

3

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(2009-2010)**

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION PLANNING BOARD (NCRPB)

[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in
the Thirty Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development
(Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]

THIRD REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

THIRD REPORT

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(2009-10)**

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION PLANNING BOARD (NCRPB)

[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in
the Thirty Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development
(Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]

Presented to Lok Sabha on 21.04.2010
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 21.04.2010



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
*April, 2010 / Vaisakha, 1932 (Saka)***

C.U.D. No.: 53

Price : Rs.

(C) 2009 By Lok Sabha Secretariat

Publish under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in

Lok Sabha (Thirteenth Edition) and Printed by

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)	Page
INTRODUCTION	(v)	
CHAPTER I	Report	1
CHAPTER II	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	17
CHAPTER III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	24
CHAPTER IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	26
CHAPTER V	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	33

APPENDICES

I	Minutes of the Fifth sitting of the Committee held on 05.01.2010	36
II	Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in Thirty-Fifth Report of the Committee (14 th Lok Sabha)	38

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)**

Shri Sharad Yadav - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri J.P. Agarwal
3. Shri Praveen Singh Aron
4. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
5. Shri Partap Singh Bajwa
6. Shri Ambica Banerjee
7. Smt. Priya Dutt
8. Shri Eknath M. Gaikwad
9. Shri Shakti Mohan Malik
10. Shri Kailash Joshi
11. Shri Mohinder Singh Kaypee
12. Shri Ramesh Kumar
13. Shri Radhe Mohan Singh
14. Shri P.C. Mohan
15. Dr. Sanjeev Ganesh Naik
16. Shri Sonawane Pratap Narayanrao
17. Shri Baijayant Panda
18. Prof. Ramshankar
19. Shri Kadir Rana
20. Dr. Kirit Premjibhai Solanki
21. Shri Adagooru H. Vishwanath

RAJYA SABHA

22. Shri Parvez Hashmi
23. Shri Rajeev Shukla
24. Shri Surendra Motilal Patel
25. Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki
26. Shri Amir Alam Khan
27. Shri Manohar Joshi
28. Shri Varinder Singh Bajwa
29. Shri Shyam Benegal
30. Shri Gireesh Kumar Sanghi
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri T.K. Mukherjee - Joint Secretary
2. Shri K.D. Muley - Director
3. Smt. Anita B. Panda - Additional Director
4. Smt. Emma C. Barwa - Committee Officer

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2008-09) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Third Report on the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Fifth Report (14th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Urban Development on 'National Capital Region Planning Board' of the Ministry of Urban Development.

2. The Thirty Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development was presented to Lok Sabha on 23rd October, 2008. The replies of the Government to 16 recommendations contained in the Report were received on 11th February, 2009.

3. The Committee considered and adopted their report at their sitting held on 5th January, 2010.

4. An analysis of the Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Fifth Report of the Committee is given at Appendix-II.

New Delhi;

5th January, 2010
15 Pausa, 1931(Saka)

SHARAD YADAV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban Development

CHAPTER-I

REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Urban Development deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Thirty-Fifth Report (14th Lok Sabha) on the subject “National Capital Region Planning Board” relating to the Ministry of Urban Development, which was presented to Lok Sabha and laid in Rajya Sabha on 23rd October, 2008.

1.2 Action Taken Notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 16 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorized as follows:

- (i) Recommendations / Observations, which have been accepted by the Government (Chapter – II):

Para Nos. 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 (Total 8)

- (ii) Recommendations / Observations, which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government’s replies (Chapter –III):

Para Nos. 15 (Total 1)

- (iii) Recommendations / Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration (Chapter – IV):

Para No. 1, 3, 4, 7 and 16 (Total 5)

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

Para No. 5 and 13 (Total 2)

1.3 The Committee trust that utmost importance would be given by the Government to the implementation of their Recommendations. In cases, where it is not possible for the Government to implement the Recommendation (s) in letter and spirit for any reason, the matter may be reported to the Committee with reasons for non-implementation.

1.4 The Committee further desire that Action Taken Notes on the Recommendations / Observations contained in Chapter-I of this Report and final replies in respect of the Recommendations for which only interim replies have been furnished by the Government (included in Chapter-V) may be furnished to them within three months of the presentation of this Report.

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

Non-Realization of objectives of NCRPB

Recommendation (Para No. 1)

1.6 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:

“The National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB) was constituted in March, 1985 by an Act of Parliament for preparation of a plan for the development of the National Capital Region (NCR) and for coordination and implementation of such a plan. The National Capital Region comprises specified districts of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and the National Capital Territory of Delhi (NCT -Delhi). The first Regional plan prepared by NCRPB was the Regional Plan-2001 which was aimed to disperse the economic activities from Delhi and to deflect future in-migrants

to Delhi. The Committee's examination of the National Capital Region Planning Board has revealed that these objectives have not been realized. There has been lack of effective co-ordination in enforcement and implementation of plans. There had been no regular meetings of the NCRPB so much so that not a single meeting of the Board was held for over three years. A number of projects in sub-regions were abandoned/ withdrawn after release of substantial funds by NCRPB. Though the Regional Plan-2021 was notified as far back as in September, 2005, the participating States are yet to prepare sub regional plans. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations arising out of the examination of these and other related issues are set out in the following paragraphs. “

1.7 The Government have replied as below:

“Para-wise replies to the committee’s conclusions and recommendations given in the report have been dealt with in the succeeding paragraphs.

With respect to non-realization of objectives of Regional Plan following is submitted:

Implementation of a Regional Plan is a long drawn process and it takes many years to develop a region. The National Capital Region has a geographical area of 33578 sq. km which is almost equivalent to a medium size state. It is 86% of the geographical area of Kerala, 75.9% of the geographical area of Haryana and 66.67% of the geographical area of Punjab. It is almost 23 times that of the geographical area of NCT-Delhi (1,483 sq km) and more than the combined geographical areas of the three states of Tripura, Nagaland and Sikkim (27,885 sq

km). Looking at the comparison of the geographical areas, the budget allocation to NCRPB for development of NCR in the Central budget [which was about Rs. 63 crore on an average per year during Xth Plan] has been meagre for development of such a vast inter-state region. It is also important to note that the Regional Plan is a multi-sectoral plan and is to be implemented by the constituent State Governments and Central Ministries through their various departments / agencies. The Plan has to be implemented through consensus on various issues. However, though there are inter-state issues, the implementation of the Regional Plan has led to many benefits.”

1.8 The Committee are not convinced with the reply furnished by the Ministry. They observe that the fact of geographical area of NCR being vast was very much evident at the time of setting up of NCRPB and thus, it cannot be an excuse for the Board and its administrative Ministry i.e. the Ministry of Urban Development to justify the dismal progress card on the non-realization of the objectives under the Regional Plan. In this regard, the Committee further feel that unless regular meetings of the Board take place, there is no way to bring all the constituent States together to evolve consensus on issues of common interest. The Ministry has chosen not to reply to the point of non-convening of regular meetings of the Board mentioned in the Committee’s observation. In fact, the Committee note that the meetings of the Empowered Committee of the Board are also not regular, as between May, 2006 and March, 2009, only two meetings of the same were held. The Ministry have not committed about future meetings and therefore, the Committee express their doubts as to whether the current situation would witness any change in future

too in the absence of regular meetings. The Committee, therefore, would reiterate that a conscious effort is required to be made to pursue the NCR participating States and Central Ministries / Departments to take necessary steps to implement its policies and proposals of Regional Plan 2021 and to develop the region to achieve its objectives. They are convinced that in order to improve the implementation of Regional Plan 2021, NCRPB should increase the frequency of Board meetings. The Committee are also of the view that the projects in sub-regions plans should not be abandoned / withdrawn abruptly after the release of funds for the same by NCRPB, as this can be counter-productive. To prevent this, the monitoring mechanism should be strengthened and made transparent and it must be ensured that only credible and viable projects are funded by the Board.

Shifting of Industries and offices from NCT-Delhi

Recommendation (Para No. 3)

1.9 In their report, the Committee had observed as below:

“There had been phenomenal growth of industries in Delhi from 26,000 units in 1971 to 137,000 units in 1999. Though there were recommendations in the Master Plan of Delhi-2001 for shifting certain heavy and large, hazardous and noxious non-conforming units from Delhi, there was hardly any progress in this regard. It was only at the intervention of the Supreme Court in the year 1996 and 2004, there seemed to be some attempts for shifting of categorized industrial units out of Delhi. The Regional Plan-2021 has since proposed allowing of only high-tech industries in Delhi. The plan has also proposed decentralization of whole-sale trading of plastic,

food grains, steel, timber, etc. at locations outside Delhi and shifting of the public sector offices from the NCT-Delhi. According to the Ministry of Urban Development, out of the 11 Central Government offices and 36 PSUs identified for shifting to places outside Delhi, 6 offices and 14 PSUs are yet to be shifted. The Committee view this as a perfect example of how plans and proposals eventually lose their steam due to non-implementation. The Committee would expect the Ministry to fix responsibility for the non-implementation of those decisions. The Committee further desire that the Government must chalk out a specific timeframe for the shifting of remaining Central Government offices and PSUs from NCT-Delhi and ensure that they are shifted within the timeframe.”

1.10 The Government have replied as below:

“The Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 for National Capital Region stipulates policies on shifting of offices from Delhi with a view to providing a balanced and regulated development of the Region.

A. Public Sector Undertakings (PSU)

Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 provides that the Public Sector Offices should be allowed to retain only very small establishments to cater for ministerial and liaison functions. The rest of the establishments should be shifted out of NCT-Delhi. No new office spaces should be created in newly developed community, district or sub-city and city centers. The Central Government and any other organization, body or authority requiring additional space should be allowed to do so only outside NCT-Delhi and beyond in Counter Magnet Areas(CMAs). Relocation and expansion of

Govt. offices/PSU's which need to perform such ministerial/protocol and liaison functions which make it incumbent upon them to be located in Delhi alone should be allowed to be located in the Central NCR towns. The opening of new Govt. offices/PSU's or expanding the existing ones should be encouraged in the rest of NCR/CMAs outside NCR.

In the year 1986 a high-powered committee was setup under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary which recommended 24 Public Sector Undertakings to be shifted out of Delhi which was approved by the Cabinet Committee on Accommodation. Later on 12 other Public Sector Undertakings were identified for shifting after 1988. Thus, the actual number of PSU offices to be shifted as per post 1988 list is 12 only. Therefore, in total 36 identified offices of Public Sector Undertakings were to be shifted outside Delhi.

Of the 36 offices of PSU's(Pre-1988:24 and post-1988:12) identified for shifting outside Delhi, 20 have already been shifted, 2 have been permitted to continue in Delhi and 14 identified PSU's are yet to be shifted from Delhi.

B. Government Offices

The Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 provides that the main criterion for location of offices in the Capital should be that they perform ministerial functions, protocol functions or liaison functions, which, by their nature cannot be performed anywhere else except in the National Capital. The existing offices, which do not perform any of the above functions, should be identified and shifted from NCT-Delhi.

1.11 The Committee deplore the fact that two decades have passed since 36 PSUs offices were identified for shifting out of NCT-Delhi and yet, till date only

20 establishments have actually been shifted. The Committee are in dark about most of other cases too as the Ministry have not provided the actual status of shifting of 11 PSUs to them. Moreover, what is particularly surprising to the Committee, w.r.t. the list of Government offices identified to be shifted out, is that one of such offices is the Department of Publication, an office of the Ministry of Urban Development itself. The Committee fail to comprehend as to why its shifting has been kept on hold when it does not perform any Ministerial or protocol function to justify its continuation in Delhi. The Committee would like to know the grounds on which the continuation of Department of Publication is being considered by the Ministry of Urban Development. Besides, as some of the Government offices have approached the Cabinet Committee on Accommodation (CCA) against shifting, the Committee would like to be apprised as to whether the earlier decision to shift them out was approved by CCA, as was the case with PSUs. Overall, the Committee find it quite distressing that the Ministry have not been able to resolve issues regarding shifting of identified offices of the Central Government and PSUs from NCT- Delhi to outside Delhi. They would impress upon the Government to make concerted efforts to speed up the process without further loss of time and chalk out specific time frame to complete the process expeditiously.

Need to make NCR a unified area in economic terms

Recommendation (Para No. 4)

1.12 The Committee had noted as below:

“As pointed out by the Regional Plan-2021, one of the main problems confronting the development of NCR is the lack of uniformity in tax rates for various commodities and services in the constituent States which, in turn, leads to concentration of trade, Industry and services in Delhi. The Committee are of the firm view that there is a need to remove the fiscal barriers and make NCR as a unified area in economic terms. The Committee would urge expeditious steps to address this issue.”

1.13 The Government have replied as under:

“The policy related to uniform taxes in the National Capital Region is to be enforced by the Ministry of Finance. Initial steps have been taken by the Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India(GOI) to introduce VAT in the country with minimum floor rates of taxes. It allows the States to keep higher VAT in their States in comparison to Delhi and vice-versa. Ministry of Finance, GOI and the State Finance Departments of the constituent States of NCR will also have to address this issue.”

1.14 The Committee are of the view that though the policy related to uniform taxes in the National Capital Region (NCR) is to be enforced by the Ministry of Finance and State Finance Departments by the constituent States of the NCR, the NCR Planning Board, in conformity with the Regional Plan 2021, should pursue the matter vigorously with the Ministry of Finance and State Finance

Departments of the constituent States for uniformity of 'VAT' rates in National Capital Region so as to make NCR a unified area in economic terms. The Committee feel that uniformity in 'VAT' rates in the NCR region would encourage business establishments to shift out of the NCT-Delhi to set up businesses in the NCR region without suffering any financial loss. Also, the removal of fiscal barriers would not only result in harmonious and balanced development of the NCR region but also in decongestion of trade, industry and services in NCT – Delhi. The Committee trust that the Government would take favourable steps expeditiously to address these issues.

Preparation of Sub-Regional Plans by the constituent States

Recommendation (Para No. 7)

1.15 The Committee had noted as below:

“As for the Regional Plan-2021, the Committee are given to understand that even three years after the notification of the Regional Plan – 2021, no participating States have prepared their Sub-regional plan. It is only in July, 2008 that UP, Haryana and Rajasthan are stated to have initiated steps for preparation of Sub-regional Plans. It is learnt that the Delhi Government has not yet started the process. The Committee urge that the State Governments should not be found wanting in this respect and should take expeditious steps to prepare their sub-regional plans in compliance with the NCRPB Act.”

1.16 The Government have replied as under:

“The directions of the Hon’ble Committee have been conveyed to the NCR constituent State Governments for compliance.”

1.17 The Committee are not satisfied with the one-line reply of the Ministry. They are particularly anguished over the careless attitude of the Government of Delhi, where NCRPB has its headquarters, as the process of preparing the Sub-Regional Plan has not even been initiated by them. The Committee feel that NCT-Delhi, being in dire need of a plan to decongest the city, should ideally have led the way, which, however, is not the case at present. The Committee feel that the NCRPB has sufficient powers under the NCRPB Act, 1985 to impress upon the constituent States to prepare their Sub-Regional Plans in conformity with the Regional Plan 2021 at the earliest so as to avoid lopsided and haphazard growth in the National Capital Region. The Committee, therefore, reiterate that all out efforts should be made to pursue and ensure that the State Governments prepare their Sub-Regional plans well in time.

Budgetary Support to NCRPB

Recommendation (Para No. 16)

1.18 The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee agree with the plea of the Ministry of Urban Development that in order to play a more effective role with the ultimate objective of translating the vision of the NCR to develop as a region of global excellence into actual reality, the NCR Planning Board needs to substantially scale up its operations by undertaking financing large infrastructural projects. Due to resource constraints, NCRPB is not in a position to finance large level projects. The Committee regret to note that budgetary support to NCRPB was a meagre Rs. 100.00 crore during 2007-08 and even this amount was reduced to Rs. 50.00 crore in 2008-09. The Committee expect the Government to provide sufficient funds to the Board to enable it to discharge its functions effectively. The Committee in this connection note that the Board has planned to raise about Rs. 9,000.00 crore from other sources such as loan from ADB/World Bank and market borrowings. The Committee believe that with the highest credit rating of the Board, it should be possible to generate adequate funds from the aforesaid sources.”

1.19 The Government have replied as below:

“(i) The projects identified by NCRPB for being financed during the 11th Plan (2007-12) involve a total investment outlay of Rs. 15,000 crore which involves

loan component of about of Rs. 11000 crore . In order to achieve the 11th Plan targets, the Board is making all-out efforts to step up its financial support to infrastructure projects in the NCR and Counter Magnet Areas. In order to extend loan assistance of Rs. 11000 crore as proposed above, substantial financial resources would have to be arranged by the Board through higher budgetary allocations for the NCRPB and/or by raising funds from other sources viz. multi-lateral funding and capital market. Accordingly, the Board had sought enhanced budgetary allocation of Rs. 2987 crore (Rs. 775 crore for NCRPB and another Rs. 2212 crore for grants-in-aid to be passed on to the borrowing Govts/agencies) during 11th Plan.

- (ii) As against the grant requirement of Rs. 2987 crore, as above, the gross budgetary support during 11th Plan period has been limited to Rs. 900 crore only. Budgetary support in BE 2008-09 is only Rs. 50 crore. As this amount is too meagre to finance infrastructure projects in the National Capital Region, the Board requested this Ministry to consider higher plan grant of Rs 150 crore in the RE for the year 2008-09. For the BE 2009-10, Board has requested for an allocation of Rs. 250 crore. This fund requirement of the Board has been projected accordingly. However considering meager allocation during current financial year and in view of specific action point, requirement of the Board to the tune of Rs.55 crore was projected to Budget Division of this Ministry in March 2008 and this was also taken up by Secretary(UD) with Secretary(Planning Commission) demi officially on 11th Feb. 2008. Ministry's request for higher allocation

has not been considered by the Ministry of Finance on finalization of RE proposals for 2008-09.

- (iii) In order to meet financing needs as per 11th Plan proposals, NCRPB will have to look for other sources of funds such as loans from multi-lateral aid agencies and/or market borrowings to the extent of Rs. 9000 crore as against Rs. 6850 crore proposed in plan proposals. The borrowing of additional amount will, however, have negative impact on the cost of funds to the Board and may affect the Board's capacity to sustain higher level of operations. Therefore, NCRPB needs to be supported with higher level of budgetary allocation to sustain operation at higher level.

- iv) Out of Rs. 9000 crore required to be raised from the market, the Board has proposed to raise Funds amounting to Rs. 4,000 crore each as loan from the World Bank and the ADB and the balance from the capital market through issuance of Bonds. The purport of raising loan from multilateral funding institutions, duly backed by government guarantee, is to reduce our cost of funds in comparison to the capital market for which the Government of India to guarantee the loan. Since all the funds are meant for development of Infrastructure Projects entailing a long gestation period and in many cases low to minimal returns in the case of water supply, sanitation, sewage, drainage and internal road network Projects, the Government of India is considering to provide guarantee and waive the guarantee fee, so as to

enable Board to keep cost of funds low and a meeting with the representative of Ministry of Finance is likely to be convened shortly to resolve the issue.

- v) The amount of fund to be raised from the domestic capital market would be likely to be around Rs. 1000 crore. However, in case loan from the multi-lateral agencies does not materialize to the extent proposed, the Board will have to raise higher amount from the market.

- vi) In view of the foregoing, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India has been requested to permit NCR Planning Board for raising a loan of Rs. 4,000 crore each from the ADB and World Bank in Multi-Tranche over a period of next five to seven years starting from 2008-09 duly backed by Govt. Guarantee and also to consider waiving of Guarantee Fee as the funds are to be deployed for development of Infrastructure Projects in the National Capital Region, which entails a long gestation period and in many cases low to minimal returns particularly in the case of water supply, sanitation, sewage, drainage and internal road network Projects. The issue of Govt. Guarantee for NCR loans is under process in Ministry of Finance.”

1.20 In view of the Ministry of Finance’s non-consideration of the request of the Ministry of Urban Development for higher allocation for NCRPB, the Committee note that the NCRPB will have to look for other sources of funds such as loans from multilateral aid agencies and for market borrowings to the extent of Rs. 9000.00 crore to meet their financing needs as per the 11th Plan

period proposals. In such a scenario, the Committee are in agreement with the view of the NCRPB that the Government should at least provide guarantee and waive the guarantee fee so as to enable NCRPB to raise the requisite loan from the multilateral aid agencies and to keep the cost of funds low, which are to be deployed for development of infrastructure projects in the National Capital Region. As the matter is under process in the Ministry of Finance, the Committee hope that the Government would agree to provide guarantee and waive the guarantee fee to NCRPB.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Population deflection from NCT-Delhi to the rest of NCR

Recommendation (Para No. 2)

2.1 The Committee are distressed to note that none of the policy parameters set out by the regional plan-2001 to be realized in the three zones of National Capital Region viz. (i) NCT-Delhi, (ii) Delhi Metropolitan Area (DMA) excluding NCT-Delhi and (iii) The Rest of NCT could be achieved by the year 2001. The Regional Plan 2001 notified in the year 1989 assigned a population of 112 lakhs to NCT-Delhi, 38 lakhs to DMA and 49 lakhs to the Rest of NCR by the year 2001 with the aim of deflecting 20 lakhs people from NCT -Delhi to the Rest of NCR. The Census 2001 has, however, shown that the population of NCT -Delhi shot up to 138 lakhs as against the assignment of 112 lakhs. DMA could attain a population of only 28 lakhs as against the proposed population of 38 lakhs and the Rest of NCR could attain a population of just 28 lakhs as against the proposal of 49 lakhs. It is evident that the plan to deflect 20 lakhs people from NCT -Delhi to the Rest of NCR by the year 2001 has miserably failed. The Committee note that in order to synergise the planning of NCT-Delhi and Rest of the NCR, the Regional Plan 2021 has assigned a population of 225 lakhs for NCT-Delhi, 164 lakhs for Haryana sub-region, 49 lakhs for Rajasthan sub-region and 204 lakhs for Uttar Pradesh sub-region by the year 2021. The Committee hope that the NCRPB and the States concerned, taking note of the past failures, will take necessary steps to keep the population at the assigned level by 2021.

Reply of the Government

2.2 It is submitted that the Regional Plan(RP) 2001 has achieved partial success. The decadal rate of population growth for Delhi which was consistently above 50% since Independence has declined to 47.02% during the decade 1991-2001. The component of migration as a share of growth of population of Delhi has also come down from 45% in 1971 to 39.82% in 2001. Further, a recent Study has shown that the in-migration to NCR districts outside NCT-Delhi is 24.55 lakh as compared to in-migration to NCT-Delhi, which is 21.02 lakh during the decade 1991-01. The NCR towns, particularly DMA (now, Central National Capital Region) towns have shown significant growth and have achieved about 76% of the population assigned as per RP-2001. Out of these,

Faridabad achieved 105% and Ghaziabad achieved 99%. The priority towns in the Rest of NCR have collectively achieved about 58% of their assigned population.

Since the policies and proposals of RP-2021 will have to be implemented by the participating states, NCRPB is making all efforts to pursue the NCR participating States and Central Ministries /Departments to take necessary steps to implement the policies and proposals of RP-2021 and to develop the region to achieve its objectives. These include development of expressways & better connectivity in the region, development of metro & regional centres & new towns, model industrial estates and social & physical infrastructure in the region.

In order to monitor the effective implementation of the policies & proposals of RP-2021, an Empowered Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Urban Development, Govt of India has been constituted with the Chief Secretaries and other senior officers as members in order take decisions relating to various critical activities in NCR and inter-state issues. Further, Steering Committees under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary of the participating State with the Principal Secretaries/ Secretaries of the concerned Departments as members have been constituted in the States of Haryana, Rajasthan and NCT-Delhi. Govt. of UP is in process of constituting the same. The first such meeting of the Steering Committee of Haryana and Delhi has taken place where issues regarding implementation of RP-2021 were discussed.

Preparation of Sub-Regional Plans

Recommendation (Para No. 6)

2.3 In terms of NCRPB Act, 1985 each participating State is required to prepare a Sub-regional Plan for the Sub-region within that State and shall be responsible for the implementation of the Sub-regional plan as finalized while the Sub-regional plans prepared by UP and Rajasthan were in consonance with the Regional Plan-2001, those prepared by Haryana and NCT-Delhi were not. The Committee regret to learn that the Board's attempts to get the sub-regional plans of Haryana and NCT-Delhi modified to align them with the Regional Plan – 2001 did not yield results. There appeared to be indifference on the part of the Governments of Rajasthan and NCT-Delhi which smacks of violation of the NCRPB Act. The Committee wish to believe that this was not intentional. The Committee hope that these State Governments will give no room for such misgivings in future and discharge their responsibilities under the Act without fail.

Reply of the Government

2.4 It is 'Governments of Haryana and NCT Delhi which have not prepared the Sub-regional Plan 2001' and not the 'Governments of Rajasthan and NCT-Delhi' which is violation of the NCRPB Act, 1985. Therefore, this modification needs to be incorporated in the recommendations / directions of the report.

The views/directions of the Hon'ble Committee have been conveyed to the Governments of Haryana and NCT-Delhi.

Monitoring Mechanism

Recommendation (Para No. 8)

2.5 The Committee commend the setting up of Steering Committees recently by the Governments of Haryana and NCT-Delhi with a view to monitoring implementation of policies and proposals of Regional Plan-2021 in a time bound manner. The Committee trust that UP and Rajasthan too will constitute the Steering Committees headed by the Chief Secretary as suggested by the NCRPB. The Committee urge the Steering Committees to meet every quarter and ensure preparation of Sub-regional Plans within the framework of Regional Plan-2021 and ensure their effective implementation.

Reply of the Government

2.6 Government of Rajasthan has constituted the Steering Committee. Government of U.P. is in the process of constituting the Steering Committee. The first such meeting of the Steering Committee of Haryana and Delhi has taken place where the implementation of RP-2021 were discussed.

The directions of the Committee have been communicated to the respective State Governments for necessary action.

Implementation of Projects

Recommendation (Para No. 9)

2.7 As on 31.3.2008, the NCRPB had reportedly provided financial assistance to 214 infrastructure development projects – (154 projects prior to the year 2001 and 61 projects thereafter) with an estimated cost of Rs. 13,942 crore. It is

observed from the information furnished by the Ministry of Urban Development that though 154 projects had been sanctioned prior to the year 2001; only 110 projects could be completed as on 31st March, 2008. It is obvious that there has been inordinate delay in implementation of a large number of projects. Sadly, as many as 9 projects were abandoned/ withdrawn in UP region after release of substantial amount of funds by NCRPB, either due to non-availability of land or due to some other reasons. The Committee wonder how the Project Sanctioning and Monitoring Group in the Ministry of Urban Development sanctioned and released funds for such projects without ensuring adequate preliminary requirements. The Committee would await an explanation in this regard. The Committee would also like to know the extent of delay in implementation of projects with reference to the original schedule of completion and the effectiveness of the monitoring mechanism in curbing such delays.

Reply of the Government

2.8 As regards Committee's observations regarding delay in implementation of projects and withdrawal of 9 projects in U.P. region, following are submitted :

NCRPB sanctions only loan assistance to State Governments and their agencies for the infrastructure projects in the NCR and its Counter Magnet Areas(CMA) towns, as submitted by them. It does not prepare or implement any infrastructure projects on its own and the responsibility for project implementation lies with the concerned state departments/agencies. However, taking cue from previous experiences with regard to delays in implementation due to issues related to land acquisition, clearances from various departments etc., the Board has now initiated an elaborate project appraisal process wherein empanelled National Institutes are mandated to appraise the project DPRs with respect to technical and financial parameters and other issues related to land and clearances. In addition, the loans are sanctioned and released subject to land availability and necessary clearances from respective authorities, thus ensuring adequate preliminary requirements prior to loan release. The issue of projects being withdrawn due to land acquisition problems was also deliberated by Project Sanctioning and Monitoring Group(PSMG) at its 31st meeting held on 22.10.03, and it was decided that NCRPB will grant loans to agencies once the notification under section 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act is issued.

It is submitted that the Board is monitoring progress of implementation through periodical reports – monthly and quarterly progress reports submitted by the implementing agency and also verifies the reported expenditures and general progress on site prior to release of subsequent loan installments. But the success of the project implementation primarily depends on the State Govt., since apart from requesting the State Authorities/Implementing Agencies for expediting the implementation process, NCRPB does not have a direct role.

As informed by the Board as on 31.12.2008, there are delays ranging from about one month to over 7 years (only in one case) in respect of 48 out of 119 ongoing projects. With regard to the extent of delay in implementation of projects with reference to original schedule of completion, it is submitted that as per extant procedure, the implementing agencies have to request for necessary extensions as applicable with appropriate reasons to the Board which are then taken up in the PSMG meetings for approval. The Group while reviewing such requests expresses its concern over delay and exhorts the State Govt. officials to complete the project within agreed time frame. The subsequent loan installments are also not released if requisite progress has not been made on the project. It has also been noticed that in a few cases, progress on projects are held up for considerable time due to court cases. Notwithstanding the above, the responsibility of adherence to timeline primarily lies with the State Government/Implementing Agency.

Further, in order to incentivise timely implementation of project, NCRPB has put in place a system of rebate of 0.15% on interest rates w.e.f. August, 2004.

Recommendation (Para No. 10)

2.9 The Committee observes that five projects pertaining to sewerage/Solid Waste Management have been completed and 23 are under implementation. There were reports in print media about Government agencies dumping garbage illegally on the green belt due to absence of garbage dumping site in Gurgaon. The Committee hope that such reports are taken note of for immediate remedial measures, expeditious completion of the on-going projects and taking up of new projects, keeping in view the adverse impact of inadequacy of waste disposal facilities on the quality of life of poor urban dwellers.

Reply of the Government

2.10 Various reports in media and other representations with respect to Board assisted projects in NCR are duly taken note of and the respective state governments and implementing agencies are asked to take necessary action on the same. Provision of sewerage and sewerage treatment project has been identified as major thrust area in RP-2021.

The Board is also monitoring the progress of sewerage and sewerage treatment projects, which have been sanctioned and is monitoring for their timely completion with the concerned state Governments.

Recommendation (Para No. 11)

2.11 A consultancy study, initiated by NCRPB, on 'Integrated Transportation Plan for National Capital Region to suggest integrated multi-model transportation system for the National Capital Region was expected to be completed by January, 2008. It appears that there has been delay in completion of the study. The Committee would await the outcome of the study. Incidentally, the Committee learn that Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) would provide hassle free and seamless mobility to people in the vast and complex urban environment of the NCR. The Committee desire that the possibility of dovetailing ITS in the Integrated Transportation Plan be examined.

Reply of the Government

2.12 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) is normally used within a city and can be successfully implemented while preparing mobility plan / intra-city transportation plan for a city. However, the possibility of use of ITS at regional level will be examined in consultation with experts on the matter. In case it is found suitable, it would be appropriately incorporated in the study. The constituent States would be requested by the Board to use ITS while preparing the mobility plan for their towns.

Recommendation (Para No. 12)

2.13 The UP Government is reportedly in favour of a Unified Metropolitan Transport Authority (UMTA) for facilitating the development of multi-modal and multi-tier transport system in the NCR. It has been stated that the proposal will be examined by a Committee of Transport Commissioners. The Committee desire that the proposal should be examined expeditiously within a time-frame under intimation to the Committee.

Reply of the Government

2.14 NCRPB has drafted the Reciprocal Common Transport Agreement for the 'Contract Carriage' and 'Goods & Stage Carriage' for unrestricted and seamless movement of vehicles in NCR. The final contract carriage agreement was signed by all the NCR constituent States on 14.10.2008 after following the due process. The public notice of draft 'Goods and Stage Carriage' Agreement has been issued by the constituent States of NCR. This will also be signed after addressing to the public objections / suggestions. This is a significant step in achieving the objectives of RP-2021.

Further, in order to facilitate multi modal public transport system in NCR, an approach paper for constitution of Unified Metropolitan Transport Authority(UMTA) is being prepared which would be discussed in the Committee of the Transport Commissioners/Secretaries of NCR constituent States.

Frequency of meetings of NCRPB

Recommendation (Para No. 14)

2.15 The Committee are of the firm view that the process of preparation of sub-regional plans and implementation of regional and sub-regional plans would not have been in such a sorry state of affairs as brought out in the preceding paragraphs, had the NCRPB, consisting of among others, the Union Urban Development Minister and the Chief Ministers of the participating States, met as frequently as mandated by the Statute. The Committee regret to note in this connection that not even a single meeting of NCRPB was held for over three years between 13.7.2000 and 15.01.2004. Perusal of information pertaining to the recent past reveals that during the years 2005, 2006 and 2007, the Board has met just once in a year as against the statutory requirement of meeting at least once in every six months. Getting the sub-regional and project plans prepared by the participating States and co-ordinating the enforcement and implementation of the plans are part of the mandates of the NCRPB. The Committee hope that in order to effectively discharge these functions and in fulfillment of the statutory requirement, the NCRPB will meet at least twice in a year in future. They further feel that NCRPB being a very high-powered body, needs to be accorded due importance and thus are of the opinion that ideally the Board should be headed by the Prime Minister.

Reply of the Government

2.16 At times, it is difficult to organize Board Meetings as per the norms because of pre-occupation of Chairman and other Board Members, in particular of Chief Ministers/ Ministers. Nonetheless, the direction to hold meeting at least twice in a year has been noted for compliance in future.

Although existing arrangement with the Minister of Urban Development as Chairman of Board has been working satisfactorily, the suggestion that the Prime Minister as the Chairman of the Board will be taken-up during the next meeting of the Board.

CHAPTER III

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

Budgetary support to NCRPB

Recommendation (Para No. 15)

3.1 At present NCRPB provides long-term loans up to 75% of the project cost to the implementing agencies for implementing infrastructure development projects. The Committee feel that in order to provide incentives to the constituent States to take up implementation of sub-regional plans vigorously, at least certain percentage of the project costs be given as grants, as proposed by the NCRPB.

Reply of the Government

3.2(i) The objectives and functions as defined in the NCRPB Act, 1985 are entirely focused on development of the National Capital Region. The Board provides soft loans for the projects which are prepared and submitted by the participating State Govts. / their implementing agencies for development of infrastructure in the NCR in the area of basic infrastructure development; water supply, sanitation and sewerage, drainage, solid waste management, roads, road over bridges etc. as mandated under the Act.

(ii) Since, the inception of the Board, and upto 2007-08, an amount of Rs.825 crore has been released by Govt. of India as budgetary support whereas, the Board has released Rs.3333 crore as financial assistance in the shape of loan out of the NCRPB Fund. To do so, the Board has been leveraging grants received to raise money from the capital market as well as by recycling repayments of loans and interests by the Borrowers.

(iii) In order to provide incentive for implementation of Sub-regional plans by the constituent States, Working Group on Urban Development for the 11th Five Year Plan has recommended a grant component of 15% to be provided for infrastructure projects financed by the NCR Planning Board which do not receive grant under the JNNURM or any other scheme and accordingly, the Board had sought enhanced budgetary allocation of Rs. 2987 crore (Rs. 775 crore for NCRPB and another Rs. 2212 crore for grants-in-aid to be passed on to the borrowing govts/agencies) during 11th Plan. Against this, an amount of Rs.900 crore have been allocated by the Planning Commission, as gross budgetary support (GBS).

(iv) The budgetary support is meagre and cannot be passed on as grant to the participating States, thus, the same has been / proposed to be utilized to leverage higher volume of funds in accordance with the investment plan prepared for each year to meet Board's financial targets.

CHAPTER NO. IV

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

Realization of objectives of NCRPB

Recommendation (Para No. 1)

4.1 The National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB) was constituted in March, 1985 by an Act of Parliament for preparation of a plan for the development of the National Capital Region (NCR) and for coordination and implementation of such a plan. The National Capital Region comprises specified districts of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and the National Capital Territory of Delhi (NCT -Delhi). The first Regional plan prepared by NCRPB was the Regional Plan-2001 which was aimed to disperse the economic activities from Delhi and to deflect future in-migrants to Delhi. The Committee's examination of the National Capital Region Planning Board has revealed that these objectives have not been realized. There has been lack of effective co-ordination in enforcement and implementation of plans. There had been no regular meetings of the NCRPB so much so that not a single meeting of the Board was held for over three years. A number of projects in sub-regions were abandoned/ withdrawn after release substantial funds by NCRPB. Though the Regional Plan-2021 was notified as far back as in September, 2005, the participating States are yet to prepare sub regional plans. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations arising out of the examination of these and other related issues are set out in the following paragraphs.

Reply of the Government

4.2 Para-wise replies to the committee's conclusions and recommendations given in the report have been dealt with in the succeeding paragraphs.

With respect to non-realization of objectives of Regional Plan following is submitted:

Implementation of a Regional Plan is a long drawn process and it takes many years to develop a region. The National Capital Region has a geographical

area of 33578 sq. km which is almost equivalent to a medium size state. It is 86% of the geographical area of Kerala, 75.9% of the geographical area of Haryana and 66.67% of the geographical area of Punjab. It is almost 23 times that of the geographical area of NCT-Delhi (1,483 sq km) and more than the combined geographical areas of the three states of Tripura, Nagaland and Sikkim (27,885 sq km). Looking at the comparison of the geographical areas, the budget allocation to NCRPB for development of NCR in the Central budget [which was about Rs. 63 crore on an average per year during Xth Plan] has been meagre for development of such a vast inter-state region. It is also important to note that the Regional Plan is a multi-sectoral plan and is to be implemented by the constituent State Governments and Central Ministries through their various departments / agencies. The Plan has to be implemented through consensus on various issues. However, though there are inter-state issues, the implementation of the Regional Plan has led to many benefits.

Comments of the Committee

4.3 For comments of the Committee please see Paragraph No. 8 of Chapter I of the Report

Shifting of Industries and offices from NCT-Delhi

Recommendation (Para No. 3)

4.4 There had been phenomenal growth of industries in Delhi from 26,000 units in 1971 to 137,000 units in 1999. Though there were recommendations in the Master Plan of Delhi-2001 for shifting certain heavy and large, hazardous and noxious non-conforming units from Delhi, there was hardly any progress in this regard. It was only at the intervention of the Supreme Court in the year 1996 and 2004, there seemed to be some attempts for shifting of categorized industrial units out of Delhi. The Regional Plan-2021 has since proposed allowing of only high-tech industries in Delhi. The plan has also proposed decentralization of whole-sale trading of plastic, food grains, steel, timber, etc. at locations outside Delhi and shifting of the public sector offices the NCT-Delhi. According to the Ministry of Urban Development, Out of the 11 Central Government offices and 36 PSUs identified for shifting to places outside Delhi, 6 offices and 14 PSUs are yet to be shifted. The Committee view this as a perfect example of how plans and proposals eventually lose their steam due to non-implementation. The Committee would expect the Ministry to fix responsibility for the non-implementation of those decisions. The Committee further desire that the Government \ must chalk out a specific timeframe for the shifting of remaining Central Government offices and PSUs from NCT-Delhi and ensure that they are shifted within the time-frame.

Reply of the Government

4.5 The Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 for National Capital Region stipulates policies on shifting of offices from Delhi with a view to providing a balanced and regulated development of the Region.

A. Public Sector Undertakings(PSU)

Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 provides that the Public Sector Offices should be allowed to retain only very small establishments to cater for ministerial and liaison functions. The rest of the establishments should be shifted out of NCT-Delhi. No new office spaces should be created in newly developed community, district or sub-city and city centers. The Central Government and any other organization, body or authority requiring additional space should be allowed to do so only outside NCT-Delhi and beyond in Counter Magnet Areas(CMAs). Relocation and expansion of Govt. offices/PSU's which need to perform such ministerial/protocol and liaison functions which make it incumbent upon them to be located in Delhi alone should be allowed to be located in the Central NCR towns. The opening of new Govt. offices/PSU's or expanding the existing ones should be encouraged in the rest of NCR/CMAs outside NCR.

In the year 1986 a high powered committee was setup under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary which recommended 24 Public Sector Undertakings to be shifted out of Delhi which was approved by the Cabinet Committee for accommodation. Later on 12 other Public Sector Undertakings were identified for shifting after 1988. Thus, the actual number of PSU offices to be shifted as per post 1988 list is 12 only. Therefore, in total 36 identified offices of Public Sector Undertakings were to be shifted outside Delhi.

Of the 36 offices of PSU's(Pre-1988:24 and post-1988:12) identified for shifting outside Delhi, 20 have already been shifted, 2 have been permitted to continue in Delhi and 14 identified PSU's yet to be shifted from Delhi.

B. Government Offices

The Regional Plans-2001 & 2021 provides that the main criterion for location of offices in the Capital should be that they perform ministerial functions protocol functions or liaison functions, which, by their nature cannot be performed anywhere else except in the National Capital. The existing offices, which do not perform any of the above functions, should be identified and shifted from NCT-Delhi. A list indicating the present status of the offices identified for shifting out of Delhi is also annexed.

Comments of the Committee

4.6 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 11 of Chapter- I of the Report

Need to make NCR a unified area in economic terms

Recommendation (Para No. 4)

4.7 As pointed out by the Regional Plan-2021, one of the main problems confronting the development of NCR is the lack of uniformity in tax rates for various commodities and services in the constituent States which, in turn, leads to concentration of trade, Industry and services in Delhi. The committees are of the firm view that there is a need to remove the fiscal barriers and make NCR as a unified area in economic terms. The Committee would urge expeditious steps to address this issue.

Reply of the Government

4.8 The policy related to uniform taxes in the National Capital Region is to be enforced by the Ministry of Finance. Initial steps have been taken by the Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India(GOI) to introduce VAT in the country with minimum floor rates of taxes. It allows the States to keep higher VAT in their states in comparison to Delhi and vice-versa. Ministry of Finance, GOI and the state finance departments of the constituent States of NCR will also have to address this issue.

Comments of the Committee

4.9 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 14 of Chapter I of the Report

Recommendation (Para No. 7)

4.10 As for the Regional Plan-2021, the Committee are given to understand that even three years after the notification of the Regional Plan – 2021, no participating States have prepared their Sub-regional plan. It is only in July, 2008 that UP, Haryana and Rajasthan are stated to have initiated steps for preparation of Sub-regional Plans. It is learnt that the Delhi Government has not yet started the process. The Committee urge that the State Governments should not be

found wanting in this respect and should take expeditious steps to prepare their sub-regional plans in compliance with the NCRPB Act.

Reply of the Government

4.11 The directions of the Hon'ble Committee have been conveyed to the NCR constituent State Governments for compliance.

Comments of the Committee

4.12 For comments of the Committee Please see Paragraph No. 17 of Chapter I of the Report

Recommendation (Para No.16)

4.13 The Committee agree with the plea of the Ministry of Urban Development that in order to play a more effective role with the ultimate objective of translating the vision of the NCR to develop as a region of global excellence into actual reality, the NCR Planning Board needs to substantially scale up its operations by undertaking financing large infrastructural projects. Due to resource constraints, NCRPB is not in a position to finance large level projects. The Committee regret to note that budgetary support to NCRPB was a meagre Rs. 100 crore during 2007-08 and even this amount was reduced to Rs. 50 crore in 2008-09. The Committee expect the Government to provide sufficient funds to the Board to enable it to discharge its functions effectively. The Committee in this connection note that the Board has planned to raise about Rs. 9,000 crore from other sources such as loan from ADB/World Bank and market borrowings. The Committee believe that with the highest credit rating of the Board, it should be possible to generate adequate funds from the aforesaid sources.

Reply of the Government

4.14(i) The projects identified by NCRPB for being financed during the 11th Plan (2007-12) involve a total investment outlay of Rs. 15,000 crore which involves loan component of about of Rs. 11000 crore . In order to achieve the 11th Plan targets, the Board is making all-out efforts to step up its financial support to infrastructure projects in the NCR and Counter Magnet Areas. In order to extend loan assistance of Rs. 11000 crore as proposed above, substantial financial resources would have to be arranged by the Board through higher budgetary allocations for the NCRPB and/or by raising funds from other sources viz. multi-lateral funding and capital market. Accordingly, the Board had sought enhanced budgetary allocation of Rs. 2987 crore (Rs. 775 crore for NCRPB and

another Rs. 2212 crore for grants-in-aid to be passed on to the borrowing Govts/agencies) during 11th Plan.

(ii) As against the grant requirement of Rs. 2987 crore, as above, the gross budgetary support during 11th Plan period has been limited to Rs. 900 crore only. Budgetary support in BE 2008-09 is only Rs. 50 crore. As this amount is too meagre to finance infrastructure projects in the National Capital Region, the Board requested this Ministry to consider higher plan grant of Rs 150 crore in the RE for the year 2008-09. For the BE 2009-10, Board has requested for an allocation of Rs. 250 crore. This fund requirement of the Board has been projected accordingly. However considering meager allocation during current financial year and in view of specific action point, requirement of the Board to the tune of Rs.55 crore was projected to Budget Division of this Ministry in March 2008 and this was also taken up by Secretary(UD) with Secretary(Planning Commission) demi officially on 11th Feb. 2008. Ministry's request for higher allocation has not been considered by the Ministry of Finance on finalization of RE proposals for 2008-09.

(iii) In order to meet financing needs as per 11th Plan proposals, NCRPB will have to look for other sources of funds such as loans from multi-lateral aid agencies and/or market borrowings to the extent of Rs. 9000 crore as against Rs. 6850 crore proposed in plan proposals. The borrowing of additional amount will, however, have negative impact on the cost of funds to the Board and may affect the Board's capacity to sustain higher level of operations. Therefore, NCRPB needs to be supported with higher level of budgetary allocation to sustain operation at higher level.

iv) Out of Rs. 9000 crore required to be raised from the market, the Board has proposed to raise Funds amounting to Rs. 4,000 crore each as loan from the World Bank and the ADB and the balance from the capital market through issuance of Bonds. The purport of raising loan from multilateral funding institutions, duly backed by government guarantee, is to reduce our cost of funds in comparison to the capital market for which the Government of India to guarantee the loan. Since all the funds are meant for development of Infrastructure Projects entailing a long gestation period and in many cases low to minimal returns in the case of water supply, sanitation, sewage, drainage and internal road network Projects, the Government of India is considering to provide guarantee and waive the guarantee fee, so as to enable Board to keep cost of funds low and a meeting with the representative of Ministry of Finance is likely to be convened shortly to resolve the issue.

v) The amount of fund to be raised from the domestic capital market would be likely to be around Rs. 1000 crore. However, in case loan from the multi-lateral agencies does not materialize to the extent proposed, the Board will have to raise higher amount from the market.

vi) In view of the foregoing, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India has been requested to permit NCR Planning Board for raising a loan of Rs. 4,000 crore each from the ADB and World Bank in Multi-Tranche over a period of next five to seven years starting from 2008-09 duly backed by Govt. Guarantee and also to consider waiving of Guarantee Fee as the funds are to be deployed for development of Infrastructure Projects in the National Capital Region, which entails a long gestation period and in many cases low to minimal returns particularly in the case of water supply, sanitation, sewage, drainage and internal road network Projects. The issue of Govt. Guarantee for NCR loans is under process in Ministry of Finance.

Comments of the Committee

4.15 For comments of the Committee please see Paragraph No. 20 of Chapter I of the Report.

CHAPTER V

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

Development of Counter-Magnet Areas

Recommendation (Para No. 5)

5.1 In order to achieve the objectives of Regional Plan, certain cities in the constituent States outside NCR have been identified as 'Counter Magnet Areas' which could act as regional growth centres. Under the Regional Plan 2001, five Counter-Magnet Areas were identified, namely, Hissar (Haryana), Bareilly (Uttar Pradesh), Kota (Rajasthan), Patiala (Punjab) and Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh). Out of 13 projects sanctioned for these cities, 4 projects were in Gwalior, 3 in Patiala and 2 each in Kota, Bareilly and Hissar. A study commissioned by the NCRPB to review the Counter-Magnet Area development strategy has reportedly been completed. The Committee would like to be apprised of the recommendations of the study and the progress in implementation thereof.

Reply of the Government

5.2 NCRPB has informed that the study has been completed. The study report has since been examined by the Secretariat of the NCRPB. The recommendations made in the study report will be placed before the Board for its consideration during the next meeting of the Board. Once the recommendations are accepted by the Board, necessary action will be taken into implement the same.

Inter-State issues

Recommendation (Para No. 13)

5.3 According to the Government of Haryana, the inter-State issues between Delhi and Haryana pertaining to road connectivity, rail connectivity and water sharing were not getting resolved despite interaction at various levels. The Committee in this connection note that there are as many as three Committees to address inter-State issues. These are (i) Empowered Committee headed by Urban Development Secretary, (ii) Committee chaired by the Planning

Commission Secretary and (iii) A Committee of Group of Secretaries under the Cabinet Secretary. The Committee would like to know the role and responsibility of each of these Committees, the number and dates of meetings held, the issues raised and discussed and the issues remaining unresolved, stating the duration of pendency, the reasons for delay in addressing the issues and whether the NCRPB ever considered those issues. The Committee strongly believe that NCRPB being a very high powered body could carry conviction and amicably resolve all inter-State issues.

Reply of the Government

5.4 Committee wise information sought is as follows:

i) Empowered Committee

The Empowered Committee was constituted by the NCR Planning Board as per the decision taken in the 29th Board Meeting held on 24.05.06 under the Chairmanship of Minister of Urban Development with a view to *taking decisions about critical activities essential for making the National Capital Region a Region of global excellence*. The Committee is Chaired by Secretary (UD) and following are the members:

- Chief Secretary, Govt. of Haryana
- Chief Secretary, Govt. of Rajasthan
- Chief Secretary, Govt. of NCT of Delhi
- Secretary, Housing Deptt., Govt. of U.P.
- Member Secretary, NCRPB, Member Secretary

Terms of the reference of the Committee are as follows:

- i) Coordination amongst the constituents of the Board with regard to solving inter-state problems;
- ii) Development of large inter-state infrastructure projects;
- iii) Responding effectively to major events organized in Delhi from time to time like the Common-wealth Games 2010; and
- iv) Developing innovative models for public-private partnership with the cooperation of the constituent States.

So far, two meetings of the Empowered Committee have been held. The Empowered Committee constituted a Committee of Transport Commissioners/Secretaries of the NCR States which has been able to pursue the signing of bilateral agreement between NCR States and Reciprocal Common Transport Agreement for Contract Carriage and State & Goods Carriage. The bilateral agreements and the Contract Carriage Agreement of Reciprocal

Common Transport Agreement have been signed. The process for Stage & Goods Carriage of Reciprocal Common Transport Agreement is in progress.

The other issue which was pursued is availability of CNG in NCR. Ministry of Petroleum & Gas has constituted a regulator to look into the matter.

The Committee has recommended to extend the Metro Rail to Noida, Gurgaon, Faridabad, Ghaziabad & Bahadurgarh.

The Committee has also taken-up the issue of Delhi-Meerut Expressway with Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport & Highways. That Ministry has agreed to construct this Expressway.

New Delhi;

5th January, 2010
15 Pausa, 1931(Saka)

SHARAD YADAV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban Development

APPENDEIX I

COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT(2009-2010)

**MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY,
5th JANUARY2010**

The Committee sat from 1530 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Room No. 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sharad Yadav - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Parveen Singh Aron
3. Shri Partap Singh Bajwa
4. Shri Ambica Banerjee
5. Shri Eknath M. Gaikwad
6. Sk. Saidul Haque
7. Shri Ramesh Kumar
8. Shri Sonawane Pratap Narayanrao
9. Dr. Kirit Premjibhai Solanki
10. Shri Adagooru H. Vishwanath

RAJYA SABHA

11. Shri Rajeev Shukla
12. Shri Surendra Motilal Patel
13. Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki
14. Shri Amir Alam Khan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri T.K. Mukherjee | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri K.D. Muley | - | Director |
| 3. Smt. Anita B. Panda | - | Additional Director |
| 4. Ms. Amita Walia | - | Under Secretary |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee took up the consideration of the draft report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Thirty Fifth Report (14th Lok Sabha) on the subject 'National Capital Region Planning Board' (NCRPB) relating to the Ministry of Urban Development and adopted the same without any modification.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Thirty Seventh Report (14th Lok Sabha) on the subject 'Urban Transport' relating to the Ministry of Urban Development and adopted the same with slight modifications.

4. The Committee then authorized the Chairman to finalise both the reports and present the same to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	16
II.	Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government Para Sl. Nos. 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14	(Total 8)
	Percentage of total recommendations	(50.00%)
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not Desire to pursue in view of the Government's Replies Para Sl. Nos. 15	(Total 1)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(6.25%)
IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Para Sl Nos. 1,3,4,7and 16	(Total 5)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(31.25%)
V	Recommendations in respect of which final Replies of the Government are still awaited: Para Sl No. 5 &13	(Total 2)
	Percentage to total recommendations	(12.50%)