first year of the Plan viz., 2012-13, the Committee are dismayed to note that though the Department had proposed an allocation of Rs. 2.12 lakh crore for the Twelfth Plan, the Planning Commission has allocated a meagre Rs. 24,000 crore for the fiscal year 2012-13 and at this level, Twelfth Plan allocation will come to about Rs. 1.20 lakh crore. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Planning Commission should find ways and means of making available higher allocations in the Twelfth Plan for PMGSY particularly when the scheme has been opened for the States for covering habitations with population below the 1000 set under Bharat Nirman in stages i.e., 500-900, 250-499 based on coverage of higher category. This was earlier stopped by the Government in the name of Bharat Nirman norms and this has added to the backlog of pending connectivity to habitations through *pucca* roads.

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

#### *Indira Awaas Yojna (IAY)*

2.14 The Committee note that during the Eleventh Plan period, against the target of providing financial assistance to 1.39 crore BPL families for construction of houses, financial assistance was provided to 1.15 crore BPL families leaving a huge backlog of about 24 lakh BPL families. The Committee also note that various Schemes such as TSC, RGGVY, Aam Aadmi Bima Yojna, Rashtriya Swastha Bima Yojna, etc. of other Ministries/Departments have been converged with IAY. However, on perusal of available information on convergence under IAY for the period 2011-12, the Committee find that against the target of about 27 lakh families, only 2,87,641 beneficiaries under TSC, 15,406

beneficiaries under RGGVY, 88,097 beneficiaries under Life Insurance scheme, 1,85,384 beneficiaries under Health scheme, 1,613 beneficiaries under bio-gas plant and 2,17,166 beneficiaries under smokeless chullah scheme have availed benefits of convergence under IAY. The Committee are of the view that poor performance of implementing agencies on this count shows lack of awareness among the beneficiaries regarding the inherent provision of this Scheme. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should initiate proactive steps to spread awareness amongst the rural populace so that they could avail benefits associated with IAY.

(Recommendation SI. No. 14, Para No. 2.14)

2.15 The Committee find that Homestead Scheme launched under IAY is a pragmatic effort by the Department to provide land to rural BPL households who do not have any land to construct houses. However, the Committee find that the scheme has been declared as 'demand driven' and only 9,93,205 sites have been allotted/regularized to landless rural BPL households in 9 States since the inception of the scheme. The Committee further observe that no estimates have been put forth by the Department for Twelfth Plan and they intend to meet demand for funds from the normal allocation under the scheme. The Committee have experienced that by making any programme as 'Demand driven', there would not be any pre-determined target and, therefore, whatever deliverable are attained by the organisation within a specified time frame are regarded and brought under the category of achievements. The accountability of optimum utilization of scarce resources also gets vitiated due to the fact that lower utilization of funds is often co-related with lower generation of demand. The Committee are constrained to mention that in order to camouflage the administrative inefficiency and/or fundamental conceptual flaw in the schemes, almost every centrally sponsored scheme of the Government is now being transformed to a demand driven approach. The Committee are of considered view that the Homestead Scheme would not be able to deliver the desired results if the scheme continue to be operated on a demand driven mode. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a quick study should be initiated by the Department to pragmatically analyse the shortcomings of the demand driven approach of scheme so that timely action for re-

transforming the scheme to target-oriented approach may be taken. The Committee urge the Government to take the desired steps and apprise the Committee accordingly.

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

2.16 The Committee note that the issue of enhancement of financial assistance up to Rs. 75,000 and loan facility up to Rs. 50,000 with repayment period of 15 years for BPL rural households for construction of house has been pending before the Committee (Group of Officers). The Committee are of considered view that financial assistance of Rs. 45,000 for plain areas and Rs. 48,500 for Hilly Areas and LWE Districts is too meager to construct a house in view of increasing cost of construction material in the country. The Committee are of the view that financial assistance under IAY should be appropriately enhanced and it may also be linked with Consumer Price Index for automatic periodic revision. The Committee also desire that decision on enhancement of assistance and loan facility under IAY as recommended by the working Group on Rural Housing for Twelfth Five year Plan be expedited by the Committee (Group of Officers). Considering the proposed hike in assistance per units, the Committee feel that increased outlay of Rs. 11075 crore for the year 2012-13 from Rs. 10000 crore in 2011-12 may not be adequate to achieve the set goals.

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

#### ***Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)***

2.17 The Committee note that PURA scheme was started as a pilot project in 2003-04 and continued till 2009-10. The Government restructured PURA in 2010 and decided to initiate new pilot project in PPP mode, wherein, the private developers will be awarded projects on meeting certain specified criteria. The Committee further note that Rs. 156.20 crore was released to DRDA during 2010-11 and 2011-12 for implementation of PURA. Apart from this, Rs. 30 crore were released in 2009-10 for pilot project undertaken during 2004-05 to 2006-07. However, the Committee are dismayed to find that no concrete infrastructure has been created in any of the pilot projects. The Committee are of considered view that a period of nine years for any scheme to continue on a pilot project



mode is sufficient to weigh the pros and cons in entirety and therefore, there is no need to run PURA scheme again on a pilot mode. The Committee, therefore, are not satisfied with the way this important scheme is being handled and recommend that more action-oriented approach is called for and the Ministry would take conclusive action in the matter.

(Recommendation SI. No. 17, Para No. 2.17)

***National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)***

2.18 The Committee note that NSAP comprising of five schemes namely Indira Gandhi National Old Age Pension Scheme (IGNOAPS), Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension Scheme (IGNWPS), Indira Gandhi National Disabled Pension Scheme (IGNDPS), National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and Annapurna, is being implemented as Additional Central Assistance to State Plan. The funds for NSAP and Annapurna are allocated by the Planning Commission and are released as Additional Central Assistance (ACA) by the Ministry of Finance to the States and by the Ministry of Home Affairs to the Union Territories on recommendation of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee also note that an amount of Rs. 24349.59 crore was released to the States during Eleventh Plan period against which the States could utilize only Rs. 21585.85 crore. The Committee find that as per 2001 Census, the total number of old age, widows and disabled persons in the country were 7.7 crore, 3.43 crore and 2.15 crore respectively, whereas, assistance was provided to 1.92 crore old age people , 36.04 lakh widows and 7.69 lakh disabled persons during 2011-12 under the relevant schemes of NSAP. The Committee are of considered view that in order to cover all needy persons under the relevant scheme, a comprehensive record should be maintained at District level to enroll each eligible person under these categories. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should take up the matter with the Planning Commission for transforming NSAP as a model programme for the welfare of needy people.

(Recommendation SI. No. 18, Para No. 2.18)

### ***National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)***

**2.19** The Committee note that NIRD as an autonomous body under the Ministry of Rural Development for organizing courses on developmental issues, capacity building of rural development and Panchayati Raj functionaries. The Committee note that NIRD has conducted 3132 training programmes as against the target of 2911 training programmes during Eleventh Plan period. The Committee also note that 2941 elected representatives of PRIs have been trained in 98 training programmes organised by NIRD. The Committee are of view that training programmes organized for PRIs are not adequate in view of vast number of elected representative of PRIs in the country. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should take steps for organizing more training programmes for elected representatives of PRIs. The Committee are of considered view that NIRD should provide a platform to elected representatives of PRIs where they can interact and share their experiences. The Committee also desire that NIRD should organize symposium on relevant topics on rural development involving elected members of PRIs.

(Recommendation SI. No. 19, Para No. 2.19)

### ***Vigilance & Monitoring Committee (V&MCs)***

**2.20** The Committee observe that Vigilance & Monitoring Committee (V&MCs), as a means of monitoring mechanism, provide crucial role for the elected representatives of Parliament, State Legislatures and PRIs in reviewing the implementation of various rural development programmes. However, the Committee note that adequate co-operation is not being extended to States and District level V&MCs. The Committee also note that 4 State/UTs namely Punjab, Goa, Lakshadweep and Puducherry are yet to re-constitute State Level V&MCs, whereas, District level V&MCs have not been reconstituted in 71 Districts after the constitution of Fifteenth Lok Sabha. This anomalous position has hampered monitoring process of various rural development programmes. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should impress upon the States for expeditious

constitution of State & District V&MCs. The Committee further observe that meetings of both State and District level V&MCs are not being held quarterly as provided in the guidelines of V&MCs. The Committee note that none of the States have held the stipulated number of meetings during the entire Eleventh Plan period, whereas, only six Districts have held the stipulated four meetings in the year 2011-12. The Committee have been informed that reasons for less number of meetings as reported by the States/Districts, include delay on the part of Chairman in indicating the date(s) for holding the meeting, postponement due to inability of the Chairman to attend meeting, preoccupation of Member Secretary etc. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Department should frame a schedule of V&MCs meetings at State & District level in consultation with Members of Parliament including Members of Rajya Sabha, State Legislatures and PRIs so that the entire process is streamlined and intended benefits start tricking down at the ground level. The Committee also recommend that due representation of SCs, STs should be provided in V & MCs.

(Recommendation SI. No. 20, Para No. 2.20)

## ***Unspent Balances***

2.21 The Committee are constrained the note that even after persistent recommendations by the Committee, there have been huge amounts lying unspent in all the programmes being implemented by the Department. In this connection, the Committee note that Rs. 1204.04 crore in NRLM, Rs. 7703.77 crore in IAY, Rs. 17968.59 crore in MGNREGS and Rs. 8713.00 crore in PMGSY have been lying as unspent as on 31.12.2011. The Committee have been informed that proposals for release of second instalment with necessary financial documents after reaching the prescribed expenditure level of 60 per cent of total available funds were not received from certain States/ Districts. The Committee feel that in order to ascertain the exact position State-wise, a study be conducted in different on-going programmes in order to ascertain the reasons for accumulation of unspent balances with the States especially the aspect of complacency on the part of the implementing authorities. Needless to point out that there should be a fund release/ utilization tracking system which should be online and has access to village Panchayats.

(Recommendation SI. No. 21, Para No. 2.21)

NEW DELHI;  
02 May, 2012  
12 Vaisakha, 1934 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN  
*Chairperson,*  
Standing Committee on Rural Development



## Annexure-II

**Cumulative number of households issued job cards**  
(Vide para 1.51 of the Report)

(In Nos)

No	State	Cumulative number of households issued job cards					
		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 reported till 23/04/12
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	5066675	8853413	11347815	11722646	11991323	11886571
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	16926	23647	154957	135140	170350	49414
3	ASSAM	916753	1565775	2970522	3611714	4369561	3912887
4	BIHAR	3562761	7988992	10284009	12403792	13044879	12085971
5	CHHATTISGARH	1848766	2875796	3354795	3574607	3911126	4382384
6	GUJARAT	632269	865503	2877792	3570123	3955998	4072486
7	HARYANA	106772	161445	377568	459367	582737	671393
8	HIMACHAL PRADESH	99446	393751	849993	994969	1050602	1101762
9	JAMMU & KASHMIR	179133	278891	497175	664494	1001681	702713
10	JHARKHAND	2304037	2958788	3375992	3697477	3920922	4009782
11	KARNATAKA	795600	1523091	3420945	5220895	5294245	5571697
12	KERALA	213840	479036	1897713	2599453	2915670	1850800
13	MADHYA PRADESH	4446195	7238784	11229547	11292252	11384370	11831834
14	MAHARASHTRA	2753047	3128352	4814593	5699877	5832823	6544653
15	MANIPUR	18568	91013	385836	426533	444886	423991
16	MEGHALAYA	113255	121542	298755	372523	398226	448704
17	MIZORAM	21966	89314	172775	180803	170894	211078
18	NAGALAND	27884	115686	296738	325242	350815	375149
19	ODISHA	2593194	4095075	5267853	5802442	6025230	6137459
20	PUNJAB	37326	97892	524928	704874	821076	863835
21	RAJASTHAN	1508223	2869457	8468740	8827935	9274312	9728122
22	SIKKIM	4498	30907	77112	70050	73575	79120
23	TAMIL NADU	1157525	2200437	5512827	6535710	7347187	8172937
24	TRIPURA	75067	465779	600615	607010	584900	601012
25	UTTAR PRADESH	4004287	7311973	10652018	11698780	13052850	14511601
26	UTTRAKHAND	199236	358734	817753	893496	974529	1020815
27	WEST BENGAL	5147141	8578073	9556067	10351948	10731538	11101452
28	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR	NA	NA	23313	12763	44406	58406
29	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	NA	NA	8100	10923	11135	374
30	GOA	NA	NA	10244	14279	21032	29193
31	LAKSHADWEEP	NA	NA	3313	6079	7787	7711
32	PUDUCHERRY	NA	NA	15547	60780	63769	66236
<b>Total</b>		<b>37850390</b>	<b>64761146</b>	<b>100145950</b>	<b>112548976</b>	<b>119824434</b>	<b>122511542</b>

NR=Not Reported  
NA=Not Applicable

## Annexure-III

**Number of households demanded employment**  
(Vide para 1.51 of the Report)

In Nos

No	State	Number of households demanded employment					
		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 reported till 23/04/12
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	2161494	4803892	5699557	6158493	6200423	4899350
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	16926	36437	110259	72606	151574	12743
3	ASSAM	798179	1448243	2155349	2139111	1807788	1352384
4	BIHAR	1708610	3956055	3822484	4127330	4763659	1516769
5	CHHATTISGARH	1282794	2297042	2271194	2025845	2485581	2698601
6	GUJARAT	226269	290691	850691	1596402	1097483	835181
7	HARYANA	50765	70869	171794	156410	237480	277756
8	HIMACHAL PRADESH	67187	275463	453724	499174	447064	530815
9	JAMMU & KASHMIR	121328	116914	214385	352287	497617	355674
10	JHARKHAND	1394108	1679978	1576857	1703243	1989083	1560337
11	KARNATAKA	548532	554002	906503	3626437	2414441	1664074
12	KERALA	104927	259275	698680	957477	1186356	1418048
13	MADHYA PRADESH	2866349	4347079	5207862	4714916	4445781	3639586
14	MAHARASHTRA	353024	474695	907783	591611	453941	1390203
15	MANIPUR	18568	112549	381109	418564	437228	354458
16	MEGHALAYA	99177	106989	239630	302537	357523	321339
17	MIZORAM	52478	88943	172775	180140	170894	175977
18	NAGALAND	27884	115331	296689	325242	350815	304909
19	ODISHA	1407251	1134751	1220596	1416560	2030029	1391482
20	PUNJAB	31788	49690	147336	272684	278567	245182
21	RAJASTHAN	1175172	2173122	6375314	6522264	6156667	4702332
22	SIKKIM	4179	21773	52554	54156	56401	55470
23	TAMIL NADU	683708	1234818	3345648	4373257	4969140	6340287
24	TRIPURA	74800	425299	549145	577540	557413	567099
25	UTTAR PRADESH	2676261	4104283	4338490	5667644	6581786	7265047
26	UTTRAKHAND	134363	189263	298741	522304	542391	445024
27	WEST BENGAL	3235360	3919996	3025854	3489363	5011657	5363053
28	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR	NA	NA	8131	20634	17937	17990
29	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	NA	NA	1919	3741	2290	NR
30	GOA	NA	NA	0	6613	13997	11173
31	LAKSHADWEEP	NA	NA	3024	5192	4507	3749
32	PUDUCHERRY	NA	NA	12264	40377	38574	42283
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21321481</b>	<b>34287442</b>	<b>45516341</b>	<b>52920154</b>	<b>55756087</b>	<b>4975837</b> <b>5</b>

NR=Not Reported  
NA=Not Applicable





**Average days Employment provided per Household**  
(Vide para 1.51 of the Report)

No	State	Average days per Household					
		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 reported till 23/04/12
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	31	42	48	66	54	56
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	27	62	43	25	23	10
3	ASSAM	72	35	40	34	26	26
4	BIHAR	35	22	26	28	34	37
5	CHHATTISGARH	56	58	55	51	45	44
6	GUJARAT	44	31	25	37	45	38
7	HARYANA	48	50	42	38	36	39
8	HIMACHAL PRADESH	47	36	46	57	49	52
9	JAMMU & KASHMIR	27	32	40	38	43	43
10	JHARKHAND	37	44	48	49	42	39
11	KARNATAKA	41	36	32	57	49	42
12	KERALA	21	33	22	36	41	45
13	MADHYA PRADESH	69	63	57	56	50	41
14	MAHARASHTRA	45	39	46	46	44	47
15	MANIPUR	100	43	75	73	68	58
16	MEGHALAYA	25	39	38	49	58	47
17	MIZORAM	15	35	73	95	97	63
18	NAGALAND	47	21	68	87	95	56
19	ODISHA	57	37	36	40	49	33
20	PUNJAB	49	39	27	28	27	26
21	RAJASTHAN	85	77	76	69	52	46
22	SIKKIM	59	44	51	80	85	60
23	TAMIL NADU	27	52	36	55	54	47
24	TRIPURA	67	43	64	80	67	86
25	UTTAR PRADESH	32	33	52	65	52	36
26	UTTRAKHAND	30	42	35	35	42	41
27	WEST BENGAL	14	25	26	45	31	26
28	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR	NA	NA	17	29	23	41
29	DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	NA	NA	25	19	21	NR
30	GOA	NA	NA	NR	28	27	28
31	LAKSHADWEEP	NA	NA	60	27	30	39
32	PUDUCHERRY	NA	NA	13	22	30	25
	<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>42</b>

NR=Not Reported

NA=Not Applicable



## No. of SHGs taken up Economic Activities under SGSY\*

*(Vide para 1.68 of the Report)*

S.No.	States /UTs	No of SHGs assisted
1	Andhra Pradesh	175513
2	Arunachal Pradesh	383
3	Assam	118506
4	Bihar	108302
5	Chattisgarh	25675
6	Goa	951
7	Gujarat	21606
8	Haryana	18433
9	Himachal Pradesh	8985
10	Jammu & Kashmir	4687
11	Jharkhand	52934
12	Karnataka	62188
13	Kerala	21072
14	Madhya Pradesh	84784
15	Maharashtra	118321
16	Manipur	2127
17	Meghalaya	3050
18	Mizoram	2460
19	Nagaland	3897
20	Odisha	85588
21	Punjab	5477
22	Rajasthan	23769
23	Sikkim	1493
24	Tamil Nadu	75903
25	Tripura	21831
26	Uttar Pradesh	221877
27	Uttaranchal	15672
28	West Bengal	123055
29	A&N Islands	283
31	Daman & Diu	0
30	D & N Haveli	0
32	Lakshadweep	13
33	Pondicherry	1084
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1409919</b>

\* Since inception till 2011-12 (up to Feb 2012)

Appendix VIII

State-wise abstract of NQM inspections for the period during January, 2007- February,2012  
(Vide para 1.92 of the Report)

S.No.	State	Total Inspection	Completed Works	Ongoing Works
1	Andhra Pradesh	1088	417	671
2	Arunachal Pradesh	272	53	219
3	Assam	1175	89	1086
4	Bihar	463	10	453
5	Bihar (NEA)	773	94	679
6	Chattisgarh	1016	234	782
7	Gujrat	569	259	310
8	Goa	0	0	0
9	Haryana	294	86	208
10	Himachal Pradesh	589	165	424
11	Jammu & Kashmir	405	45	360
12	Jharkhand	555	68	487
13	Karnataka	934	159	775
14	Kerala	370	57	313
15	Madhya Pradesh	2160	258	1902
16	Maharashtra	1951	187	1764
17	Manipur	155	14	141
18	Meghalya	105	13	92
19	Mizoram	112	15	97
20	Nagaland	82	10	72
21	Odisha	1702	259	1443
22	Punjab	621	142	479
23	Rajasthan	1058	353	705
24	Sikkim	201	10	191
25	Tamil nadu	974	345	629
26	Tripura	212	31	181
27	Uttar Pradesh	2041	649	1392
28	Uttrakhand	283	27	256
29	West Bengal	1062	147	915
<b>Total</b>		<b>21222</b>	<b>4196</b>	<b>17026</b>

**State wise Abstract of SQM inspection (Nov 2010 to Feb 2012)\***  
(Vide para 1.92 of the Report)

\*Data prior to Nov 2010 was not being maintained in the OMMAS

Sl. No.	States/UTs	Total Inspections	Completed Works	Ongoing Works
			Total	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	491	280	211
2	Arunachal Pradesh	295	54	241
3	Assam	1285	56	1229
4	Bihar	1165	19	1146
5	Chathisgarh	1046	191	855
6	Dadar and Nagar Haveli	0	0	0
7	Goa	0	0	0
8	Gujarat	154	57	97
9	Himachal Pradesh	477	27	450
10	Haryana	77	10	67
11	Jharkand	1378	162	1216
12	Jammu and Kashmir	514	43	471
13	Karnataka	839	369	470
14	Kerala	6	0	6
15	Meghalaya	12	0	12
16	Maharastra	1243	325	918
17	Manipur	165	17	148
18	Madhya Pradesh	3047	273	2774
19	Mizoram	78	2	76
20	Nagaland	34	24	10
21	Odisha	2527	963	1564
22	Punjab	29	1	28
23	Rajasthan	238	61	177
24	Sikkim	95	23	72
25	Tamilnadu	613	260	353
26	Tripura	396	162	234
27	Uttar Pradesh	408	273	135
28	Uttarakand	323	21	302
29	West Bengal	672	160	512
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17607</b>	<b>3833</b>	<b>13774</b>

**State-wise Housing Shortage in Rural Areas as per 2001 Census**  
(Vide para 1.97 of the Report)

Sl. No.	States / UT s	Housing Shortage in Rural Areas (In No.)
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	1350282
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	105728
3	ASSAM	2241230
4	BIHAR	4210293
5	CHHATTIS GARH	115528
6	GOA	6422
7	GUJARAT	674354
8	HARYANA	55572
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	15928
10	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	92923
11	JHARKHAND	105867
12	KARNATAKA	436638
13	KERALA	261347
14	MADHYA PRADESH	207744
15	MAHARASHTRA	612441
16	MANIPUR	69062
17	MEGHALAYA	148657
18	MIZORAM	30250
19	NAGALAND	97157
20	ODISHA	655617
21	PUNJAB	75374
22	RAJASTHAN	258634
23	SIKKIM	11944
24	TAMIL NADU	431010
25	TRIPURA	174835
26	UTTAR PRADESH	1324028
27	UTTARANCHAL	53521
28	WEST BENGAL	974479
29	ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS	17890
30	DADAR & NAGAR HAVELI	1926
31	DAMAN AND DIU	787
32	LAKSHADWEEP	190
33	PONDICHERRY	7778
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14825436</b>

## Appendix -XI

## Indira Awaas Yojana (State-wise Physical Achievements 2010 – 2011)

(Vide para 1.101 of the Report)

(IN Numbers)

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE STATES / UTs	ANNUAL TARGET FOR THE YEAR	HOUSES SANCTIONED DURING THE YEAR					%AGE
			SCHE DULED CASTE SC	SCHE DULED TRIBE ST	MINORITY	OTHERS	TOTAL Col. (4 to 7)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	NAGALAND	7730	0	16175	0	0	16175	209.25
2	MIZORAM	2489	0	4916	0	0	4916	197.51
3	SIKKIM	1478	345	670	1015	709	2739	185.32
4	JHARKHAND	167691	36620	66330	21305	138846	263101	156.90
5	GOA	1584	43	714	109	1440	2306	145.58
6	GUJARAT	126090	7797	86380	4167	79792	178136	141.28
7	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	17995	2770	9733	320	11955	24778	137.69
8	TRIPURA	15050	3064	11267	2036	3887	20254	134.58
9	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	7726	0	10265	0	0	10265	132.86
10	BIHAR	758904	477063	25977	155118	345004	1003162	132.19
11	RAJASTHAN	63362	32801	15627	9509	22759	80696	127.36
12	MEGHALAYA	11681	10	12860	58	62	12990	111.21
13	HARYANA	17703	10864	0	2656	6157	19677	111.15
14	ODISHA	149100	57093	41881	8298	58057	165329	110.88
15	UTTARAKHAND	15856	4343	1534	2882	8068	16827	106.12
16	PUNJAB	21893	17077	0	1935	4211	23223	106.08
17	KARNATAKA	99055	32954	16059	11857	42570	103440	104.43
18	ASSAM	170849	45432	54402	30289	46332	176455	103.28
19	MAHARASHTRA	155052	38049	43848	17017	58653	157567	101.62
20	HIMACHAL PRADESH	5793	2793	454	248	2376	5871	101.35
21	CHHATTISGARH	39759	7582	19115	1051	12476	40224	101.17
22	ANDHRA PRADESH	257104	117973	59899	38208	41024	257104	100.00
23	TAMIL NADU	102939	58313	2730	13053	28843	102939	100.00
24	UTTAR PRADESH	340868	170586	2176	39920	122297	334979	98.27
25	KERALA	55084	21130	4508	9935	17425	52998	96.21
26	WEST BENGAL	205671	79675	22381	49965	43934	195955	95.28
27	MADHYA PRADESH	79073	18552	27471	4774	20470	71267	90.13
28	MANIPUR	6707	83	2178	481	1192	3934	58.66
29	AND & NIC ISLANDS	2446	0	0	49	391	440	17.99
30	DAD & NAG HAVELI	407	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
31	DAMAN AND DIU	182	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
32	LAKSHADWEEP	158	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
33	PUDUCHERRY	1218	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2908697</b>	<b>1243012</b>	<b>559550</b>	<b>426255</b>	<b>1118930</b>	<b>3347747</b>	<b>115.09</b>

**Benefit Availed Under DRI in Indira Awaas Yojana**  
(Vide para 1.111 of the Report)

Sl. No.	STATES UTS	(In Nos)				Total
		2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 (Reported upto Feb.2012)	
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	0	0	0	0	0
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	0	0	0	0	0
3	ASSAM	0	325	252	0	577
4	BIHAR	0	8526	2686	0	11212
5	CHHATTIS GARH	1242	78	3586	642	5548
6	GOA	0	0	0	0	0
7	GUJARAT	0	255	22590	36075	58920
8	HARYANA	0	26	21	8	55
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	0	79	64	104	247
10	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	0	0	0	0	0
11	JHARKHAND	0	666	1155	2260	4081
12	KARNATAKA	0	0	0	0	0
13	KERALA	73	128	129	1489	1819
14	MADHYA PRADESH	0	3576	0	0	3576
15	MAHARASHTRA	0	0	0	0	0
16	MANIPUR	0	498	0	0	498
17	MEGHALAYA	0	0	0	3	3
18	MIZORAM	0	0	0	0	0
19	NAGALAND	0	0	0	0	0
20	ODISHA	0	0	0	0	0
21	PUNJAB	0	0	0	0	0
22	RAJASTHAN	0	1550	12	0	1562
23	SIKKIM	0	0	0	0	0
24	TAMIL NADU	0	30384	9192	2689	42265
25	TRIPURA	0	0	0	0	0
26	UTTAR PRADESH	0	2	0	0	2
27	UTTARANCHAL	0	0	257	284	541
28	WEST BENGAL	0	2337	4352	1083	7772
29	AND & NIC ISLANDS	0	0	4	5	9
30	DAD & NAG HAVELI	0	0	0	0	0
31	DAMAN AND DIU	0	0	0	0	0
32	LAKSHADWEEP	0	0	0	0	0
33	PONDICHERRY	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1315</b>	<b>48430</b>	<b>44300</b>	<b>44642</b>	<b>138687</b>





Appendix -XIV

**Total Number of Old Age, Disabled and Widow persons in the Country**  
(Vide para 1.132 of the Report)

S.No.	Name of the State	Persons of 60 years and above	Widows	Disabled Persons
1	Andhra Pradesh	5788078	3270964	1364981
2	Bihar	5501274	1887575	1887611
3	Chattisgarh	1504383	771106	419887
4	Goa	112273	69052	15749
5	Gujarat	3499063	1614413	1045465
6	Haryana	1584089	533974	15749
7	Himachal Pradesh	547564	229664	155950
8	Jammu & Kashmir	675324	196604	302670
9	Jharkhand	1578662	822827	448377
10	Karnataka	4062022	2322843	940643
11	Kerala	3335675	1690508	860794
12	Madhya Pradesh	4280924	1752228	1408528
13	Maharashtra	8454660	3726735	1569582
14	Odisha	3039100	1370123	1021335
15	Punjab	2191693	662113	424523
16	Rajasthan	3810272	1589726	1411979
17	Tamilnadu	5507400	2976137	1642497
18	Uttar Pradesh	11649468	3763168	3453369
19	Uttarakhand	654356	293331	194769
20	West Bengal	5700099	3155365	1847174
21	Arunachal Pradesh	49916	25639	33315
22	Assam	1560366	869005	530300
23	Manipur	145470	59459	28376
24	Meghalaya	105726	59604	28803
25	Mizoram	49023	20373	16011
26	Nagaland	90323	26516	26499
27	Sikkim	29040	10005	20367
28	Tripura	232549	123817	58940
29	A & N Islands	17366	8461	7057
30	Chandigarh	44912	16788	15538
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	8814	4979	4048
32	Daman & Diu	8042	5511	3171
33	NCT of Delhi	719650	305940	235886
34	Lakshadweep	3729	2136	1678
35	Puducherry	81016	53040	25857
	<b>Total</b>	<b>76622321</b>	<b>34289729</b>	<b>21467478</b>

**Status of reconstitution of State and District level VMCs**  
(Vide para 1.148 of the Report)

Sl.No.	Name of State	Reconstitution of State VMC (Y/N)	No. of Districts where VMCs have been reconstituted
1	Andhra Pradesh	Yes	22
2	Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	15
3	Assam	Yes	26
4	Bihar	Yes	25
5	Chhattisgarh	Yes	14
6	Goa	No	2
7	Gujarat	Yes	26
8	Haryana	Yes	21
9	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	12
10	Jammu & Kashmir	Yes	5
11	Jharkhand	Yes	22
12	Karnataka	Yes	30
13	Kerala	Yes	14
14	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	47
15	Maharashtra	Yes	30
16	Manipur	Yes	8
17	Meghalaya	Yes	7
18	Mizoram	Yes	8
19	Nagaland	Yes	2
20	Odisha	Yes	30
21	Punjab	No	18
22	Rajasthan	Yes	33
23	Sikkim	Yes	4
24	Tamil Nadu	Yes	30
25	Tripura	Yes	4
26	Uttarakhand	Yes	13
27	Uttar Pradesh	Yes	65
28	West Bengal	Yes	13
29	Andaman & Nicobar	Yes	2
30	Daman & Diu	Yes	1
31	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	Yes	0
32	Lakshadweep	No	1
33	Puducherry	No	0
	<b>Total</b>		<b>550</b>

**State Level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee Meeting**  
(Vide para 1.150 of the Report)

Name of State	Number of meetings held				
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Andhra Pradesh	1	1	1	1	1
Arunachal Pradesh	1	1	1	1	-
Assam	1	1	1	2	-
Bihar	1	3	-	-	1
Chhattisgarh	1	1	-	1	2
Goa	3	1	-	-	
Gujarat	-	1	-	-	2
Haryana	-	-	-	1	1
Himachal Pradesh	-	1	-	-	1
Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	1	1	-
Jharkhand	1	1		-	2
Karnataka	2	2	1	3	2
Kerala	1	1		1	
Madhya Pradesh	2	1	1	1	1
Maharashtra	1	-	1	2	2
Manipur	1	-		-	1
Meghalaya	-	1		2	1
Mizoram	-	-	1	1	1
Nagaland	1	-	1	1	-
Odisha	1	1	1	1	-
Punjab	1	1	-	-	-
Rajasthan	3	1	-	2	-
Sikkim	3	2	1	2	2
Tamil Nadu	2	2	1	2	-
Tripura	-	1	-	2	1
Uttarakhand	1	1	1	1	1
Uttar Pradesh	-	3	-	2	-
West Bengal	3	3	-	3	3
Andaman & Nicobar	1	1	-	1	2
Daman & Diu	-	1	1	1	-
Dadar & Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-	-
Lakshadweep	1	1	-	-	-
Puducherry	2	2	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>27</b>

**District Level Vigilance & Monitoring Committee meetings (2007-08 & 2008-09)**  
(Vide para 1.150 of the Report)

(As on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2009)

Name of State	Total No. of V&MC Districts	No. of Districts where meetings held	No of Meetings of District level V & MC	No of Meetings of District level V & MC	
				2007-08	2008-09
ANDHRA PRADESH	23	22	42	19	29
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	16	14	18	8	8
ASSAM	27	22	25	11	14
BIHAR	39	37	45	23	23
CHHATTISGARH	16	16	36	10	12
GOA	2	2	4	2	2
GUJARAT	25	25	60	25	62
HARYANA	20	19	25	10	13
HIMACHAL PRADESH	12	11	17	3	4
JAMMU & KASHMIR	22	9	9	2	2
JHARKHAND	24	20	33	5	6
KARNATAKA	29	26	41	15	16
KERALA	14	14	40	14	32
MADHYA PRADESH	48	48	76	40	63
MAHARASHTRA	33	32	59	21	34
MANIPUR	9	5	5	3	3
MEGHALAYA	7	7	7	7	7
MIZORAM	8	8	15	8	11
NAGALAND	11	9	9	3	3
ODISHA	30	30	49	17	29
PUNJAB	20	17	28	7	8
RAJASTHAN	33	31	47	26	41
SIKKIM	1	1	1	1	2
TAMIL NADU	29	29	57	29	51
TRIPURA	4	4	5	4	4
UTTAKHAND	13	13	17	13	13
UTTAR PRADESH	70	70	105	44	63
WEST BENGAL	19	18	34	11	15
ANDAMAN & NICOBAR	3	1	1	2	3
D & NAGAR HAVELI	1	1	1	-	-
DAMAN AND DIU	2	0	0	2	3
LAKSHADWEEP	1	0	0	1	1
PUDUCHERRY	1	1	2	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>579</b>

## Appendix -XVIII

## District Level Vigilance &amp; Monitoring Committee meetings (2009-10, 2010-11 &amp; 2011-12)

(Vide para 1.150 of the Report)

Name of State	No. of V&MC District	No. of Districts where meetings held	No of Meetings held	No. of Districts where meetings held	No of Meetings held	No. of Districts where meetings held	No of Meetings held
		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
Andhra Pradesh	22	20	23	19	28	8	14
Arunachal Pradesh	16	11	12	13	23	11	13
Assam	27	25	38	23	33	20	29
Bihar	38	32	41	13	19	13	19
Chhattisgarh	16	9	10	14	26	6	12
Goa	2			1	1	2	2
Gujarat	26	40	39	26	54	20	40
Haryana	21	19	21	19	34	15	23
Himachal Pradesh	12	5	6	9	11	8	12
Jammu & Kashmir	22	1	1	3	4	1	1
Jharkhand	24	10	16	18	27	17	32
Karnataka	30	25	31	29	53	27	46
Kerala	14	13	19	14	26	14	29
Madhya Pradesh	50	33	39	42	89	38	75
Maharashtra	33	20	23	28	49	24	45
Manipur	9	9	9	8	11	2	3
Meghalaya	7	7	11	7	14	6	10
Mizoram	8	8	12	8	22	8	19
Nagaland	11	2	2	2	2		
Odisha	30	29	37	28	52	25	33
Punjab	20	16	17	18	37	11	15
Rajasthan	33	13	18	28	56	31	59
Sikkim	4	3	3	2	2	3	3
Tamil Nadu	31	25	29	26	41	17	21
Tripura	4	4	9	4	8	4	9
Uttarakhand	13	10	10	11	16	6	6
Uttar Pradesh	72	36	43	60	88	37	48
West Bengal	19	8	8	10	17	8	18
Andaman & Nicobar	2	-	-	2	3	2	5
Daman & Diu	1	1	1	-	-	1	1
Dadar & Nagar Haveli	2	1	1	-	-	-	-
Lakshadweep	1	-	-	1	1	1	1
Puducherry	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>641</b>

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

MINUTES OF THE TWENTIETH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
TUESDAY, THE 10 April, 2012

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1800 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan

-

Chairperson

**MEMBERS**  
**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
3. Shri P.Kumar
4. Shri Rakesh Pandey
5. Dr. P.L.Puniya
6. Shri Bishnu Pada Ray

**RAJYA SABHA**

7. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
8. Shri Hussain Dalwai
9. Dr. Ram Prakash
10. Shri P. Rajeeve
11. Shri Mohan singh
12. Smt.Maya Singh

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri Brahm Dutt - Joint Secretary
2. Smt. Veena Sharma - Director
3. Shri Raju Srivastava - Additional Director

**REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

1. Shri S. Vijay Kumar - Secretary
2. Shri Arvind Mayaram - Additional Secretary & F.A.
3. Shri P.P. Mitra - Chief Economic Adviser
4. Shri A.K. Singh - DG, CAPART
5. Dr. M.V. Rao - DG, NIRD
6. Shri D.K. Jain - Joint Secretary
7. Shri N. Muruganandam - Joint Secretary
8. Shri Niten Chandra - Joint Secretary
9. Shri T. Vijay Kumar - Joint Secretary
10. Dr. P.K. Anand - Joint Secretary
11. Shri Sanjay Kumar Rakesh - Joint Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee to the sitting convened to take evidence of the representatives of the Department of Rural development on Demands for Grants (2012-13) of the Department. The Chairperson apprised about broad allocation of budget to the Department.

*[Witnesses were then called in]*

3. The Chairperson then read out Direction 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings. Thereafter, the Chairperson highlighted the issues of reduction of allocation under MGNREGA, initiation of work under PMGSY for habitations below 1000 population, need for enhancement of financial assistance under Indira Awaas Yojna etc.

4. Thereafter, the representatives of the Department of Rural Development made a power point presentation highlighting the salient features of the programmes being implemented by the Department, current implementation status, physical and financial achievements etc. The issues highlighted by the Chairperson and members were replied to by the officers of the Department. The Committee also sought clarifications particularly with reference to decreasing trend of employment generation under MGNREGA schemes in States like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Odisha etc. in the programme, which were responded to by the witnesses. The Committee also sought clarification about irregularities in implementation of PMGSY works in Union Territories especially in Andaman & Nicobar Islands, which the representatives of the department promised to submit later.

*[The representatives of Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) withdrew]*

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

-----



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

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
WEDNESDAY, THE 02 MAY 2012

The Committee sat from 1600 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'C', Ground Floor,  
Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

**Shrimati Maya Singh** - ***in the Chair***

**MEMBERS**

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti
3. Dr. Ratna De (Nag)
4. Shri A. Sai Prathap
5. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
6. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
7. Dr. Sanjay Singh
8. Shri Kodikunnil Suresh
9. Shri A.K. S. Vijayan

**RAJYA SABHA**

10. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
11. Shri Hussain Dalwai
12. Shri P. Rajeeve

**SECRETARIAT**

- |    |                      |   |                     |
|----|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Shri Brahm Dutt      | - | Joint Secretary     |
| 2. | Smt. Veena Sharma    | - | Director            |
| 3. | Shri Raju Srivastava | - | Additional Director |

2. At the outset, in the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha chose Smt. Maya Singh to act as Chairperson for the sitting.

3. Thereafter, the Chairperson welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the Draft Reports on Demands for Grants (2012-13) of xxx xxx and the Department of Rural Development, Ministry of Rural Development. After discussing the Draft

Reports in detail the Committee adopted the Draft Reports with minor modifications.

4. The Committee also authorized the Chairperson to finalize the above mentioned Draft Reports taking into consideration consequential changes arising out of factual verification, if any, by the concerned Ministry/Department and to present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

-----