

35

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2002)**

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION
(DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2002-2003)**

THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|-------|
| COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE | (iii) |
| ABBREVIATIONS | (v) |
| INTRODUCTION | (vii) |
| REPORT | |
| CHAPTER I Introductory | 1 |
| CHAPTER II Overall Assessment of the Demands for Grants of the Department of Urban Development | 3 |
| (a) Total expenditure during 2001-2002 | 3 |
| (b) Staff strength of the Ministry | 4 |
| (c) Allocation and expenditure of funds for North-Eastern area | 5 |
| (d) New Scheme to be started during 2002-2003 ... | 6 |
| (e) Monitoring of Schemes/Programmes and review of works/projects | 7 |
| CHAPTER III Demand-wise Analysis for Grants 2002-2003 | 11 |
| (a) Demand number 82 (Department of Urban Development) | 11 |
| (b) Demand number 83 (Public Works) | 12 |
| (c) Construction of residential accommodation by CPWD | 14 |
| (d) Demand number 84 (Stationery and Printing) | 16 |
| CHAPTER IV Scheme-wise Analysis for Grants 2002-2003 | 21 |
| (a) IDSMT Scheme | 21 |
| (b) Mega City Scheme | 23 |
| (c) Urban Mapping Scheme | 26 |

(ii)

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| (d) AUWSP | 27 |
| (e) LCS for Liberation of Scavengers Scheme .. | 30 |
| (f) Urban Transport — Delhi Metro Rail Corporation..... | 32 |
| (g) Autonomous/statutory bodies | 37 |
| (i) NCR Planning Board | 37 |
| (ii) Delhi Development Authority | 43 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Statement of BE, RE and actuals of the Department since 1998-99 | 47 |
| II. Financial outlay for the Ninth Plan and actuals of Annual Plans 1997-98 to 2001-2002 and allocation 2002-2003. | 48 |
| III. Statement showing BE, RE, actuals and amount surrendered by the Department during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. | 53 |
| IV. Strength of Establishment and provision therefor in the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation | 55 |
| V. Statement showing staff strength as on 31.12.2000 | 56 |
| VI. Headwise expenditure of Demand number 82 since 1999-2000 | 58 |
| VII. Minutes of 6th sitting of the Committee held on 3.4.2002 | 64 |
| VIII. Minutes of 7th sitting of the Committee held on 3.4.2002 | 67 |
| IX. Extracts of the Minutes of 11th sitting of the Committee held on 16.04.2002 | 70 |
| X. Summary of Observations and Recommendations | 72 |

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Shri Shriram Chauhan
8. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
11. Shri Basavanagoud Kolor
12. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
15. Dr. Laxminarayan Pandey
16. Shri Sukhdeo Paswan
17. Shri Chandresh Patel
18. Shri Laxmanrao Patil
19. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
20. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
21. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
22. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
23. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
24. Shri Maheshwar Singh
25. Shri D.C Srikantappa
26. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
27. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
28. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav

(iv)

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri N.R. Dasari
- *34. Ven'ble Dhammaviriyo
35. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
- §36. Shri Maurice Kujur
37. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
- @38. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
39. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
40. Shri Nabam Rebia
- *41. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
42. Shri Man Mohan Samal
43. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
- *44. Shri Prakanta Warisa

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
5. Shri N.S. Hooda — *Assistant Director*

§ Retired from the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 2.4.2002.

* Retired from the Committee consequent upon their retirement from Rajya Sabha on 9.4.2002.

@ Retired from the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 12.4.2002.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| AUWSP | — | Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme |
| BE | — | Budget Estimate |
| CPHEEO | — | Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organisation |
| CC | — | Commercial Complex |
| CMA | — | Counter Magnet Area |
| CPWD | — | Central Public Works Department |
| DC | — | District Centre |
| DDA | — | Delhi Development Authority |
| DIZ Area | — | Delhi Imperial Zone Area |
| DMRC | — | Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. |
| DPR | — | Detailed Project Report |
| GIP | — | Government of India Press |
| GNCTD | — | Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi |
| GPRA | — | General Pool Residential Accommodation |
| GNPRA | — | General Pool Non-Residential (Office) Accommodation |
| GPO | — | General Post Office |
| HUDCO | — | Housing and Urban Development Corporation |
| IDSMT | — | Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns |
| IEBR | — | Internal Extra Budgetary Resources |
| I&B | — | Information and Broadcasting |
| JBIC | — | Japanese Bank for International Cooperation |
| LBZ | — | Lutyen's Bunglaow Zone |
| LCS | — | Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers Scheme |
| LIG | — | Lower Income Group |
| L&DO | — | Land and Development Office |
| lpcd | — | litre per capita per day |
| LPU | — | Letter Press Unit |
| LRT | — | Light Rail Transit |
| LSC | — | Local Shopping Centre |

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| MH | — | Major Head |
| MIG | — | Middle Income Group |
| MLA | — | Member of Legislative Assembly |
| MNP | — | Minimum Needs Programme |
| MOUD&PA | — | Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation |
| MP | — | Member of Parliament |
| MRT | — | Metro Rail Transit |
| MRTS | — | Mass Rapid Transit System |
| NA | — | Not Available |
| NCR | — | National Capital Region |
| NCRPB | — | National Capital Region Planning Board |
| NIUD | — | National Institute of Urban Development |
| NRSA | — | National Remote Sensing Agency |
| NSDP | — | National Slum Development Programme |
| OE | — | Office Expenses |
| OECD | — | Overseas Economic Corporation Fund (Japan) |
| PB | — | Planning Board |
| PLU | — | Photo Litho Unit |
| P&T | — | Post and Telegraph |
| R&D | — | Research and Development |
| RE | — | Revised Estimate |
| RGNDWM | — | Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission |
| RTES | — | Rail India Technical and Economy Services |
| SLSCs | — | State Level Sanctioning Committees |
| SMT | — | Small and Medium Towns |
| SFS | — | Self Finance Scheme |
| TA | — | Travelling Allowance |
| TCPO | — | Town and Country Planning Organisation |
| UC | — | Utilisation Certificate |
| UD | — | Urban Development |
| UTs | — | Union territories |

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

According to the Census of India, the urban population in the country as on 1st March, 2001 was 285 million. This constituted 27.8 percent of the total population of 1027 million. The net addition of population in urban areas during the decade 1991-2001 was 68 million. The contribution of urban sector to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is currently at 60 per cent and accounts for more than 90% of the Government revenues. The Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation addresses issues of various sectors through policy, legislative and sectoral guidance.

1.2 The Ministry has two Departments namely, (i) Department of Urban Development and (ii) Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation.

1.3 The Department of Urban Development deals with promotion of Urban Development, including Urban Water Supply and Sanitation, Planning and coordination of Urban Transport System, Local self-Government, Planning and Development of National Capital Region (NCR), designing and construction of Central Government residential accommodation and non-residential (office) buildings and connected works through Central Public Works Department, Directorate of Estates, Directorate of Printing, Controller of Stationery, Controller of Publications, etc.

1.4 The overall Demands for Grants of the said Department for 2002-2003 are Rs. 2455.59 crore for both plan and non-plan.

1.5 The detailed Demands for Grants 2002-2003 of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 19th March, 2002.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination to only major issues concerning programmes relating to (i) Urban Development-IDSMT, Mega City Scheme, urban mapping Scheme, Planning and Coordination of urban transports matter; (ii) Water supply and Sanitation-AUWSP and Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers; (iii) Public Works—General Pool Residential and non-residential (office) accommodation; (iv) Directorate of Printing; (v) Subordinate offices like Directorate of Estates; and (vi) Statutory and autonomous bodies like Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC), National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB), Delhi Development Authority (DDA) in the context of overall budgetary allocation in Demands for Grants for the year 2002-2003.

CHAPTER II

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Demand numbers 82, 83 and 84

A. Total expenditure during 2001-2002

The information regarding BE, RE and actuals under plan and non-plan heads of the Department since 1998-99 may be seen at *Appendix I*. The 9th five year plan allocation and actual expenditure are given at *Appendix-II*. As per the information made available to the Committee, BE 2001-2002 of Department of Urban Development was Rs. 2216.95 crore and RE 2001-2002 was Rs. 3089.72 crore, resulting in an increase of Rs. 872.77 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 39.37%). The increase in the RE stage is due to the additionality of Rs. 782.35 crore as supplementary Grants for pass through assistance from JBIC. The entire amount has been released to DMRC. The Ministry could not utilise Rs. 90.42 crore from the said increase at revised estimate stage.

2.2 The actual expenditure of the Department for all the three Demands as on 30th September, 2001 was Rs. 788.55 crore (*i.e.* 35.57 percent of BE 2001-2002). When asked about the reasons for the lower utilisation of funds in the first six months of 2001-2002, the Government have replied that, during the said period, the percentage utilisation for plan funds was 29.30 percent and for non-plan funds was 40 percent.

2.3 The information regarding the allocated amount surrendered by the Department of Urban Development during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 is given at *Appendix III*. As can be seen therefrom, during the said years, Rs. 185.81 crore and Rs. 243.87 crore, respectively, were surrendered by Department. Thus, under utilisation of allotted funds during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 by the Department as a whole was to the tune of Rs. 429.68 crore.

2.4 The Committee are concerned to note the dismal performance of the Department in respect of utilisation of planned funds, which is stated to be a little over 29 per cent in the first half of 2001-2002. They also note that the Government could not utilise satisfactorily the non-plan funds which is reported to be only 40 percent, during the same period. They further note that in the last two years, the Government have under-spent Rs. 429.68 crore and during 2001-2002, out of the increase in revised estimate, above Rs. 90 crore have not been utilised. Being critical of the way of the Government have spent the scarce resources allotted, it is high time that the Ministry should think in depth and analyse the reasons for underspending. The Committee also feel that it is necessary to gear up the implementing machinery and eradicate the causes for its slow functioning so that the allocated money is fully utilised. They also recommend that budget estimates should be made more realistic and not an inflated one, so that the other developmental works of the Government are not deprived of their requisite outlay.

B. Staff strength of the Ministry

2.5 During the examination of Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department of Urban Development, the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation had informed that a discrepancy was noticed in the figures for the staff strength of the establishment, attached and subordinate offices and the public sector units. This year, the Government furnished information regarding staff strength of the Ministry as on 31.12.2000 (*Appendix IV*) which is stated to be 59,929 in the offices of the Ministry and 4,871 in the public sector units (*i.e.* a total of 64,800 employees). The CPWD had a huge staff strength of 46,818 as on 31.12.2000 out of which 24,495 were work-charge employees.

2.6 As per the information given in the detailed Demands for Grants 2002-2003, the Ministry had 30,039 employees in position as on 2001, on which an expenditure of Rs 330.62 crore had been actually incurred during 2000-2001. (*Appendix V*).

2.7 The Committee have observed that the staff strength of Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation a per detailed Demands for Grants laid on the Table, was 30,039, whereas as per information furnished to the Committee the staff has been given as 59,929.

The Committee are unable to understand the reasons for variation in the staff strength of the Ministry as furnished by them to the Parliament in two different documents. They, therefore, desire that the reasons for this variation should be explained to them. They would also like the Ministry to explore the feasibility of downsizing the staff strength in a time bound manner, in order to contain the non-plan expenditure of the Ministry to reasonable limits.

2.8 The Committee would also like to be apprised of the sources from where the pay and allowances etc. to these 29890 staff members whose figure does not find place in the Demands for Grants, are paid.

2.9 The Committee have further noted that CPWD's total staff strength is 46,818 out of which 24,495 are temporary staff employed as work-charge. They would like to be apprised as to how the services of such a huge staff strength is being meaningfully utilised. The Committee recommend that the staff strength of the Ministry and CPWD should be rationalised.

C. Allocation and expenditure of funds for North-Eastern area

2.10 In the BE 2001-2002 an amount of Rs. 82.50 crore as non lapsable fund was earmarked for North-Eastern States and Sikkim. As per the written replies, an expenditure (up to January, 2002) of Rs. 39.37 crore *i.e.* 47.27% has been made out of this fund during 2001-2002. During 2001-2002, nil expenditure was reported against the BE of Rs. 80.05 crore. 10% earmarking of the gross Budget support was first done in 2000-2001 in case of North-Eastern States and Sikkim.

2.11 However, as per the latest position given by the Department, during 2002-2003, Rs. 90 crore have been earmarked for such States. During 2001-2002, the Department sanctioned 22 projects/schemes proposed by the said State Governments at an estimated cost of Rs. 160.09 crore. The entire amount of Rs. 82.5 crore earmarked for schemes has already been released during 2001-2002. The estimates earmarked during 2001-2002 have thus been fully utilised *i.e.* Rs. 78.91 crore under the capital head of account and Rs. 3.58 crore (Rs. 358.37 lakh) under the revenue head of account. During 2001-2002, the Department released part of the estimated cost of the different programmes to the State Governments/implementing agencies, in most of the cases. The Committee were informed that on receipt of utilisation certificate from State Governments/Implementing agencies, funds would be released during 2002-2003. The Department has thus committed to release Rs. 75.62 crore to State Governments/implementing agencies during 2002-2003 in respect of projects/schemes sanctioned during 2001-2002.

2.12 When asked about the position of utilisation certificates in respect of the funds released to the North Eastern areas, as on 28th February, 2002, the Department has submitted that the first payment in this regard was released in the 3rd quarter of 2001-2002. As other sanctions followed subsequently, utilisation certificates in this regard would be due during 2002-2003. Thereafter, further funds would be provided to the executing agencies.

2.13 The Committee find that during 2001-2002 (upto January 2002), only 47.72 per cent of the funds exclusively earmarked for North-Eastern States and Sikkim were released to them. The remaining portion was released during the last two months of the financial year. They find that releases of the funds in the last months of the financial year result in gross irregularities in the implementation of a programme/scheme. They, therefore, urge the Government to release the funds in a phased manner throughout the year. Besides, the concerned State Governments/UTs should be impressed upon to furnish the utilisation certificates in time. They would also like the Department to procure the information regarding physical and financial achievement under respective schemes of the Department from each of the North-Eastern States and Sikkim since the concept of earmarking 10% of the outlay to such States was introduced and apprise the Committee accordingly.

D. New Schemes to be started during 2002-2003

2.14 The Committee have been apprised that three new schemes namely, (i) Urban Information System; (ii) Pooled Finance Development Fund; and (iii) City Challenge Fund are going to be started from 2002-2003 with an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs for each of the Scheme.

2.15 The Department was requested to furnish a copy of the guidelines of each of the said new schemes. Besides they were asked to clarify as to whether they have consulted the States and Union territory administrations and ensured their competence and infrastructure to implement the new schemes before starting new schemes. The Department has submitted that the Finance Minister in his Budget speech has announced the setting up of the City Challenge Fund and Pooled Finance Development fund. The modalities of the proposed fund are to be worked out. The development of Urban Information System is also being considered. Details have not yet been finalised.

2.16 During the 9th Five Year Plan, the Government had announced to start ten new (plan) schemes. The allocations for the said schemes were also made subsequently in different Annual Plans and also for five schemes in the BE 2000-2001. The Government, however, could not put the schemes in operation.

2.17 The Committee are distressed to note that the Government could not operationalise even a single scheme out of the ten new plan schemes which were to be launched during 9th Plan. They further note that the Government is going to launch three new schemes as announced by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech, though they are yet to finalise the modalities of these schemes. The Committee are afraid that launching of fresh schemes without working out their modalities, may result in these schemes meeting the same fate as was met by the schemes which were to be launched during 9th Plan. They, therefore, recommend that the Government should make proper homework before launching any new scheme and when approved, these schemes should be implemented without any delay so as to avoid time and cost overruns.

E. Monitoring of Schemes/Programmes and review of Works/Projects

2.18 The Committee have been informed that the Ministry holds review meetings from time to time with the senior officials of the State Governments/Heads of implementing agencies and request them to sort out on a priority basis the utilisation of Central and State funds, released under any Scheme/Programme, optimally so as to accrue the benefits to the community in a time-bound manner.

2.19 At present, five different Centrally Sponsored Schemes are being implemented by the Department. These are, (i) Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT), (ii) 'Mega City Scheme', (iii) Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP), (iv) 'Urban Mapping Scheme', and (v) 'Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers Scheme'.

2.20 The State Governments and the implementing agencies are required to submit their utilisation certificates (UCs) on annual basis for the Central grants released to them in the previous years.

2.21 While going through the information furnished by the Department in respect of the respective Centrally sponsored schemes/programmes, it is found that some of the State Governments, financial institutions/implementing agencies do not release their share, as required under the guidelines in time. Besides some of the Governments and implementing agencies are also not particular in forwarding the UCs for the expenditure made by them in the previous years.

2.22 It has been stated by the Government that the delay in furnishing UCs is not due to the communication gap, but on account of procedural delays at the State administration level.

2.23 The Government have also not been able to furnish the unspent/opening balance data with the State Governments and the implementing agencies on any of the aforesaid schemes.

2.24 When asked about the information regarding total release of funds under IDSMT released by States and financial institutions to implementing agencies, the Department has stated that the said information is not available since 1997-98 and the latest position is being obtained.

2.25 Further, when asked about the cost and time overrun and post project evaluation of Projects undertaken by the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation under Mega City Scheme, the Department has stated that these are the responsibility of the State Governments/State Level Sanctioning Committee.

2.26 Regarding the monitoring of Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programmes (AUWSP), Central Public Health Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO) has been given the responsibility for monitoring of the Programme. It has been submitted that there is no monitoring cell and CPHEEO is facing acute shortage of manpower. The officers of the said organisation make field visits only occasionally. HUDCO, the nodal agency for implementing LCS Scheme, has not been able to properly monitor the scheme.

2.27 While mentioning about the monitoring and review of the schemes and works, the Secretary of the Urban Development, during the course of oral evidence stated that,

“I convene a meeting of all the State urban development Secretaries and review the schemes/works once in six months. We also request them to expedite and sort out the coordination problems. Other wise, scheme-wise I review it once in every six months and the hon'ble Minister calls for a review meeting of all the State Urban Development Ministers once in two years.”

2.28 The Committee have examined the implementation of each of the Centrally sponsored schemes, as mentioned above, in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report. As regards the overall position of monitoring of the respective schemes/programmes, the Committee find that much emphasis is not being given to the monitoring of the respective schemes of the Department. The State Governments/implementing agencies are slack in sending the utilisation certificates in time. Besides, they are not very particular in contributing their share as per the respective guidelines of the schemes. It is astonishing that the Department also has made no effort to procure the data regarding unspent balances from the State Governments/implementing agencies in respect of various schemes/programmes. While the Committee have no objection in State Government's having their own monitoring mechanism, they feel that the Centre can not escape from the responsibility of monitoring specifically when these are the Centrally sponsored schemes/programmes and the major portion of the outlay is contributed by the Union Government. The Committee would, therefore, like to recommend:

- (i)** to persuade the implementing agencies to hold monthly review meeting about the achievements and implementation of the schemes;
- (ii)** to persuade the implementing agencies to furnish quarterly progress reports to the respective State Government/and also to the Central Government;
- (iii)** to procure utilisation certificates from the implementing agencies/State Governments twice in a year instead of once in a financial year. The necessary changes in the guidelines of schemes/programmes should be made;
- (iv)** to establish a monitoring cell in the Central Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation, to collect and analyse monthly review reports, quarterly progress reports, and utilisation certificates. They also urge that the Department should use the latest technology to procure the utilisation certificates timely from the implementing agencies/State Governments. The Planning Commission be requested to provide adequate financial provision for the Cell;

- (v) to obtain the aforesaid reports/certificates from CPWD, all autonomous and statutory bodies, attached and subordinate offices, Government of India Press and Public Sector Units etc. which are under the administrative control of the Ministries; and
- (vi) to introduce a scheme for monitoring of the Central Sector/ Sponsored schemes in line with the area officers scheme of the sister Ministry *i.e.* Ministry of Rural Development.

2.29 The Committee further note that the Secretary of the Department holds a review meeting of his counterparts in the States and Union territories twice a year, for monitoring of Central Sector/ sponsored schemes and review of works/projects. They also note that the Minister for Urban Development calls for a review meeting of the State's Urban Development Ministers, once in two years. The Committee desire that the Government should involve elected representatives like MPs and MLAs also for the monitoring of the schemes at the State level. MPs from the States/Union territories be also invited at the review meetings convened by the Union Minister for Urban Development so that first hand information can be shared and on-the-spot decision regarding effective implementation of such schemes, can be taken.

CHAPTER III

DEMAND-WISE ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—2002-2003

The Demands for Grants 2002-2003 of the Department have been presented to Parliament under the following Demand numbers:

| | | |
|---------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Demand No. 82 | — | Department of Urban Development, |
| Demand No. 83 | — | Public Works, and |
| Demand No. 84 | — | Stationery and Printing. |

(a) Demand No. 82 (Department of Urban Development)

3.2 The Committee were informed that the BE, RE and Actual expenditure of the Demand No. 82 is as under:

Department of Urban Development

(Rs. in crore)

Plan

| Year | BE | RE | Actual | Remarks |
|-----------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2000-2001 | 785.03 | 644.09 | 518.54 | — |
| 2001-2002 | 799.06 | 1579.57 | 1361.92 | — |
| 2002-2003 | 883.79 | — | — | — |

Non-Plan

| Year | BE | RE | Actual | Remarks |
|-----------|--------|--------|-----------------------|---------|
| 2000-2001 | 370.04 | 343.34 | 306.05 | — |
| 2001-2002 | 358.44 | 426.85 | 314.75 (28.2.2002) | — |
| 2002-2003 | 427.27 | — | — | — |

3.3 As per the written information furnished to the Committee, the following observations about the Demand No. 82 are being made:

- (i) In the overall allocation for plan schemes, the BE 2001-02 was Rs. 799.06 crore and the BE 2002-03 is Rs. 883.79 crore (an increase of 10.60 per cent);
- (ii) In the overall allocation for non-plan schemes, the BE 2001-02 was Rs. 358.44 crore and the BE 2002-03 is Rs. 427.27 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 19.20 per cent); and
- (iii) As regards the position of overall allocation under plan and non-plan schemes, the BE 2001-02 was Rs. 1157.50 crore and the BE 2002-03 is Rs. 1311.06 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 13.27 per cent).

3.4 The Committee note that allocation for Department of Urban Development under Demand number 82 has been increased by nearly 13 per cent in 2002-03. While appreciating the overall increase, they have observed that growth in the non-plan sector during 2002-2003 has been more than 19 per cent whereas the increase for the plan schemes is a little over 10 per cent. The Committee, therefore, would like to urge the Ministry to take suitable steps for better utilisation of plan scheme funds while minimising the increase in the non-plan sectors. They should also like that there should be adequate enhancement in plan schemes so that more and more developmental projects could be taken up under the respective schemes of the Department.

(b) Demand No. 83 (Public Works)

3.5 As per the detailed Demands for Grants for 2002-2003 of the Ministry, the following observations about Public Works (Revenue + Capital) are being made:

Public Works

Plan + Non-Plan

| | BE | RE | Actuals | Rs. in crore |
|-----------|--------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1998-1999 | 844.53 | 794.19 | 704.22 | — |
| 1999-2000 | 810.91 | 757.32 | 741.97 | — |
| 2000-2001 | 858.85 | 817.45 | 588.97 | Actuals is 68.49% of BE 2000-2001 |
| 2001-2002 | 871.35 | 910.01 | 740.99 (upto Feb., 02) | Increase in RE Rs. 39 crore. |
| 2002-2003 | 965.37 | — | — | |

3.6 As per the written information furnished to the Committee, the following facts about the Revenue section could be ascertained:

- (i) For the CPWD Establishment, Maintenance and Repairs (*i.e.* the Revenue Section) the BE 2002-2003 has been increased to Rs. 673.24 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 4.28 percent) from Rs. 645.60 crore during BE 2001-2002.
- (ii) The BE 2001-2002 for the CPWD Establishment, maintenance and repairs was increased from Rs. 601.05 crore in 2000-2001 to Rs. 645.60 crore *i.e.* by 7.30 per cent.

The BE and actuals for CPWD establishment, maintenance and repairs are as below:

(Rs. in crore)

| | 1998-99 | | 1999-2000 | | 2000-2001 | | 2001-2002 | | 2002-2003 |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | BE | Actuals | BE | Actuals | BE | Actuals | BE | Actuals | BE |
| Maintenance Repairs etc. | 387.88 | 325.26 | 324.97 | 278.96 | 416.00 | 297.74 | 391.10 | 313.55 | 406.18 |
| Establishment | 213.12 | 213.01 | 238.48 | 216.00 | 230.00 | 221.23 | 254.50 | 229.91 | 267.06 |
| Total | 619.00 | 538.27 | 563.45 | 494.96 | 646.00 | 518.97 | 645.60 | 543.46 | 673.24 |

3.7 The Committee are concerned to note that the allocation for public works during 2001-02 was increased by nearly Rs. 39 crore in the revised estimates stage, but adequate steps were not taken to ensure the proper utilisation of enhanced outlay as could be seen from the figures of 2000-2001 when the actual expenditure was 68 per cent of the total budget estimates. The Committee would, therefore, recommend that effective measures should be taken so that cent per cent utilisation of funds for Public works, is achieved.

3.8 The Committee are dismayed to note that the expenditure on the establishment of CPWD has increased by more than Rs. 16 crore in three years *i.e.* between 1998-99 and 2001-2002, whereas the funds under maintenance, repairs etc. have decreased by nearly Rs. 12 crore during same period. They are at a loss to point out that the Government have not taken any measure to minimise the expenditure on the establishment of CPWD, as has been recommended by them in their earlier Report (Paragraph 3.7 of 23rd Report—13th Lok Sabha refers). They also recommend that the Government should take appropriate steps to fully utilize the allotted funds so that trouble free maintenance is provided by the CPWD.

(c) Construction of residential accommodation by CPWD

3.9 As per the written information furnished to the Committee, the following achievements were reported to have been made by CPWD in the 9th plan:

Residential (4216-UD)

| Year | Financial | | | Physical | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Requirement (Rs. in crore) | Allocation (Rs. in crore) | Expenditure (Rs. in crore) | Target for Completion (in units) | Achievement (in terms of units) |
| 1997-98 | 134.00 | 61.35 | 63.05 | 1078 | 644 |
| 1998-99 | 132.00 | 70.00 | 72.00 | 884 | 1016 |
| 1999-2000 | 80.00 | 56.00 | 55.90 | 833 | 773 |
| 2000-2001 | 80.00 | 75.00 | 72.91 | 1086 | 996 |
| 2001-2002 | 100.00 | 80.00 | 68.13 (upto to 2/02) | 417 | 452 |
| 2002-2003 | — | — | — | — | — |

3.10 As per the Performance Budget 2002-2003, the Directorate of Estates had 88,626 dwelling units of different types of accommodation as on 31st December, 2001. However, the number of dwelling units during the last five years have fluctuated as below:

| Year | No. of dwelling units | Net addition |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 1997-98 | 88,503 | Minus 419 |
| 1998-99 | 88,084 | 373 |
| 1999-2000 | 88,457 | 169 |
| 2000-2001 | 88,626 | — |
| 2001-2002 | NA | NA |

3.11 When asked about whether it is true that 169 quarters only could be added to the general pool during 1999-2000 and what was the expenditure made in this regard, the Committee have been informed that as per information furnished by CPWD, 990 quarters have been constructed during the year 2000-2001 at a cost of Rs. 72.91 crore. However, all these quarters are at various stages of handing over to the Directorate of Estates for allotment.

3.12 As per written replies, in addition to the General Pool residential accommodation, there are other than General Pool residential accommodation like Lok Sabha Pool, P&T, Home Affairs, Communication, etc. from which Directorate of Estates receives the licence fees.

3.13 When asked to provide the details regarding the number of quarters of other than the general pool category, the Government have replied that Directorate of Estates is responsible for administration of General Pool residential accommodation only and it has no administrative control over the accommodation being maintained by various Departments e.g. Defence Pool, P&T Pool, Rajya Sabha Pool, Lok Sabha Pool etc. These organisations/Departments were under the General Pool which is under the administrative control of Directorate of Estates before they created their own pool.

3.14 As per the Performance Budget 2002-2003, the Directorate of Estates is also responsible for eviction of unauthorised occupants from public premises under its control. When the Committee wanted to know that out of total 88,626 dwelling units, how many of these have been occupied by the original allottees and how many of those were 'under repair', category as on 31st December, 2001, they were informed that vacancies in respect of only those quarters are reported to Directorate of Estates, which are fit for occupation. Out of 88,626 dwelling units, 1667 units were 'under repair' category as on 31.12.2001. 3,460 units were vacant and available for allotment and the remaining 83,499 units were in occupation of allottees. The Committee were further informed that 847 unauthorised occupants were evicted by the Directorate of Estates during 2000-2001 from these 83,499 residential units.

3.15 The Committee are surprised to find that only 373 residential units were added to the total General Pool accommodation (GPA) by Directorate of Estates during 1998-99, whereas CPWD constructed 1016 quarters during this period for this purpose. During 1999-2000, only 169 quarters were added to GPA, whereas CPWD constructed 773 quarters during this period and though CPWD has claimed to have constructed 990 quarters during 2000-2001 at a cost of Rs. 72.91 crore, these quarters are at various stages of handing over to Directorate of Estates for allotment. The Committee would like to know about the position of the quarters handed over so far and the likely date, when all these quarters will be handed over. They would also like to be apprised of the reasons for delay in taking over the quarters by the Directorate of Estates from CPWD.

3.16 The Committee also note that the Directorate of Estates is responsible for administration of General Pool residential accommodation and, it has no administrative control over the accommodation being maintained by various Departments. The Committee further note that some of these Departments, before constructing their own pool, which is far less than the demand, were coming under the administrative control of the Directorate of Estates. The Committee would like to be apprised of the year from which the Directorate of Estates started handing over the residential accommodation to other Departments and since when they have stopped transferring the quarters from the General Pool to these other department pools. The Committee desire that the Government should make an action plan to ensure cent per cent satisfaction level in respect of residential accommodation to all the Central Government Employees.

(d) Demand No. 84 (Stationery and Printing)

Directorate of Printing

3.17 The status of modernisation of all Government of India Presses (GIPs) in the country during 2000-2001 was as under:—

| Modernised Presses (Offset Technology) | Partially Modernised (Letter Press/Offset Technology) | Old Technology (Letter Press) |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Govt. of India Press, Minto Road—Photolitho Unit, New Delhi | 1. Govt. of India Press (Letter Press Unit), Faridabad | 1. Govt. of India Press (Pub. Unit), Santragachi |
| 2. Govt. of India Text Book Press, Chandigarh | 2. Govt. of India Press, Nilokheri | 2. Govt. of India Press (From Unit), Santragachi |
| 3. Govt. of India Text Book Press, Mysore | 3. Govt. of India Press, Nashik | 3. Govt. of India Press, Gangtok |
| 4. Govt. of India Text Book Press | 4. Govt. of India Press Coimbatore | 4. Govt. of India Press (Letter Press) (Unit), Minto Road |
| 5. Govt. of India Press (Photolitho Unit), Faridabad | 5. Govt. of India Press, Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi. | 5. Govt. of India Press, Shimla |
| 6. Govt. of India Patent Printing Press, Mumbai | 6. Govt. of India Press, Aligarh | |
| 7. Govt. of India Press, Wellington | 7. Govt. of India Press, Temple Street, Calcutta | |
| 8. Govt. of India Press, Koratty | | |
| 9. Govt. of India Press, Ring Road, Mayapuri | | |

3.18 Thus, out of 21 Government of India Presses, 9 Presses had been modernised, 7 Presses had been partially modernised and the remaining 5 Presses were working with the old technology.

3.19 The information on B.E., R.E. and actual expenditure upto February 2002 of demand No. 84 during 1998-99, 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 alongwith B.E. 2002-2003 is as under:—

Demand No. 84 (Stationery & Printing)

Revenue Section

(Rs in lakh)

| Year | B.E. | R.E. | Actual |
|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|
| 1998-1999 | 17386.00 | 17314.00 | 14083.89 |
| 1999-2000 | 15991.00 | 15242.00 | 14400.32 |
| 2000-2001 | 17326.00 | 16754.00 | 13986.02 |
| 2001-2002 | 18670.00 | 17301.00 | 14334.78 |
| | | | (upto Feb. 2002) |
| 2002-2003 | 17891.00 | — | — |

Capital Section

(Rs. in lakh)

| Year | B.E. | | R.E. | | Actual | |
|-----------|------|-----|------|-----|--------|-------|
| 1998-1999 | 100 | 500 | — | 500 | — | 43.22 |
| 1999-2000 | 25 | 400 | 25 | 175 | — | 39.07 |
| 2000-2001 | — | 175 | — | 120 | — | 1.66 |
| 2001-2002 | — | 140 | — | 28 | — | — |
| 2002-2003 | — | 25 | — | — | — | — |

3.20 As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, the BE 2001-2002 was Rs. 188.10 crore, RE 2001-2002 was Rs. 173.29 crore and the BE 2002-2003 has been increased to Rs. 179.16 crore (*i.e.* a reduction of 4.75 per cent over BE 2001-2002).

3.21 Year-wise allocation, release, expenditure and unspent balance of the Directorate of Printing for the years 1998-99 to 2001-2002 and B.E. 2002-2003 is as under:—

| (Rs. in lakh) | | | | |
|---------------|------|-------------|---------------------------|---|
| Year | B.E. | Final Grant | Expenditure | Unutilized amount |
| 1998-1999 | 4258 | 4014.90 | 2860.73 | 1154.17 |
| 1999-2000 | 2507 | 2440.72 | 2218.13 | 222.59 |
| 2000-2001 | 3317 | 2754.50 | 2395.59 | 358.91 |
| 2001-2002 | 3739 | 4467.65 | 3685.04 (upto Feb., 2002) | Can be ascertained after closing of Fin. Year |
| 2002-2003 | 3828 | — | — | — |

(Total unutilized/surrendered amount between 1998-99 and 2000-2001 is Rs. 17.3567 crore)

3.22 During the course of oral evidence, the representative of the Ministry stated as:—

“It is a fact that most of the printing Presses are slightly outdated. There are 21 Printing Presses; 3 text book printing Presses; 18 are printing different forms of stationery and other materials. Since 1986, the matter of closure of some of the Presses has come up; modernisation is to be taken up in several Presses. Initially, it was decided to close some of the presses. Then, it was decided to review. This matter went to the Committee of Secretaries, which is reviewing it. Even the Expenditure Reforms Commission has made several recommendations on it. We have made a proposal of merging five Presses with the other 13. So, the 13 Presses will remain, which will be modernised. We have prepared a complete comprehensive plan for modernisation, which will cost Rs. 24 crore. The remaining 3 Presses in Chandigarh, Bhubaneswar and Mysore are proposed to be transferred to the State Governments; they have not made any response so far. There was a provision for modernisation of the Faridabad printing Press since the last

4-5 years. If you go from the letter Press to the Offset Printing Press, you need to retain some of the staff and also give their different scales. That has not been agreed to by the Finance Ministry. During the last four years, every year, we used to keep some money for modernisation and they used to lapse also. This time, we have already prepared a Cabinet note and submitted for consideration of the Cabinet. They had asked for some modifications. Again, we will be sending the modified note this week. This includes creation of some posts. There are a lot of vacant posts. Presently, out of 12215 posts, 4020 are lying vacant. We have asked for abolition of some and recreate some of the posts to take care of the modernisation process. If that is done, this will be taken care of. In this current year, we can take up modernisation of Presses in phased manner. This is our present proposal.”

3.23 The Government have also informed that between 1st April 1999 and 1st October 2001 annual capacity utilisation of 19 GIPs (out of the total 21 Presses) has been revised. However during 2001-2002 (upto December 2001) the capacity utilization of GIPs at Santragachi (PU) Press is 26.38 per cent, Faridabad (PLU) Press is 34.38 per cent, Aligarh Press is 36.96 per cent, Trample Street, Calcutta Press is 42.15 per cent and Minto Road (PLU) Press is 42.26 per cent only.

3.24 The Committee find that the process of modernisation of Government of India Presses started in 1986 and since then almost 16 years have elapsed. They are really astonished to note that the final decision in the matter has not yet been taken. They are also concerned to note the dismal performance of most of the Government of India Presses. They are surprised to find that even the optimum utilisation of some of the Presses like Minto Road, Faridabad etc., which are in the vicinity of NCR, could not be ensured. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending for the last four or five years to take action for modernisation or restructuring of Government of India Presses expeditiously, yet the final decision is still awaited. They are informed, that a Cabinet note in this regard has since been submitted. The Committee feel that sufficient time has been taken unnecessarily and the Government are still uncertain about the process of modernisation of Presses. The Committee deplore the casual approach to such a serious matter. They strongly recommend that a final decision in this regard should be taken without any further delay.

3.25 The Committee further note that Rs. 17.36 crore were surrendered during the last three years by the Directorate of Printing. They are at a loss to understand why the Government could not ensure the proper utilisation of these resources by using surrendered outlay for modernisation process. They urge the Government to ensure that the outlay earmarked for Directorate of Printing during 2002-2003, is utilised cent per cent.

3.26 The Committee also recommend that till a final decision is taken to modernise/close some of the Presses, Government should explore the possibility of undertaking private jobs which may be technically feasible.

CHAPTER IV

SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 2002-2003

The Central Sector Programmes/Sponsored Schemes of the Department of Urban Development are as under:

- (i) IDSMT (ii) Mega City Scheme (iii) Urban Mapping Scheme (iv) AUWSP' and (v) Low Cost Sanitation for liberation of Scavengers Scheme. The analysis of Demands for Grants for each of the programmes is as follows:

(a) Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT) Scheme

4.2 The Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns Scheme is in operation in the urban areas of all States and Union territories (for towns having a population upto 5 lakhs) since 1979-80. The revised financing pattern of the IDSMT scheme since August, 1995 is as below:

(Rs. in lakh)

| | Category of Town and Population | Project Cost | Central Assistance (Grant) | State/UT Share | HUDCO/ Financial Institution Loan/Other Sources/ Municipality share |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|---|
| A. | (Less than 20,000) | 100 | 48 | 32 | 20 (20%) |
| B. | (20,000 to 50,000) | 200 | 90 | 60 | 50 (25%) |
| C. | (50,000 to 1,00,000) | 350 | 150 | 100 | 100 (29%) |
| D. | (1 to 3 lakh) | 550 | 210 | 140 | 200 (36%) |
| E. | (3 to 5 lakh) | 750 | 270 | 180 | 300 (40%) |

4.3 The Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation has the responsibility of broad policy formulation and monitoring of the Scheme. The monitoring is done at the Central level by the Town and Country Planning Organisation (TCPO) and at the State level by the Town and Country Planning/Municipal Administration Department and at the district level by the District Collector.

4.4 During 2001-2002, the Budget allocation and Revised estimate for IDSMT was Rs. 76.71 crore which were released to the States/UTs as on 28 February 2002. The BE 2002-2003 for IDSMT is Rs. 105 crore (i.e. an increase of Rs. 35 crore over BE 2001-2002). As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, the total number of small and medium towns with population up to 5 lakh was 4565 out of which, till February, 2002, the IDSMT Scheme is in operation in 1121 towns only.

4.5 It has also been mentioned that so far 158 new towns have been covered during the 9th Five Year Plan.

4.6 The data made available to the Committee regarding Central share, State share and assistance from financial institutions and expenditure incurred under IDSMT during 8th and 9th Plan is as below:

| (Rs. in crore) | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Year | Total Central Asst. Released | State share Released | Releases of Financial Institutions. | Expenditure reported |
| 8th Plan | 107.80 | 111.84 | 74.39 | 184.90 |
| 9th Plan | 238.99 | * | * | * |

*Cumulative releases during 9th Plan was not available with the Department.

4.7 The Committee observe that the IDSMT Scheme is in operation since 1979-80 and out of 4565 total small and medium towns identified, only 1121 have been covered till February 2002. It is all the more distressing to note that during the whole 9th Five Year Plan, only 158 new towns were covered under this scheme. Thus, in 24 years period, only 24% of the total small and medium towns could be covered. The cumulative release of funds during 9th

Plan period is also not available with the Department. It shows the callous attitude and non-serious approach of the Government for the development of small and medium towns which, if not taken care of at this stage, may grow in an haphazard way and urbanisation process, if not planned, may convert such cities/towns into as urban slums with no sanitation and sewer system, narrow lanes and by-lanes; no drinking water, health and education facilities to the residents. The Committee, therefore, recommend that since more and more people are turning towards urban areas for their livelihood, with a view to ensure better health and education facilities to their family members, the Government should cover all the identified small and medium towns under IDSMT Scheme in the 10th Five Year Plan and the scheme should be monitored regularly.

(b) Infrastructure Development in Mega Cities (Mega City Scheme)

4.8 The Mega City Scheme is in operation in 5 Mega Cities (Kolkata, Mumbai, Chennai, Hyderabad and Bangalore) since 1993-94. It is applicable to cities with population above 40 lakh as per 1991 census. The financing pattern of the Scheme is as below:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Central Share (Grant) | 25% |
| State Share (Grant) | 25% |
| Institutional Finance/Capital Market (Loan) | 50% |

4.9 The projects to be included under the Scheme are of three categories: e.g. (a) Remunerative Projects; (b) User charge based Projects; (c) Basic Service Projects.

4.10 The Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation has the responsibility of broad policy formulation and monitoring of the Scheme. At the State/Mega City level, State Level Project Sanctioning Committee and representatives of HUDCO monitor the Mega City Scheme.

4.11 During the 9th Plan, the Planning Commission had provided an allocation of Rs. 500 crore as central share against which the actual allocation was Rs. 404.50 crore. The BE 2001-2002 (i.e. Central share) was Rs. 95 crore against which Rs. 72 crore was released to nodal agencies. The BE 2002-2003 has now been increased to Rs. 100 crore (i.e. Rs. 5 crore over RE 2001-2002). Till 30th June, 2001 out of 392 approved projects, 202 projects were completed (i.e. 51.53 percent) and 150 projects were under progress and 40 projects are yet to be started and the approved total project cost was Rs. 3409.84 crore for which, Rs. 671.59 crore as Central share and Rs. 738.52 crore as State share were released. Institutional finance mobilised was to the tune of Rs. 922.33 crore.

4.12 As per the written replies, State level nodal agencies would have to be enabled to establish a revolving fund for infrastructure development by March, 2002. No nodal agency has been able to establish such funds by this period. When asked about the unspent opening balance of the mega city programme, the Government have replied that the information is not available with them. But as per the financial progress of the scheme, so far Rs. 2306.85 crore have been released by the Centre, States and the financial institutions and an expenditure of Rs. 1935.87 crore has been reported. Thus, the unspent balance, as on 31.12.2001 is Rs. 370.96 crore.

4.13 The release of funds Under the Mega City Scheme is as under:

| <i>Release</i> | <i>Rs. in Crore</i> |
|--|---------------------|
| Central share (as on 28.02.2002) | 671.59 |
| State Share (as on 30.06.2001) | 38.52 |
| Institutional Finance (as on 30.06.2001) | 922.33 |

4.14 As per the requirement of funding pattern for the scheme, institutional finance of Rs. 1343.18 crore, *i.e.*, double of the Central release should have been released. The Committee in their 23rd Report (13th Lok Sabha) had also pointed out this lacuna. When asked about the reasons for which the institutional finance could not be mobilized so far, as per the requirement, the Government have replied that the reasons for shortage in the mobilization of required institutional finance by the State Governments/Nodal Agencies are:

- (a) High interest rate charged by financial institutions and the requirement of either State guarantee or mortgage of assets.
- (b) The tendency of financial institutions to finance individual projects of remunerative category and not the scheme as a package. The cost increases further as the borrowers have to pay 1-2% of loan amount for obtaining State Local Bodies and other implementing agencies to service the debt on account of inadequate internal income generation.

4.15 The Committee are concerned to note that Rs. 95.50 crore was provided less to what was proposed during 9th Plan. Besides, 40 of approved projects are yet to be started. The Committee are of the view that unless the Government implement the infrastructure schemes of Mega Cities with all seriousness, these cities will grow in an haphazard way and the Government will have to spend more funds than required, for providing the basic minimum facilities and complete the projects taken up for implementation.

4.16 The Committee have also been apprised that State level nodal agencies were asked to establish a revolving fund for infrastructure development under Mega City scheme by March, 2002, but none of the nodal agency could establish such fund. This shows the lackadaisical approach of the State Governments towards the programme. The Committee recommend that the State level nodal agencies should be motivated to take the necessary steps to provide revolving fund as required under the guidelines.

4.17 The Committee are concerned to note that both the Central Government and the State Level Sanctioning Committees have not been able to mobilize the required share under the existing financing pattern for the Mega City Scheme, in its nine years of existence. They are at a loss to point out that during the last year, no assistance from the financial institutions has been received under this Scheme. They also note the reason, as furnished by the Department for the inability of financial institutions to come forward in advancing loan for the purpose. Besides, the Committee find that Urban Local Bodies are unable to service loan due to inadequate internal income generation. They, therefore, recommend that the Government should restructure the existing financing pattern of the scheme.

Furnishing of utilisation certificates under Mega City Scheme

4.18 As per the written information forwarded to the Committee BE 2001-2002 (*i.e.*, Central Share) was Rs. 95 crore out of which Rs. 72 crore only has been released till February 2002. Rs. 23 crore earmarked for Mumbai is yet to be released due to non-receipt of utilisation certificates and matching State share.

4.19 When asked about the steps initiated by the Department to obtain utilization certificates and the release of State's share, in time, the Government have replied that further funds are not released to the nodal agencies until the utilization certificate for the previous releases are received in the Ministry and an intimation from the State Government department to the effect that the matching State Share to that of the Central share has been released/being released.

4.20 As per the written replies, the funds available during 2000-2001 were fully utilized (released to the Nodal Agencies). Asked as to whether the Department has received utilisation certificate for funds released under the scheme up to 2000-2001, the Government have

replied that the following cities have furnished the UCs as per the details given below:

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| Mumbai | 19.10.2001 & 13.03.2002 |
| Kolkata | 24.05.2001 |
| Chennai | 20.04.2001 |
| Hyderabad | 17.05.2001 & 06.06.2001 |
| Bangalore | 02.05.2001 |

4.21 The Committee are concerned to note that the Government is yet to receive the utilization certificate for funds released during 2001-02 from Mumbai under the Mega City Scheme. For the year 2000-01 also the utilization certificate on Mega City Scheme of Mumbai was supplied to the Government of India on 13th March, 2002 after a delay of one full year. In view of these persistent delays, the Committee recommend that the Government should further strengthen the existing monitoring mechanism to impress upon the State Governments to furnish utilization certificates regularly and in time.

(c) Urban Mapping Scheme

4.22 The Urban Mapping Scheme is in operation since 1992-93. This is a 100 per cent Central funded Scheme under which the funds are released to the Town and Country Planning Organisation (TCPO). National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) is the executing agency of the urban mapping projects.

4.23 The BE 2000-2001 for the Scheme was Rs. 4 crore out of which Rs. 3.71 crore has been shown as expenditure by the Ministry. During 2001-2002, BE was Rs. 4.93 crore out of which only Rs. 4.0 crore had been released so far by the Ministry. As per the Performance Budget 2001-2002, till now Rs. 18.89 crore has been released to TCPO for the Scheme out of which an expenditure of Rs. 13.44 crore has been incurred by way of payment to NRSA, upgradation facilities and training. During the first phase (*i.e.* during the 8th Five Year Plan) mapping of 25 towns had been taken up and was completed. During the 9th Five Year Plan, 28 more towns were approved to be covered by 2001-2002, out of which mapping of 18 towns has been completed by the National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA). So far NRSA has been assigned survey work of the remaining 10 towns.

4.24 During the course of oral evidence the Secretary of the Department opined as under:

“The mapping work is being taken up by the National Remote Sensing Agency through satellite photographs as well as aerial photographs. Due to the sensitivity of the security aspects involved, this work is given only to that agency to take up in a planned manner. In certain cases, there are problems because the aircraft is not being allowed to fly over some defence or sensitive areas.”

4.25 The Committee note that the TCPO is yet to release a little over Rs. 5 crore to the executing agency NRSA under the urban mapping scheme. The mapping of 10 towns targeted to be covered in the 9th plan has been spilled over to the 10th plan. They further note that the physical progress of the scheme in defence and sensitive areas, is delayed because of want of clearance from Government. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter regarding clearance should be taken up at the appropriate level with the concerned Ministries. Besides, the cities where no such clearance is required should be given priority so as to cover more and more cities under the scheme.

(d) Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP)

4.26 The Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme was launched in 1993-94 for the towns/cities having a population of less than 20,000 (as per 1991 census) in 25 States. Through the programme, the Government aims to provide safe drinking water supply @ 70 lpcd where sewerage does not exist and 135 lpcd where sewerage exists. The funding pattern of the Scheme is shared on a 50:50 basis between the Centre and the States. The projects under the AUWSP are scrutinised by the Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO) and the funds are released to the State Governments. The Department of Urban Development monitors the financial and physical progress of AUWSP on quarterly basis.

4.27 As per 1991 census, there were 2151 towns (of less than 20,000 population) and 23.4 million people were residing in these towns. As per 1996-97 cost estimates, Rs. 3394 crore were needed to provide water supply in these towns whereas till 31.03.2002, Central Government have released Rs. 337.37 crore and State Governments have released Rs. 244.09 crore (i.e. a total of Rs. 581.46 crore). No specific physical target has been fixed for the programme but, so far, 594 schemes at an estimated cost of Rs. 779.18 crore have been approved. Till 31st December, 2002, 213 schemes (38.86% of the approved schemes) in 145 towns are reported to have been completed/commissioned.

4.28 As per the Annual Report 2001-2002 of the Ministry, the financial achievement under AUWSP is as under:

| | (Rs. in crore) |
|---|----------------|
| Central share released (1993-2001) | 337.37 |
| State share released (1993-2001) | 244.09 |
| Total available funds | 581.46 |
| Expenditure reported (upto to 27.03.2002) | 391.38 |
| Unspent balance (as on 27.03.2002) | 118.29 |
| Unspent balance (as on 31.03.2001) | 148.96 |
| Budget Estimate 2002-2003 (Central Share) | 143.00 |

4.29 During 2001-2002, the entire Central Share of Rs. 95 crore has been released to the States.

4.30 As per Performance Budget 2002-2003, Jharkhand, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have utilised less than 50% available funds under AUWSP.

Based on the information furnished by various State implementing agencies, upto 30th March, 2002, all the State Governments except Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Nagaland and Punjab have not released their matching State share for implementation under AUWSP.

4.31 As per the written reply, Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation at the Central level, officers of Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO) are responsible for monitoring of the scheme.

4.32 The Committee appreciate the total release of central share of funds to the States under AUWSP during 2000-2001 and the increase in allocation of funds to Rs. 143 crore during 2002-2003 under the Programme. While taking note of the fact that Rs. 118.29 crore as on 27th March, 2002 is lying unspent with the implementing agencies and further increase in outlay for 2002-2003, the Committee find that some of the States like Jharkhand, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have utilised less than 50 per cent funds available with them whereas Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Nagaland and Punjab have not released the matching State share.

The Committee recommend that the Government should persuade these States to utilise the available funds and release their matching contribution on time. They also recommend that Government should make every effort to utilise the entire funds made available for this Scheme.

Problem of fluorosis and arsenic in the drinking water

4.33 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary of the Department acknowledging the problem of fluorosis and arsenic in water contamination in some parts of the country, stated as under:

“With regard to fluorosis as well as arsenic spread in West Bengal, the only way is to cover not only the towns but also the surrounding villages through protected water supply, if necessary bringing water from a far off source. We have been requesting the State Governments to submit comprehensive proposals. We are working in close collaboration with the Rural Development, a separate Department, called the Department for Drinking Water Supply and work in collaboration with them. Wherever the State Governments are willing to come forward with suitable projects, we will definitely consider to fund it.”

4.34 The Committee were also informed that the recent studies have revealed that the fluorosis, one of the dreaded public hazard has been found in the supply of water in more than 19 States of the country and a coordinated effort is required to tackle the problems relating to fluorosis and arsenic spread.

4.35 The Committee note the findings of the recent studies which reveal existence of problems related to fluorosis and arsenic which are detected in the water supply of more than 19 States and feel that a coordinated effort at the National level is required to be taken to tackle the health hazards caused due to their presence. They, therefore, would like to recommend that the Government should set-up a fluorosis and arsenic control cell at the Central level comprising of officials and experts of both Rural and Urban Ministry and other concerned Ministries like Health, Water Resources, etc. Besides, they strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to water quality R&D, and set-up research institutes and laboratories exclusively for this purpose. Sufficient outlay should be provided during 10th Plan in this regard.

Coverage of cities in Union territories under AUWSP

4.36 It has been reported in the reply that since Union territories have been included under the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) of Ministry of Rural Development, no Central assistance is provided under AUSWP. However, RGNDWM is covered in rural areas only.

4.37 When asked about the justification of not including urban areas of the Union territories under AUWSP, the Government have informed that keeping in view the fact that such small towns located in Union territories are, by and large, of rural in character, the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission of Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India is providing financial assistance for meeting water supply facilities in such small towns as well. As such, small towns located in Union territories are getting Central assistance for providing water supply facilities.

4.38 The Committee are surprised to find that the cities located in Union territories having less than 20,000 population are not being covered under AUWSP at present. According to the Government, the reason for not covering the said towns under AUWSP is, these being predominantly rural in character and having been covered under RGNDWM of Ministry of Rural Development. In this regard, they would like to be apprised of the number of such small towns, Union territory-wise under which AUWSP is not applicable. They would also like the Department of Urban Development to ensure from the Ministry of Rural Development about the application ARWSP and MNP to these cities and apprise the Committee accordingly.

(e) Low Cost Sanitation Scheme for liberation of Scavengers

4.39 Initially started during 1980-81, the Low Cost Sanitation Scheme was administered in the beginning under the Ministry of Home Affairs and later on by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. From 1989-90, the Scheme is being implemented by the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation, through Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO). The HUDCO extends loan (recoverable over a period of 7 years) at an interest rate of 10% per annum, and receives a mix of subsidy from the Central Government as per the following financing pattern:—

| Category | Subsidy | Loan | Beneficiary Contribution |
|----------|---------|------|--------------------------|
| EWS | 45% | 50% | 5% |
| LIG | 25% | 60% | 15% |
| MIG/LIG | Nil | 75% | 25% |

4.40 The Scheme is being implemented with the following objectives:—

- Conversion of dry latrines into water borne low cost sanitary units;
- Construction of new units/on whole town approach where no facilities exist;
- Liberation and Rehabilitation of Scavengers;
- Focus on towns below 5 lakh population and as per 1991 census there were 3643 such towns in the country.

4.41 The Financial performance of the Scheme is as below:

| (Rs. in crore) | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---|
| Year | Budget Estimate | Revised Estimate | Actual Expenditure (released to HUDCO) |
| 1997-98 | 27.80 | 26.80 | 26.80 |
| 1998-99 | 27.80 | 23.80 | 23.80 |
| 1999-2000 | 34.65 | 27.35 | 27.35 |
| 2000-2001 | 29.80 | 29.80 | 29.80 |
| 2001-2002 | 39.80 | 10.00 | 10.00 (as on 07.02.02) |
| 2002-2003 | 30.00 | — | — |

Physical targets of scheme:

4.42 There were 4 lakhs scavengers and 72.1 lakhs dry latrines in urban areas as per the estimate by the Committee constituted by the Planning Commission in 1988-89. The 8th Plan envisaged conversion of dry latrines into Low Cost Pour Flush Twin Pit Latrines.

4.43 Up to 31st December, 2001, 16,45,071 units were sanctioned for conversion while 18,47,884 units were sanctioned for new construction. Against these, 14,11,484 units have been completed and 3,22,105 units are under progress. The slow progress of the scheme is attributed to the following:

- (a) Absence of new schemes/proposal sent by the State/Local Bodies.

- (b) Lack of awareness amongst the people about the benefits of the LCS scheme.
- (c) Unwillingness among the beneficiaries to bear the beneficiary contribution and subsequent repayment of loan.
- (d) Lack of proper monitoring system for effective implementation of programme at the State level.
- (e) Delay in giving guarantee by the State Governments.

4.44 The Committee express their displeasure over the fact that only Rs. 10 crore have been released to HUDCO during 2001-2002 under the Low Cost Sanitation for liberation of Scavengers Scheme against the budget estimate of Rs. 39.80 crore. They find that the physical progress of the scheme in the last 13 years of its operation, is not at all satisfactory as out of the 72 lakh units identified in urban areas a little over 14 lakh units have been completed so far. Moreover, HUDCO which is doing pioneering work for housing in this country, has not so far been able to give momentum to the Low Cost Sanitation Scheme, They, therefore, recommend that Government should restructure the scheme in the 10th Five Year Plan in such a way that the task of liberation and rehabilitation of scavengers in the country is achieved in a time bound manner.

(f) Urban Transport

Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC)

4.45 The Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) — a Government Company with Government of India (GoI) and Government of National Capital Territory, Delhi has been set up to implement Delhi Metro Rail Transport System Project. The Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the DMRC was prepared by Rail India Technical and Economic Services (RITES) in 1995. As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, the Govt. of India had approved the investment proposals for Phase-I of the Delhi MRTS Project on 17th September, 1996. It provided for an investment of Rs. 4860 crore at April 1996 prices. These cost estimates were based on the DPR prepared by RITES in April 1995 and subsequent projections with a cost escalation of 2% p.a. for foreign exchange costs and 10% p.a. for local costs (conveyed to DMRC on 12th November, 1996). However, around the same time as per the Cabinet approval, the Overseas Economic

Corporation Fund (OEFC) evaluated the project for the purpose of providing a soft loan towards financing part of the project cost. As per their estimation, the project completion cost was estimated at Rs. 8155 crore for a length of 55.3 kms. This had the approval of the Government of India and the Government of Delhi. A revised estimate exercise was carried out by DMRC in 2001 according to which the completion cost was coming to Rs. 8518 crore for a length of 52 kms. This was based on the alignment incorporating Shahdra-Barwala (replacing Holambi Kalan — Subzi Mandi by Trinagar Barwala), Viswavidyalaya — Central Secretariat And Trinagar - Nangloi. However, the Trinagar - Nangloi corridor is proposed to be replaced by the Connaught Place — Dwarka corridor and the revised estimates for the project will be prepared thereafter. The proposal is, at present, under the consideration of Government of India.

4.46 The Government as on 31.03.2003 could arrange the following funds:

Three tranche of loan from Japanese Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) have been arranged so far:

- (i) 1st tranche amounting to approximately Rs. 470 crore on 25.02.1997.
- (ii) 2nd tranche amounting to approximately Rs. 276 crore on 30.03.2001.
- (iii) 3rd tranche amounting to approximately Rs. 1035 crore on 13.02.2002.

4.47 As on 28th March, 2002, an amount of Rs. 879.35 crore has been provided to DMRC as pass through assistance (as on 31st March, 2001).

4.48 The repayment schedule of the JBIC loan is as below:

Amortization Schedule
JBIC Loan

| Tranche | Due Date | Amount (in Japanese Yen) |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1st Tranche 14,760 m. JPY @ 2.3% p.a. | On each February 20, and August 20 beginning February 20, 2007 through February 20, 2027 | 360,000,000 (Rs. 13.33 Cr.) half yearly |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2nd Tranche | on March 20, 2011 | 164,200,000 |
| 6732 m. JPY | On each March 20 and September | 164,195,000 |
| @1.8% p.a. | 20 beginning September 20, 2011 | (Rs. 6.08 cr.) |
| | through March 20, 2031 | half yearly |
| 3rd Tranche | On each February 20 and August 20 | 699,000,000 |
| 28,659 m. JPY | beginning February 20, 2012 | (Rs. 25.89 cr.) |
| @1.8% p.a. | through February 20, 2032 | half yearly. |

4.49 The information regarding the target set for the 10th Plan under the Delhi MRTS Project, the year of expected completion and the likely investment is given in the following paragraph.

4.50 The phase-I of the project is expected to be completed by the year 2005 *i.e.*, during the 10th plan period. The likely investment during the 10th plan part of Government of India would be Rs. 4456.82 crore.

The break-up of the same is as under:

Proposed investment by Government of India during 10th Plan

1. Pass Through Assistance against JBIC loan Rs. 4035.63 crore
2. Equity: Rs. 418.19 crore
3. Subordinate debt: Rs. 3 crore

4.51 As per the detailed project report prepared by RITES in 1995, the work was to be completed in a period of 10 years and the completion date was estimated as 31st March, 2005, if the work commenced on 1st April, 1995. However, the Cabinet approval for the project came only in September, 1996 and the Managing Director for the project joined DMRC in November, 1997. The skeletal organization for the project was in place only by April 1998 and the construction could commence in October, 1998. The period from November, 1997 to October 1998 was spent in planning for the project and in appointing the General Consultants for the project. Hence, as per the DPR if a 10 years completion schedule was to be maintained, the project should have been completed only by March 2008. However, DMRC as struck to the original completion date *i.e.*, March 2005 and all efforts are being made to ensure that the project is completed within a period of 7 years *i.e.*, March 2005 as against 10 years envisaged in the DPR, although as per the latest estimate the project is likely to be completed by September, 2005.

4.52 As on 31st March, 2002 the progress on the project is 27%. The reasons for a shortfall of 3% in the plan targets for the 9th Plan are as under:

- Delay in the appointment of the General Consultants
- Delay in finalising of the major contracts.

In any case these delays are with reference to the compressed time schedule.

4.53 As per the written replies, the Cabinet while approving the project had given specific directions that the project should be completed within the time and cost without any slippage. There is continuous monitoring of the project by various Government agencies including the Department of Programme Implementation, Ministry of Urban Development and GNCTD and empowered Committee under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary. DMRC has built in deterrent clauses in the contracts as a result of which the likelihood of any delays by the contractors are minimised.

4.54 The Committee note that the actual construction work for the Delhi MRTS project Phase-I could start nearly three and half years later, on October, 1998 which as per the study made by the RITES, should have been commenced on 1st April, 1995. Similarly, during the 9th Plan, as per calculation of the Government, there has been 3 per cent shortfall in the Plan targets, which is due to delay in the appointment of consultants and the delay in finalising the contracts. The Committee hope that as stipulated, the Phase-I of the Project should be completed by March, 2005 without any time and cost over run. They would, therefore, strongly recommend that proper planning and time schedule should be drawn and strictly adhered to and adequate outlay be made available to the project on time.

Coverage of Phase-I of Delhi Metro Rail Project

4.55 Apart from implementation of Phase-I of the DMR Project, DMRC is in the process of formulating a master plan for Delhi MRTS for next 20 years. For this master plan surveys are presently in progress and when completed, it will enable a network for the MRTS to be drawn up to meet the traffic needs of the commuters upto the horizon year 2021.

4.56 The proposed areas to be covered under the proposed master plan are that RITES has been awarded the work for the preparation of the master plan for Delhi. As the surveys are going on at present, it will not be possible to state the proposed areas to be covered under the proposed master plan till the study is completed.

4.57 When asked as to whether the Government is considering to connect new colonies around Delhi like the one at Dwarka etc. through metro rail, the Government have replied that there is a proposal to connect Dwarka through metro rail as the replacement of Trinagar—Nangloi Corridor. This proposal is under examination by MOUD & PA at present.

4.58 The proposed new corridor which replaces the Trinagar-Nangloi corridor (13 kms.) covers a length of 23.16 kms. comprising 1.12 kms under ground, 20.72 kms. elevated and 1.32 kms. at grade. The completion cost of this corridor is likely to be Rs. 3000 crore. The traffic carried by the Phase-I network in this corridor will be 21.82 lakh passengers per day in the year 2005.

4.59 The Committee note that the proposal to connect new colonies around Delhi like the one at Dwarka is under examination by the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation at present. They find that a large number of houses completed by the Cooperative Group Housing Societies in Dwarka are not being occupied due to the lack of good conductivity. They hope that the final decision in respect of connecting Dwarka and other new colonies by Metro is taken expeditiously by the Government. They also note that the Government is considering to replace some of the corridors already approved under the project viz. Trinagar-Nangloi corridor. They would like to be apprised of the reasons for the said change. Besides, the Committee are of the view that the Government should think of connecting more and more areas through MRTS by sanctioning more projects and not by replacing the already approved projects keeping in view the acute transport problem being faced by the city commuters. Time schedule for the above may be drawn expeditiously and the Committee be informed about the action taken.

(g) Autonomous/statutory Bodies**(i) National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB)**

4.60 The National Capital Region Planning Board was constituted under the National Capital Region Planning Board Act, 1985 (Act No. 2 of 1985) enacted by the Parliament with the concurrence of the legislatures of the States of Haryana, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh for:—

- (i) preparing a plan for the development of the National Capital Region;
- (ii) coordinating and monitoring the implementation of such plan; and
- (iii) evolving harmonised policies for land-uses and development of infrastructure in the National Capital Region so as to avoid any haphazard development thereof.

4.61 During the course of evidence tendered before the Committee, the Secretary, NCRPB stated as under:

“The Delhi Development Authority came up in 1957 and it was supposed to invest in DMA towns. This did not happen. So the National Capital Planning Board (NCRPB) came up in 1985.”

The total area (existing and proposed) under NCR is as below:—

| Sub-region | Existing Area | (Sq. Kms.) | |
|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | Proposed Additioinal Area | Proposed Total Area |
| NCT-Delhi | 1,483 | — | 1,483 |
| Haryana Sub-region | 13,413 | 12,312 | 25,725 |
| Rajasthan Sub-region | 4,493 | 15,007 | 19,500 |
| Uttar Pradesh Sub-Region | 10,853 | 11,082 | 21,935 |
| NCR | 30,242 | 38,401 | 68,643 |

4.62 The 11 priority towns under NCR are Panipat, Rohtak, Palwal, Rewari, Dharuhera (in Haryana) Bhiwadi, Alwar (in Rajasthan), Meerut, Hapur, Bulandshahar and Khurja (in Uttar Pradesh). In addition, 5 Counter Magnet Areas (CMAs) are Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh), Patiala (Punjab), Hissar (Haryana), Kota (Rajasthan) and Bareilly (Uttar Pradesh).

4.63 For the 9th Five Year Plan Rs. 200 crore were proposed for the NCRPB against which Rs. 235.00 crore had been allocated. The following statements the BE, RE, Actual expenditure (*i.e.* releases by the Central Government) of NCRPB during 1997-98 to 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 BE:

Plan

| (Rs. in crore) | | | |
|----------------|----|----|------------------------|
| Year | BE | RE | Actual Expenditure* |
| 1997-1998 | 45 | 42 | 155.60 |
| 1998-1999 | 45 | 45 | 277.36 |
| 1999-2000 | 45 | 42 | 431.06 |
| 2000-2001 | 45 | 45 | 306.91 |
| 2001-2002 | 50 | 50 | 443.97 (upto 31.03.02) |
| 2002-2003 | 55 | — | — |

Non-Plan

| (Rs. in crore) | | | |
|----------------|------|------|-----------------------|
| Year | BE | RE | Actual Expenditure |
| 1997-1998 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.97 |
| 1998-1999 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.07 |
| 1999-2000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.29 |
| 2000-2001 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.23 |
| 2001-2002 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.35 (upto 15.3.2002) |
| 2002-2003 | 1.50 | — | — |

*The expenditure incurred in excess of budgetary support was met out of internal accruals (interest and repayment of loan instalments). Contribution by Government of NCT of Delhi and market borrowings.

4.64 The NCRPB has approved functional plans in the Transportation, Telecommunication, Power and Industry areas.

4.65 As on December 2001, the Board has extended financial assistance to the participating States for implementing 148 projects for land acquisition and development, for residential and industrial facilities and infrastructure including water supply, sewerage, drainage, transport etc. These projects altogether have an estimated cost of Rs. 4277.40 crore against which, Rs. 1141.35 crore loan assistance has been provided (by Government of India Rs. 13.68 crore up to 3/85 and by NCRPB Rs. 1127.67 crore from 4/85 to 9/2001 period)

(Rs. in crore)

| States | No. of Schemes | Estimated Cost | Loan Sanctioned | Loan Released | | Expenditure up to 9/2001 |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------|
| | | | | GOI | NCRPB | |
| Uttar Pradesh | 58 | 1445.56 | 663.61 | 5.61 | 420.72 | 615.35 |
| Rajasthan | 45 | 375.54 | 151.30 | 3.37 | 137.98 | 183.79 |
| Haryana | 41 | 2022.50 | 750.96 | 4.69 | 534.22 | 595.28 |
| Sub-total | 144 | 3843.60 | 1538.93 | 13.68 | 1092.93 | 1694.42 |
| CMAAs* | 4 | 433.80 | 54.00 | 0.00 | 34.74 | 82.37 |
| Total | 148 | 4277.40 | 1592.93 | 13.68 | 1127.67 | 1776.79 |

*Counter Magnet Areas

4.66 As per the written reply the efforts by the NCRPB have helped the creation of the following infrastructure in the region by 2001-2002:

| States | Residential Plots | Commercial Plots/Offices | Industrial Plots/Shops |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Uttar Pradesh | 63,288 | 1,895 | 3,518 |
| Rajasthan | 33,051 | 3,248 | 1,559 |
| Haryana | 16,140 | 2,531 | 2,585 |
| Total | 1,12,749 | 7,674 | 7,662 |

4.67 As per the written replies, during 1997-98 to 2001-2002, the allocation of IEBR targeted by the Planning Commission was Rs. 3120 crore against which final IEBR allocation made was Rs. 1580 crore. However, actual IEBR was only Rs. 1500.35 crore.

4.68 When asked about whether the NCRPB has ever achieved the allocation of IEBR by Planning Commission, the Committee were apprised that the NCRPB has not achieved the allocation of IEBR by the Planning Commission.

4.69 They were informed further that the reasons for not achieving the said allocation target was that the IEBR proposal is based on the fund requirements projected by the participating States and the implementing agencies at the beginning of the Five Year Plan/Annual Plan. If the actual requirement of funds by the State Governments etc. do not warrant raising funds from the market, market borrowings are not resorted to.

4.70 The Committee appreciate the increase in the annual allocation of the Central share in the BE 2002-2003 by Rs. 5 crore. They also note that so far, NCRPB has extend financial assistance for implementation of 148 development projects in three participatory States and counter Magnet areas with the help of contributions received from the different Central Government Ministries, State Governments and market borrowings. However, they are at pains to point out that the Board has failed to achieve the allocation of IEBR during the 9th Five Year Plan. As the development of the NCR is completely dependent upon the assistance given by the Board, the Committee would recommend that the Government should find out ways and means to achieve the targets set in this regard by the Planning Commission during 10th Five Year Plan and more so in the eleven priority towns under National Capital Region.

Containing the growth of population in NCT Delhi

4.71 As per the Performance Budget 2002-2003, one of the objective of NCRPB was to contain the growth of NCT-Delhi within a manageable population size of 112 lakh by 2001 A.D. When asked as to whether, the NCRPB has been able to achieve the said objective and is there any independent study to assess the population deflected from Delhi by the activities of NCRPB, the Committee were apprised that the Regional Plan assigned a population of 112 lakh for NCT-Delhi by 2001. This assignment was against a projected population of 132.64 lakh by 2001. This was based on the estimates given by the Expert Committee set up by the Office of the Registrar General of India and also published in the Delhi Statistical Hand Book, 1989. As per the Census of India 2001 (provisional figures) the population of NCT Delhi is 137.83 lakh.

4.72 The migration figures for the decade 1991-2001 as per the Census 2001, are not yet available. Asked further as to what extent the plans made in the Regional Plan 2001 have been achieved in the NCR region, the Government have replied that the Regional Plan is basically a policy document which gives the direction for the future growth of the region in the form of land use, economic and other policies to be followed. However, the target for a few of the specific transport projects identified in the Regional Plan-2001 has been achieved.

4.73 The Committee are concerned to note that the NCRPB has failed in its task to achieve the target of containing the growth of NCT-Delhi within a manageable population size of 112 lakh by the year 2001. They are distressed to note the reasons put forward by the Board that the said Regional plan is basically a policy document which gives the direction for the future growth of the region in the form of land use, economic and other policy to be followed. This explanation of the Government is unacceptable to the Committee. They would like the Board to intimate, immediately corrective steps proposed to be taken during 2002-03, in order to achieve the targets in letter and spirit, as set for it in the policy documents such as the Regional plans.

Contribution by the Central Ministries, States and NCRPB

4.74 When asked about the proposals made by the NCRPB and accepted by the Government during the 9th Five Year Plan but could not be achieved, the Committee were informed that sub-group on NCR issues set up under the Working Group on Urban Development constituted by the Planning Commission for the 9th Plan, while elaborating the investment requirements for the plan suggested the following allocations for the NCR.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Central Ministries | |
| Ministry of Surface Transport | Rs. 601 crore |
| Ministry of Railways | Rs. 985 crore |
| Ministry of Communication | Rs. 1300 crore |
| | <hr/> |
| | Rs. 2886 crore |
| 2. States | |
| Haryana | Rs. 941 crore |
| Rajasthan | Rs. 206 crore |
| Uttar Pradesh | Rs. 951 crore |
| | <hr/> |
| | Rs. 2098 crore |
| NCT Delhi | Rs. 2035 crore |
| 3. NCR Planning Board | Rs. 800 crore |
| Total budgetary provision required for the NCR Projects during Ninth Plan | Rs. 7819 crore |

4.75 However, only the Ministry of Communication earmarked the amount in their plan for NCR.

4.76 The NCR Planning Board was allocated an amount of Rs. 200 crore for the 9th Plan against Rs. 800 crore suggested by the sub-Group on NCR issues. However, Rs. 224 crore has actually been released by the Government to NCR Planning Board during the Plan so far.

4.77 There is no physical target laid down as the planning and development of NCR is a continuous process. During the 9th Plan Rs. 961.01 crore (tentative figures) were released to the participating States. The amount released over and above the plan allocations consisted of the Internal Extra Budgetary Resources (IEBR) *i.e.* internal accruals, market borrowings and contribution from NCT-Delhi. NCRPB has facilitated so far the following developments:

| Type of Project | No. of Schemes | Area (in acres) | Estimated Cost | Loan Sanctioned | Loan Released* |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Residential | 72 | 19079.80 | 1525.03 | 699.07 | 564.81 |
| Industrial | 25 | 13405.96 | 1693.76 | 442.95 | 337.11 |
| Commercial | 14 | 269.06 | 72.70 | 31.83 | 27.95 |
| Infrastructure | 33 | 424.29 | 552.11 | 365.09 | 175.36 |
| CMAs | 4 | — | 433.80 | 54 | 34.74 |
| Total | 148 | 33179.11 | 4277.40 | 1592.94 | 1139.97 |

*Includes loan released by the Government of India prior to the year 1985.

4.78 The Committee note that Rs. 800 crore were suggested by sub-Group on NCR issues set for the 9th Plan allocation initially. The allocation was scaled down to only Rs. 200 crore, against which NCRPB has released Rs. 224 crore. Further, except for Ministers of

Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation and Communication, other Ministries like Surface Transport and Railways are yet to earmark the funds for NCR in their respective budgets. The Committee would, therefore, like the Government to impress upon the Planning Commission to substantially step up the allocation for NCRPB in the 10th five year plan and also to persuade other concerned ministries to earmark their contribution for NCR in their budgets separately.

(ii) Delhi Development Authority (DDA)

4.79 The Delhi Development Authority was established in 1957 with an objective to promote and secure the development of Delhi according to plan and for that purpose the Authority shall have the power to acquire, hold, manage & dispose of land & other property, to carry out building, engineering and other operations to execute works in connection with supply of water and electricity, disposal of sewage and other services and amenities and generally to do anything necessary or expedient for the purpose of such development and for purpose incidental thereto.

4.80 DDA is committed to planned growth and development of Delhi (now, National Capital Territory of Delhi) as per the approved Master Plan of Delhi 1962 and further upgraded and revised in 2001.

4.81 DDA has been successful in achieving its objectives as it has reasonable met the residential needs (by facilitating/constructing more than 1 million dwelling units); commercial (by establishing more than 582 commercial centres); Recreational (by providing more than 16000 acres of green/recreational land) and infrastructure (by developing roads, flyovers) for the citizens of Delhi.

4.82 The DDA has the statutory jurisdiction for overall development and land use in the National Capital Territory of Delhi.

4.83 As per the Annual report 2000-2001 of the Ministry, the Physical achievement for construction of Residential Building/houses is as below:

**Physical achievement for construction of
Residential Houses by the DDA**

| | SFS/HIG | MIG | LIG | Janta | Total |
|---|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. Houses completed upto 31.3.2001 | 51753 | 61814 | 75596 | 86331 | 275544 |
| 2. Houses in progress as on 1.4.2001 | 3563 | 2430 | 1134 | 7624 | 14751 |
| 3. New houses taken up/ started upto December 2001 | 2545 | 1161 | 1408 | Nil | 5114 |
| 4. New houses to be taken up during January to March, 2002 | 1690 | 974 | 11909 | 314 | 14887 |
| 5. Houses targeted to be completed during 2001-2002 | 2091 | 390 | 542 | 5200 | 8223 |
| 6. Houses completed upto December 2001 | 444 | Nil | Nil | Nil | 444 |
| 7. Houses likely to be completed between January to March, 2002 | 1271 | 390 | 590 | 5164 | 7415 |
| 8. Houses on progress as on 1.1.2002 | 5664 | 3591 | 2542 | 7624 | 19421 |

Thus, the number of houses likely to be completed between January-March 2002 is 7415 and in progress is 19421 (*i.e.* a total 26836 houses are in hand).

4.84 When asked about the status of wait-listed persons for allotment of different types of accommodation by DDA, the Committee were informed that the position is as under:

(i) *New Pattern Registration Scheme, 1979*

| Category | No. of Registrants | Allotment made | Backlog |
|----------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| MIG | 47,521 | 44,211 | 3,310 |
| LIG | 67,502 | 55,549 | 12,544* |

* The difference with reference to total registrants: allotments made plus backlog is due to the fact that many allottees get their registration allotment cancelled, and many allottees after cancellation of previous allotments, get re-allotments after retaining their registration at tail end by depositing cancellation charges.

(ii) *Ambedkar Awas Yojana, 1989*

| Category | No. of Registrants | Allotment made | Backlog |
|----------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| MIG | 7,000 | 5,450 | 1,550 |
| LIG | 10,000 | 5,874 | 4,126 |

(iii) *Janta Housing Registration Scheme, 1996*

| No. of Registrants | Allotment made | Backlog |
|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| 20,000 | 9,088 | 10,912 |

Total Backlog (12544+4126+10912) 32,442

4.85 When asked whether DDA have any scheme for retired Government employees, the representative of DDA stated as under:

“We had a scheme of retired employees last year, but it was limited to 2000 dwelling units. I am happy to report that enough applications were there and all the houses were allotted to the people. We refunded the money to the unsuccessful people. But we do propose to relaunch another scheme.”

4.86 The Committee find from the reply furnished by the Department that there is a backlog of 32442 houses under the three different schemes of DDA. Further they also note that 26836 houses are being built and likely to be completed by March, 2002. They are concerned to note such a huge backlog of houses with DDA. Equally disturbing is the fact that the number of backlog in case of LIG and Janta housing schemes is more than that of MIG category. They feel that the DDA has failed in its committed liability to provide housing to the lower income groups. They take it seriously and would like to be apprised of the action taken by DDA to clear the said backlog. They would also like to be apprised year-wise position of the said backlog in each of the schemes. They also strongly recommend that the said backlog should be cleared in the minimum possible time and sufficient funds should be provided for the purpose.

4.87 The Committee also note that DDA had recently launched a scheme to allot houses to retired Government employees and under this scheme 2,000 dwelling units have already been allotted to the applicants. They find that the representative of DDA had stated during the course of evidence that another such scheme is proposed to be launched. The Committee would like to recommend to take decision about this and launch the scheme expeditiously.

NEW DELHI;
23 April, 2002

3 Vaisakha, 1924 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban
and Rural Development.

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT & POVERTY ALLEVIATION
Statement showing allocation & expenditure for 1998-99, 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002 & 2002-2003

| Department of Urban Development | (Gross Basis) (Rs. in crore) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | 1998-1999 | | | 1999-2000 | | | 2000-2001 | | | 2001-2002 | | | 2002-2003 |
| | BE | Actual | | BE | RE | Actual | BE | RE | Actual | BE | RE | Actual up to 28.2.2002 | BE |
| Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | 609.21 | 567.71 | 518.89 | 664.63 | 600.00 | 588.96 | 785.03 | 644.09 | 639.52 | 799.06 | 1579.57 | 1361.92 | 883.79 |
| Demand No. 83 | 113.08 | 96.74 | 64.58 | 109.46 | 80.87 | 74.62 | 115.40 | 95.00 | 98.44 | 114.30 | 114.30 | 77.00 | 170.72 |
| Demand No. 84 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 723.29 | 664.45 | 583.47 | 774.34 | 681.12 | 663.58 | 900.43 | 739.09 | 737.96 | 913.36 | 1693.87 | 1438.92 | 1054.51 |
| Non-Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | 319.42 | 343.15 | 323.32 | 377.82 | 340.04 | 356.39 | 370.04 | 343.34 | 352.39 | 358.44 | 426.85 | 314.75 | 427.27 |
| Demand No. 83 | 731.45 | 697.45 | 639.64 | 701.45 | 676.45 | 667.35 | 744.45 | 722.45 | 715.83 | 757.65 | 795.71 | 485.74 | 794.65 |
| Demand No. 84 | 178.86 | 178.14 | 141.27 | 163.91 | 154.17 | 144.39 | 175.01 | 168.74 | 139.88 | 188.10 | 173.29 | 143.36 | 179.16 |
| Total | 1229.73 | 1218.74 | 1104.23 | 1243.18 | 1170.66 | 1168.13 | 1289.50 | 1234.53 | 1208.10 | 1303.59 | 1395.85 | 943.85 | 1401.08 |
| Total (Plan+Non Plan) | 1953.02 | 1883.19 | 1687.70 | 2017.52 | 1851.78 | 1831.71 | 2189.93 | 1973.62 | 1946.06 | 2216.95 | 3089.72 | 2382.77 | 2455.59 |

APPENDIX I

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT & POVERTY ALLEVIATION

Statement showing allocation & expenditure for 1998-99, 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002 & 2002-2003

| Department of Urban Development | (Gross Basis) (Rs. in crore) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------|------------------------|-----------|----|
| | 1998-1999 | | | 1999-2000 | | | 2000-2001 | | | 2001-2002 | | | 2002-2003 | |
| | BE | RE | Actual | BE | RE | Actual | BE | RE | Actual | BE | RE | Actual up to 28.2.2002 | BE | |
| Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | {fi~.wv | z{ . v | zv}.~ | {y.{x | {fifi.fifi | z}.~{ | }z.fix | {yy.fi~ | {x~.zw | ~.fi{ | vz ~.z | vz{v.~w} | }x. ~ | 47 |
| Demand No. 83 | vvx.fi} | ~{. y | {y.z} | vfi~.y{ | }fi.} | y.{w | vvz.yfi | ~z.fifi | ~}.yy | vvv.xfi | vvv.xfi | .fifi | v fi. w | |
| Demand No. 84 | v.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.wz | fi.wz | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | fi.fifi | |
| Total | wx.w~ | {y.yz | z}x.y | y.xy | {v.vw | {x.z} | ~fifi.yx | x~.fi~ | x .~{ | ~vx.x{ | v{~x.} | vyx}.~w | fizy.zv | |
| Non-Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | xv~.yw | xyx.vz | xwx.xw | x .}w | xyfi.fiy | xz{.x~ | x fi.fiy | xyx.xy | xzw.x~ | xz}.yy | yw{.}z | xvy. z | yw .w | |
| Demand No. 83 | xv.yz | {~ .yz | {x~.}y | fiv.yz | { .yz | { .xz | yy.yz | ww.yz | vz.}x | z .}{z | ~z. v | y}z. y | ~y.{z | |
| Demand No. 84 | v }.){ | v }.vy | vyv.w | v{x.~v | vzy.v | vyv.x~ | v z.fiv | v{.} y | vx~.}{ | v }.vfi | v x.w~ | vyx.x{ | v ~.v{ | |
| Total | vww~. xvwv} | . yvvfiy | wxvwyx.v} | vv fi. | {vv{.vxvw} | ~.zfiwvxy | .zxvwfi} | vfiwvfix | .z~vx~z.} | z~yxy.} | zvvyfiv.f} | fi} | | |
| Total (Plan+Non Plan) | v~zx.fiwv} | }x.v~v{} | .fiwfiw | .zvw}zv. | }v}xv. | vwv}~.~xv~ x. | {wv~y{.fi{ | wwv{.~zx} | xfi}~. wwx}w. | wyzz.z~ | | | | |

APPENDIX II

**FINANCIAL OUTLAY FOR THE NINTH PLAN AND ACTUALS OF ANNUAL PLANS 1997-98
TO 2001-2002 AND ALLOCATION FOR 2002-2003**

**Name of the Ministry/Department: Ministry of Urban development &
Poverty Alleviation (Department of Urban Development)**

As on 31.01.2002
(Rs. in crores)

| S.No. | Name of Schemes | 9th Plan 1997-02 Approved Outlay | Annual Plan 1997-98 | | Annual Plan 1998-99 | | Annual Plan 1999-2000 | | Annual Plan 2000-01 | | Annual Plan 2001-02 | | Toal 9th Plan 1997-02 | | Annual Plan 2002-03 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | App Outlay | Actual Exp. | App Outlay | Actual Exp. | App outlay | Actual Exp. | App Outlay | Actual Exp. | App Outlay | Actual Exp. | App Outlay | Actual Exp. upto 31.1.2002 | App Outlay |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| A. Urban Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | IDSMT | 275.00 | 35.00 | 26.05 | 55.00 | 35.68 | 50.00 | 44.49 | 60.00 | 57.17 | 70.00 | 43.76 | 270.00 | 207.15 | 105.00 |
| 2. | Contribution to NCRPB | 200.00 | 45.00 | 42.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 | 45.00 | 42.00 | 50.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 | 12.50 | 235.00 | 186.50 | 55.00 |
| 3. | Urban Transport Consortium Fund | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4. | Equity to HUDCO | 15.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 5.00 |
| 5. | Research in Urban & Regional Planning | 10.00 | 2.80 | 1.42 | 2.80 | 1.02 | 3.00 | 2.98 | 4.00 | 3.94 | 4.93 | 0.51 | 17.53 | 9.87 | 8.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 6. | Mega City Schemes | 500.00 | 81.00 | 68.90 | 86.50 | 74.90 | 86.47 | 79.50 | 91.00 | 85.91 | 95.50 | 72.25 | 440.47 | 381.46 | 125.00 |
| 7. | Urban Transport | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equity | 425.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 90.00 | 160.00 | 160.00 | 165.00 | 165.00 | 575.00 | 565.00 | 172.00 |
| | Land Acquisition | 200.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 | 58.00 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 206.00 | 199.00 | 3.00 |
| | Others | 25.00 | 4.20 | 0.46 | 4.20 | 0.21 | 2.10 | 0.89 | 7.62 | 0.89 | 6.64 | 0.47 | 24.76 | 2.92 | 5.00 |
| 8. | Pass through Assistance of OECF | 362.22 | 50.00 | 20.00 | 63.50 | 23.00 | 80.00 | 52.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 745.45 | 195.50 | 841.45 | 1.00 |
| 9. | Computerisation | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 1.00 | 0.66 | 1.00 | 0.37 | 3.50 | 1.54 | 3.00 |
| 10. | New Township Scheme | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11. | Capacity Building for Urban Governance (UNDP) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 1.20 |
| 12. | Urban Municipal Capacity Building 74th Amendment | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13. | Rejuvenation of Cultural Cities | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| | New Schemes | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.53 | 0.00 | 1.50 |
| | Total: Urban Development | 2019.22 | 323.00 | 261.83 | 427.00 | 384.51 | 435.60 | 372.87 | 405.62 | 384.57 | 402.15 | 1046.31 | 1993.37 | 2413.89 | 485.70 |

New Schemes namely (i) Urban Information System (ii) Pooled Finance Development Fund & (iii) City Challenge fund with B.E. Rs. 50.00 Cr. each started from the year 2002-03.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| B. Water Supply & Sanitation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | Training in PHE | 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.89 | 2.00 | 1.01 | 2.00 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 1.52 | 1.98 | 0.77 | 9.98 | 5.69 | 1.30 |
| | Research | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Monitoring & MIS | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Urban Waste Disposal | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15. | Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers | 200.00 | 28.00 | 26.80 | 28.00 | 23.80 | 34.65 | 27.35 | 30.00 | 29.82 | 40.00 | 10.00 | 160.65 | 117.77 | 30.00 |
| 16. | Equity for UD&LWS Finance Corporation | 90.00 | 8.00 | 8.00 | 18.00 | 18.00 | 18.00 | 18.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 84.00 | 84.00 | 20.00 |
| 17. | Central Scheme for Urban Water Supply & Sanitation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 18. | Extension of ALWSP to Small Towns | 370.00 | 28.00 | 27.95 | 45.00 | 40.00 | 65.00 | 63.46 | 87.90 | 64.00 | 95.00 | 71.61 | 320.90 | 287.02 | 143.00 |
| 19. | External Assistance to HUDCO from OECF | 64.00 | 64.00 | 33.47 | 0.50 | 2.25 | 10.00 | 16.74 | 3.93 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 78.43 | 52.46 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 20. | Support to Water Supply Scheme of Major cities facing acute water shortage | 86.00 | 4.50 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 0.00 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 60.00 | 59.99 | 61.00 | 60.90 | 134.50 | 125.48 | 0.00 |
| 21. | Pilot Project on solid Waste Management near Airport in few selected Cities | 20.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 5.00 |
| 22. | Special Scheme for Water Supply | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 23. | Special Scheme for Solid Waste Management & Sanitation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 24. | New Schemes | 28.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Total | 864.00 | 135.00 | 97.11 | 99.00 | 85.06 | 135.15 | 131.55 | 210.83 | 175.33 | 223.00 | 163.37 | 802.98 | 652.42 | 199.30 |
| C. General Pool | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Accommodation (Residential) | 327.00 | 45.00 | 63.63 | 70.00 | 72.32 | 80.00 | 54.12 | 75.00 | 72.91 | 80.00 | 60.84 | 350.00 | 323.82 | 90.00 |
| D. Public Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25. | CPWD Training Institute | 15.00 | 2.50 | 1.73 | 2.50 | 2.12 | 3.00 | 2.07 | 3.00 | 1.58 | 3.00 | 1.79 | 14.00 | 9.29 | 3.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 26. | General Pool Accommodation (Non-residential) | 100.00 | 20.00 | 15.18 | 20.00 | 9.85 | 20.00 | 14.80 | 20.00 | 17.71 | 20.00 | 9.68 | 100.00 | 67.22 | 25.00 |
| 27. | North Eastern Zone | 18.00 | 3.00 | 2.56 | 3.50 | 3.01 | 4.00 | 3.10 | 4.00 | 3.30 | 4.00 | 2.73 | 18.50 | 14.70 | 4.00 |
| 28. | NBCC (Equity) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.35 | 8.35 | 8.35 | 8.35 | 0.00 |
| 29. | Computerisation | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.42 | 2.00 | 0.36 | 7.00 | 2.63 | 3.00 |
| | Total: Public Works | 138.00 | 25.50 | 19.47 | 27.00 | 15.83 | 29.00 | 19.97 | 29.00 | 24.01 | 37.35 | 22.91 | 147.85 | 102.19 | 85.00 |
| E. Stationery & Printing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30. | MEFP | 3.00 | 0.50 | 0.21 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.75 | 0.21 | 0.00 |
| | F.N.E. Areas | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.00 | 0.00 | 21.00 | 80.05 | 0.00 | 82.50 | 39.37 | 162.55 | 69.37 | 90.00 |
| | Grand Total | 3351.22 | 529.00 | 442.25 | 624.00 | 530.52 | 680.00 | 599.51 | 800.50 | 656.82 | 825.00 | 1332.80 | 3458.50 | 3561.90 | 900.00 |

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT SHOWING ALLOCATION & EXPENDITURE FOR 1999-2000, 2000-01 AND THE SAVINGS OVER BE

(Gross Basis)

(Rs. in crore)

Department of Urban Development

| | 1999-2000 | | | | 2000-01 | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| | BE | RE | Actual | Savings/ Surrenders over BE | BE | RE | Actual | Savings/ Surrenders over BE |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Plan | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | 664.63 | 600.00 | 588.96 | 75.67 | 785.03 | 644.09 | 639.52 | 145.51 |
| Demand No. 83 | 109.46 | 80.87 | 74.62 | 34.84 | 115.40 | 95.00 | 98.44 | 16.96 |
| Demand No. 84 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 774.34 | 681.12 | 663.58 | 110.76 | 900.43 | 739.09 | 737.96 | 162.47 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Non-Plan | | | | | | | | |
| Demand No. 82 | 377.82 | 340.04 | 356.39 | 21.43 | 370.04 | 343.34 | 352.39 | 17.65 |
| Demand No. 83 | 701.45 | 676.45 | 667.35 | 34.10 | 744.45 | 722.45 | 715.83 | 28.62 |
| Demand No. 84 | 163.91 | 154.17 | 144.39 | 19.52 | 175.01 | 168.74 | 139.88 | 35.13 |
| Total | 1243.18 | 1170.66 | 1168.13 | 75.05 | 1289.50 | 1234.53 | 1208.10 | 81.40 |
| Total (Plan+Non Plan) | 2017.52 | 1851.78 | 1831.71 | 185.81 | 2189.93 | 1973.62 | 1946.06 | 243.87 |

APPENDIX IV

STRENGTH OF ESTABLISHMENT AND PROVISION THEREFOR IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

| Demand head | As on 2001 | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | Total no. of Posts | No. of Employees in position | Actual Expenditure 2000-2001 (Rs. in crore) |
| Department of Urban Development | 1891 | 1776 | 19.90 |
| Public Works | 19689 | 18097 | 217.41 |
| Stationery and Printing | 10050 | 10039 | 91.64 |
| Total | 31630 | 29912 | 328.95 |
| Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation | 146 | 127 | 1.67 |
| Grand Total M/o UDPA | 31776 | 30039 | 330.62 |

APPENDIX V

STATEMENT SHOWING STAFF STRENGTH AS ON 31.12.2000

| Sl. No. | Name of Office | Group A | Group B (Gazetted) | Group B Non-Gazetted | Group C | Group D | Work Charged | Total Strength |
|---------|---|---------|--------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1. | M/o Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation- (Sectt.) | 87 | 38 | 95 | 179 | 120 | - | 519 |
| 2. | C.P.W.D. | 1126 | - | 3365* | 12666 | 5066 | 24495 | 46818 |
| 3. | Dte. of Estates | 22 | 32 | 74 | 431 | 210 | - | 769 |
| 4. | Dte. of Printing | 29 | 73 | 81 | 7481 | 1658 | - | 9322 |
| 5. | Controller of Publication | 1 | 3 | - | 239 | 179 | - | 422 |
| 6. | Controller of Stationery | 3 | 8 | 6 | 465 | 416 | - | 898 |
| 7. | Land and Development Office | 10 | 5 | 1 | 165 | 48 | - | 229 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|----|---|--------------------|
| 8. | Town and Country Planning Organization | 33 | 1 | 36 | 78 | 49 | - | 197 |
| 9. | National Buildings Organization | 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 17 | - | 44 |
| 10. | Pr. Accounts Office | 7 | 84 | 20 | 520 | 80 | - | 711 |
| | | | | | | | | Sub-total : 59,929 |

B. Public Sector Undertakings

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|-----|------|-----|----|------|
| 11. | Hindustan Prefab Ltd. | 41 | - | 26 | 369 | 170 | 79 | 685 |
| 12. | Housing and Urban Development Corporation Ltd. | 518 | - | 54 | 345 | 123 | - | 1040 |
| 13. | National Buildings Construction Corpn. Ltd. | 600 | - | 360 | 1264 | 911 | 11 | 3146 |

Grand-total : 64,800

*The figures include both Gazetted and Non-Gazetted.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|--------------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| 6. | 3601 | 117.97 | 0.00 | 117.97 | 126.00 | 0.00 | 126.00 | 127.00 | 0.00 | 127.00 |
| 7. | 3602 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.33 |
| 8. | 4215 | 22.50 | 0.00 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 0.00 | 22.50 | 18.00 | 0.00 | 18.00 |
| 9. | 4216 | 93.88 | 99.60 | 193.48 | 63.25 | 66.54 | 129.79 | 61.14 | 87.64 | 148.78 |
| 10. | 4217 | 148.00 | 0.00 | 148.00 | 135.00 | 0.00 | 135.00 | 135.00 | 0.00 | 135.00 |
| 11. | 4552 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 12. | 6215 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 16.74 | 0.00 | 16.74 |
| 13. | 6217 | 145.00 | 0.00 | 145.00 | 110.00 | 0.00 | 110.00 | 110.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| 14. | 7601 | 17.66 | 0.00 | 17.66 | 17.66 | 0.00 | 17.66 | 22.16 | 0.00 | 22.16 |
| 15. | 7602 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 664.63 | 377.82 | 1042.47 | 600.00 | 340.04 | 940.04 | 495.11 | 358.38 | 851.4 |

2000-2001

| Sl. No. | Major Head | Budget Estimates | | | Revised Estimates | | | Actual | | |
|---------|------------|------------------|----------|--------|-------------------|----------|--------|--------|----------|--------|
| | | Plan | Non-Plan | Total | Plan | Non-Plan | Total | Plan | Non-Plan | Total |
| 1 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 1. | 2052 | 1.30 | 13.40 | 14.70 | 1.30 | 13.40 | 14.70 | 0.18 | 12.30 | 12.48 |
| 2. | 2215 | 126.70 | 0.00 | 126.70 | 96.24 | 0.00 | 96.24 | 81.42 | 0.00 | 61.42 |
| 3. | 2216 | 0.00 | 271.92 | 271.92 | 0.00 | 256.80 | 256.80 | 0.00 | 223.64 | 223.64 |
| 4. | 2217 | 13.02 | 9.89 | 22.91 | 7.29 | 8.88 | 16.17 | 0.86 | 5.87 | 6.73 |
| 5. | 2552 | 80.05 | 0.00 | 80.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6. | 3601 | 149.00 | 0.00 | 149.00 | 140.59 | 0.00 | 140.59 | 78.88 | 0.00 | 78.88 |
| 7. | 3602 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.40 |
| 8. | 4215 | 20.01 | 0.00 | 20.01 | 20.01 | 0.00 | 20.01 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |

| 1 | 2 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|--------------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 9. | 4216 | 88.53 | 74.83 | 163.36 | 81.17 | 64.26 | 145.43 | 61.21 | 64.24 | 125.45 |
| 10. | 4217 | 215.00 | 0.00 | 215.00 | 210.00 | 0.00 | 210.00 | 210.00 | 0.00 | 210.00 |
| 11. | 4552 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 12. | 6215 | 3.93 | 0.00 | 3.93 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13. | 6217 | 26.00 | 0.00 | 26.00 | 26.00 | 0.00 | 26.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 |
| 14. | 7601 | 60.99 | 0.00 | 60.99 | 60.99 | 0.00 | 60.99 | 60.99 | 0.00 | 60.99 |
| 15. | 7602 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 785.03 | 370.04 | 1155.07 | 644.09 | 343.34 | 987.43 | 518.54 | 306.05 | 824.59 |

| Sl. No. | Major Head | Budget Estimates | | | Revised Estimates | | | Actual 28.2.2002 | | | Budget Estimates | | |
|---------|------------|------------------|----------|--------|-------------------|----------|--------|------------------|----------|--------|------------------|----------|--------|
| | | Plan | Non-Plan | Total | Plan | Non-Plan | Total | Plan | Non-Plan | Total | Plan | Non-Plan | Total |
| 1 | 2 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |
| 1. | 2052 | 1.30 | 14.53 | 15.83 | 1.30 | 15.08 | 16.38 | 0.58 | 12.60 | 13.16 | 3.30 | 15.30 | 18.80 |
| 2. | 2215 | 141.80 | 0.00 | 141.80 | 141.80 | 0.00 | 141.80 | 82.87 | 0.00 | 82.67 | 179.10 | 0.00 | 179.10 |
| 3. | 2216 | 0.00 | 269.94 | 269.94 | 0.00 | 294.85 | 294.85 | 0.00 | 238.19 | 238.19 | 0.00 | 316.29 | 316.29 |
| 4. | 2217 | 14.05 | 10.18 | 24.23 | 9.43 | 9.55 | 18.98 | 1.44 | 7.79 | 9.23 | 17.10 | 10.31 | 27.41 |
| 5. | 2552 | 41.25 | 0.00 | 41.25 | 41.25 | 0.00 | 41.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| 6. | 3601 | 163.50 | 0.00 | 163.50 | 168.50 | 0.00 | 168.50 | 118.46 | 0.00 | 118.46 | 228.00 | 0.00 | 228.00 |
| 7. | 3602 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 |
| 8. | 4215 | 20.01 | 0.00 | 20.01 | 20.01 | 0.00 | 20.01 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| 9. | 4216 | 91.41 | 63.79 | 155.20 | 109.19 | 107.37 | 218.56 | 71.98 | 56.17 | 128.15 | 108.09 | 85.37 | 194.18 |

| | 1 | 2 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------|
| 10. | 4217 | 220.00 | 0.00 | 220.00 | 220.00 | 0.00 | 220.00 | 220.00 | 0.00 | 220.00 | 220.00 | 220.00 | 0.00 | 232.00 |
| 11. | 4552 | 41.25 | 0.00 | 41.25 | 41.25 | 0.00 | 41.25 | 39.37 | 0.00 | 39.37 | 89.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 90.00 |
| 12. | 6215 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13. | 6213 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 784.35 | 0.00 | 784.35 | 746.45 | 0.00 | 746.45 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 |
| 14. | 7601 | 61.99 | 0.00 | 81.99 | 61.99 | 0.00 | 61.99 | 60.99 | 0.00 | 60.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| 15. | 7602 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 |
| Total | 799.06 | 358.44 | 1157.50 | 1579.57 | 426.85 | 2006.42 | 1361.92 | 314.75 | 1676.67 | 883.79 | 427.27 | 1311.08 | | |

| Revenue Section | | Capital Section | |
|-----------------|------|--|---|
| Major Head | 2052 | Major head | 4215 |
| | — | Secretariat/General Services | — |
| | 2215 | Water Supply and Sanitation | — |
| | 2216 | Housing | 4216 |
| | 2217 | Urban Development | 4217 |
| | 2552 | North Eastern States | 4552 |
| | 3601 | Grants-in-aid to State Governments | 6215 |
| | 3602 | Grants-in-aid to Union territory Governments | 6217 |
| | — | | 7601 |
| | — | | 7602 |
| | | | — |
| | | | Loans and advances to the Union territory Governments |

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD
ON WEDNESDAY, THE 3rd APRIL, 2002

The Committee sat from 1130 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in Committee Room
'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ranen Barman
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
6. Shri Shriram Chauhan
7. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
10. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
11. Shri Sukdeo Paswan
12. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Maheshwar Singh
15. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
16. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
17. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
18. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

Rajya Sabha

19. Shri S. Agniraj
20. Shri N.R. Dasari
21. Ven'ble Dhammaviriyo
22. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
23. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
24. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
25. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
26. Shri Man Mohan Samal
27. Shri Devi Prasad Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri N.S. Hooda — *Assistant Director*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development
and Poverty Alleviation**

(Department of Urban Development)

1. Shri K. Kosal Ram, Secretary (UD)
2. Shrimati Vineeta Rai, Additional Secretary (UD)
3. Shri H.N. Nayer, Chief Controller of Accounts
4. Shri Krishan Kumar, Director General (Works), CPWD
5. Shri P.K. Pradhan, Joint Secretary (UD and D&L)
6. Shri R.S. Prasad, Joint Secretary & FA (UD&PA)
7. Shri V.B. Ramaprasad, Adviser (PHEE), CPHEEO
8. Smt. Achla Sinha, Director of Estates
9. Shri H.A. Yadav, Director of Printing
10. Shri V. Suresh, Chairman & Managing Director, HUDCO
11. Shri R.N. Joshi, Director (Finance), DMRC
12. Shri A.R. Chaoudhury, Chairman & Managing Director, NBCC
13. Shri A.K. Jha, Member Secretary, NCR Planning Board
14. Shri Prasanna K. Hota, Vice Chairman, DDA

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee choose Shri Chinmayanand Swami, M.P. to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. He was in the chair till 1155 hrs., when the Chairman came and presided over the sitting.

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation) to the sitting. Before starting evidence, the Chairman apprised the representatives of the Department about the feelings of the Committee on the issue of furnishing action taken replies on their recommendations made in the respective reports. They were informed that the action taken replies furnished by them were not categorical, specific and sometimes on certain issues pursued by the Committee in their respective reports, the reply furnished by them year after year remained more or less the same. He, therefore, urged them to take care of the feelings of the Committee while furnishing action taken replies in future. The Chairman then drew their attention to the provision of direction 55(1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation) on Demands for Grants (2002-2003). The evidence could not be concluded.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again in the afternoon.

APPENDIX VIII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 3rd APRIL, 2002

The Committee sat from 1430 hrs. to 1515 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ranen Barman
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
6. Shri Shriram Chauhan
7. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Basavanagoud Kolor
10. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
11. Shri Sukhdeo Paswan
12. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Maheshwar Singh
15. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
16. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
17. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
18. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

Rajya Sabha

19. Shri S. Agniraj
20. Shri N.R. Dasari
21. Ven'ble Dhammaviriyo
22. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
23. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
24. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
25. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
26. Shri Man Mohan Samal
27. Shri Devi Prasad Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri N.S. Hooda — *Assistant Director*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development
and Poverty Alleviation**

(Department of Urban Development)

1. Shri K. Kosal Ram, Secretary (UD)
2. Shrimati Vineeta Rai, Additional Secretary (UD)
3. Shri H.N. Nayer, Chief Controller of Accounts
4. Shri Krishan Kumar, Director General (Works), CPWD
5. Shri P.K. Pradhan, Joint Secretary (UD and D&L)
6. Shri R.S. Prasad, Joint Secretary & FA (UD&PA)
7. Shri V.B. Ramaprasad, Adviser (PHEE), CPHEEO
8. Smt. Achla Sinha, Director of Estates
9. Shri H.A. Yadav, Director of Printing
10. Shri V. Suresh, Chairman & Managing Director, HUDCO
11. Shri R.N. Joshi, Director (Finance), DMRC
12. Shri A.R. Choudhury, Chairman & Managing Director, NBCC
13. Shri A.K. Jha, Member Secretary, NCR Planning Board
14. Shri Prasanna K. Hota, Vice Chairman, DDA

2. The Committee resumed discussion on the Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation) and took oral evidence of the representatives of the said Department on remaining Demands for Grants.

3. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IX

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH SITTING OF
THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 16th APRIL, 2002

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1750 hrs. in Committee Room
'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
3. Shri Shriram Chauhan
4. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
8. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Chandresh Patel
11. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

Rajya Sabha

14. Shri S. Agniraj
15. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
16. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
17. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
18. Shri Man Mohan Samal
19. Shri Devi Prasad Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri N.S. Hooda — *Assistant Director*

2. The Chairman at the outset welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration and adoption the following draft reports on Demands for Grants (2002-2003):—

- | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| (i) | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| (ii) | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| (iii) | *** | *** | *** | *** |

- (iv) Draft report on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation).

3. The Committee adopted the said draft reports on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) with minor modifications.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/Departments and present the same to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1500 hrs. on Wednesday, the 17th April, 2002.

***Relevant portions of the minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

APPENDIX X

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

| Sl.No. | Para | Recommendations/Observations |
|--------|------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. | 2.4 | <p>The Committee are concerned to note the dismal performance of the Department in respect of utilisation of planned funds, which is stated to be a little over 29 per cent in the first half of 2001-2002. They also note that the Government could not utilise satisfactorily the non-plan funds which is reported to be only 40 percent, during the same period. They further note that in the last two years, the Government have under-spent Rs. 429.68 crore and during 2001-2002, out of the increase in revised estimate, above Rs. 90 crore have not been utilised. Being critical of the way of the Government have spent the scarce resources allotted, it is high time that the Ministry should think in depth and analyse the reasons for underspending. The Committee also feel that it is necessary to gear up the implementing machinery and eradicate the causes for its slow functioning so that the allocated money is fully utilised. They also recommend that budget estimates should be made more realistic and not an inflated one, so that the other developmental works of the Government are not deprived of their requisite outlay.</p> |
| 2. | 2.7 | <p>The Committee have observed that the staff strength of Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation as per detailed Demands for Grants laid on the Table, was 30,039, whereas as per information furnished to the Committee the staff strength has been given as 59,929.</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----|------|---|
| | | <p>The Committee are unable to understand the reasons for variation in the staff strength of the Ministry as furnished by them to the Parliament in two different documents. They, therefore, desire that the reasons for this variation should be explained to them. They would also like the Ministry to explore the feasibility of downsizing the staff strength in a time-bound manner, in order to contain the non-plan expenditure of the Ministry to reasonable limits.</p> |
| 3. | 2.8 | <p>The Committee would also like to be apprised of the sources from where the pay and allowances etc. to these 29890 staff members whose figure does not find place in the Demands for Grants, are paid.</p> |
| 4. | 2.9 | <p>The Committee have further noted that CPWD's total staff strength is 46,818 out of which 24,495 are temporary staff employed as work-charge. They would like to be apprised as to how the services of such a huge staff strength is being meaningfully utilised. The Committee recommend that the staff strength of the Ministry and CPWD should be rationalised.</p> |
| 5. | 2.13 | <p>The Committee find that during 2001-2002 (upto January 2002), only 47.72 per cent of the funds exclusively earmarked for North-Eastern States and Sikkim were released to them. The remaining portion was released during the last two months of the financial year. They find that releases of the funds in the last months of the financial year result in gross irregularities in the implementation of a programme/scheme. They, therefore, urge the Government to release the funds in a phased</p> |

1

2

3

manner throughout the year. Besides, the concerned State Governments/UTs should be impressed upon to furnish the utilisation certificates in time. They would also like the Department to procure the information regarding physical and financial achievement under respective schemes of the Department from each of the North-Eastern States and Sikkim since the concept of earmarking 10% of the outlay to such States was introduced and apprise the Committee accordingly.

6. 2.17 The Committee are distressed to note that the Government could not operationalise even a single scheme out of the ten new plan schemes which were to be launched during 9th Plan. They further note that the Government is going to launch three new schemes as announced by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech, though they are yet to finalise the modalities of these schemes. The Committee are afraid that launching of fresh schemes without working out their modalities, may result in these schemes meeting the same fate as was met by the schemes which were to be launched during 9th Plan. They, therefore, recommend that the Government should make proper homework before launching any new scheme and when approved, these schemes should be implemented without any delay so as to avoid time and cost overruns.
7. 2.28 The Committee have examined the implementation of each of the Centrally sponsored schemes, as mentioned above, in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report. As regards the overall position of monitoring of the respective schemes/programmes, the
-

Committee find that much emphasis is not being given to the monitoring of the respective schemes of the Department. The State Governments/implementing agencies are slack in sending the utilisation certificates in time. Besides, they are not very particular in contributing their share as per the respective guidelines of the schemes. It is astonishing that the Department also has made no effort to procure the data regarding unspent balances from the State Governments/implementing agencies in respect of various schemes/programmes. While the Committee have no objection in State Government's having their own monitoring mechanism, they feel that the Centre can not escape from the responsibility of monitoring specifically when these are the Centrally sponsored schemes/programmes and the major portion of the outlay is contributed by the Union Government. The Committee would, therefore, like to recommend:

- (i) to persuade the implementing agencies to hold monthly review meeting about the achievements and implementation of the schemes;
 - (ii) to persuade the implementing agencies to furnish quarterly progress reports to the respective State Government/and also to the Central Government;
 - (iii) to procure utilisation certificates from the implementing agencies/State Governments twice in a year instead of once in a financial year. The necessary changes in the guidelines of schemes/programmes should be made;
-

1

2

3

-
- (iv) to establish a monitoring cell in the Central Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation, to collect and analyse monthly review reports, quarterly progress reports, and utilization certificates. They also urge that the Department should use the latest technology to procure the utilisation certificates timely from the implementing agencies/State Governments. The Planning Commission be requested to provide adequate financial provision for the Cell;
 - (v) to obtain the aforesaid reports/certificates from CPWD, all autonomous and statutory bodies, attached and subordinate offices, Government of India Press and Public Sector Units etc. which are under the administrative control of the Ministries; and
 - (vi) to introduce a scheme for monitoring of the Central Sector/Sponsored schemes in line with the area officers scheme of the sister Ministry *i.e.* Ministry of Rural Development.

8.

2.29

The Committee further note that the Secretary of the Department holds a review meeting of his counterparts in the States and Union territories twice a year, for monitoring of Central Sector/sponsored schemes and review of works/projects. They also note that the Minister for Urban Development calls for a review meeting of the State's Urban Development Ministers, once in two years. The Committee desire that the Government should involve elected representatives like MPs and

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|-----|--|
| | | MLAs also for the monitoring of the schemes at the State level. MPs from the States/Union territories be also invited at the review meetings convened by the Union Minister for Urban Development so that first hand information can be shared and on-the-spot decision regarding effective implementation of such schemes, can be taken. |
| 9. | 3.4 | The Committee note that allocation for Department of Urban Development under Demand number 82 has been increased by nearly 13 per cent in 2002-03. While appreciating the overall increase, they have observed that growth in the non-plan sector during 2002-2003 has been more than 19 per cent whereas the increase for the plan schemes is a little over 10 per cent. The Committee, therefore, would like to urge the Ministry to take suitable steps for better utilisation of plan scheme funds while minimising the increase in the non-plan sectors. They should also like that there should be adequate enhancement in plan schemes so that more and more developmental projects could be taken up under the respective schemes of the Department. |
| 10. | 3.7 | The Committee are concerned to note that the allocation for public works during 2001-02 was increased by nearly Rs. 39 crore in the revised estimates stage, but adequate steps were not taken to ensure the proper utilisation of enhanced outlay as could be seen from the figures of 2000-2001 when the actual expenditure was 68 per cent of the total budget estimates. The Committee would, therefore, recommend that effective measures should be taken so that cent per cent utilisation of funds for Public works, is achieved. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|--|
| 11. | 3.8 | <p>The Committee are dismayed to note that the expenditure on the establishment of CPWD has increased by more than Rs. 16 crore in three years <i>i.e.</i> between 1998-99 and 2001-2002, whereas the funds under maintenance, repairs etc. have decreased by nearly Rs. 12 crore during same period. They are at a loss to point out that the Government have not taken any measure to minimise the expenditure on the establishment of CPWD, as has been recommended by them in their earlier Report (Paragraph 3.7 of 23rd Report—13th Lok Sabha refers). They also recommend that the Government should take appropriate steps to fully utilize the allotted funds so that trouble free maintenance is provided by the CPWD.</p> |
| 12. | 3.15 | <p>The Committee are surprised to find that only 373 residential units were added to the total General Pool Accommodation (GPA) by Directorate of Estates during 1998-99, whereas CPWD constructed 1016 quarters during this period for this purpose. During 1999-2000, only 169 quarters were added to GPA, whereas CPWD constructed 773 quarters during this period and though CPWD has claimed to have constructed 990 quarters during 2000-2001 at a cost of Rs. 72.91 crore, these quarters are at various stages of handing over to Directorate of Estates for allotment. The Committee would like to know about the position of the quarters handed over so far and the likely date, when all these quarters will be handed over. They would also like to be apprised of the reasons for delay in taking over the quarters by the Directorate of Estates from CPWD.</p> |
| 13. | 3.16 | <p>The Committee also note that the Directorate of Estates is responsible for administration of</p> |

1

2

3

General Pool residential accommodation and, it has no administrative control over the accommodation being maintained by various Departments. The Committee further note that some of these Departments, before constructing their own pool, which is far less than the demand, were coming under the administrative control of the Directorate of Estates. The Committee would like to be apprised of the year from which the Directorate of Estates started handing over the residential accommodation to other Departments and since when they have stopped transferring the quarters from the General Pool to these other department pools. The Committee desire that the Government should make an action plan to ensure cent per cent satisfaction level in respect of residential accommodation to all the Central Government Employees.

14.

3.24

The Committee find that the process of modernisation of Government of India Presses started in 1986 and since then almost 16 years have elapsed. They are really astonished to note that the final decision in the matter has not yet been taken. They are also concerned to note the dismal performance of most of the Government of India Presses. They are surprised to find that even the optimum utilisation of some of the Presses like Minto Road, Faridabad etc., which are in the vicinity of NCR, could not be ensured. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending for the last four or five years to take action for modernisation or restructuring of Government of India Presses expeditiously, yet the final decision is still awaited. They are informed, that a Cabinet note in this regard has since been submitted. The Committee feel that

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| | | sufficient time has been taken unnecessarily and the Government are still uncertain about the process of modernisation of Presses. The Committee deplore the casual approach to such a serious matter. They strongly recommend that a final decision in this regard should be taken without any further delay. |
| 15. | 3.25 | The Committee further note that Rs. 17.36 crore were surrendered during the last three years by the Directorate of Printing. They are at a loss to understand why the Government could not ensure the proper utilisation of these resources by using surrendered outlay for modernisation process. They urge the Government to ensure that the outlay earmarked for Directorate of Printing during 2002-2003, is utilised cent per cent. |
| 16. | 3.26 | The Committee also recommend that till a final decision is taken to modernise/close some of the Presses, Government should explore the possibility of undertaking private jobs which may be technically feasible. |
| 17. | 4.7 | The Committee observe that the IDSMT Scheme is in operation since 1979-80 and out of 4565 total small and medium towns identified, only 1121 have been covered till February 2002. It is all the more distressing to note that during the whole 9th Five Year Plan, only 158 new towns were covered under this scheme. Thus, in 24 years period, only 24% of the total small and medium towns could be covered. The cumulative release of funds during 9th Plan period is also not available with the Department. It shows the callous attitude and non-serious approach of the Government for the development of small and |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| | | <p>medium towns which, if not taken care of at this stage, may grow in an haphazard way and urbanisation process, if not planned, may convert such cities/towns into as urban slums with no sanitation and sewer system, narrow lanes and bye-lanes; no drinking water, health and education facilities to the residents. The Committee, therefore, recommend that since more and more people are turning towards urban areas for their livelihood, with a view to ensure better health and education facilities to their family members, the Government should cover all the identified small and medium towns under IDSMT Scheme in the 10th Five Year Plan and the scheme should be monitored regularly.</p> |
| 18. | 4.15 | <p>The Committee are concerned to note that Rs. 95.50 crore was provided less to what was proposed during 9th Plan. Besides, 40 of approved projects are yet to be started. The Committee are of the view that unless the Government implement the infrastructure schemes of Mega Cities with all seriousness, these cities will grow in an haphazard way and the Government will have to spend more funds than required, for providing the basic minimum facilities and complete the projects taken up for implementation.</p> |
| 19. | 4.16 | <p>The Committee have also been apprised that State level nodal agencies were asked to establish a revolving fund for infrastructure development under Mega City scheme by March, 2002, but none of the nodal agency could establish such fund. This shows the lackadaisical approach of the State Governments towards the programme. The</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| | | <p>Committee recommend that the State level nodal agencies should be motivated to take the necessary steps to provide revolving fund as required under the guidelines.</p> |
| 20. | 4.17 | <p>The Committee are concerned to note that both the Central Government and the State Level Sanctioning Committees have not been able to mobilize the required share under the existing financing pattern for the Mega City Scheme, in its nine years of existence. They are at a loss to point out that during the last year, no assistance from the financial institutions has been received under this Scheme. They also note the reason, as furnished by the Department for the inability of financial institutions to come forward in advancing loan for the purpose. Besides, the Committee find that Urban Local Bodies are unable to service loan due to inadequate internal income generation. They, therefore, recommend that the Government should restructure the existing financing pattern of the scheme.</p> |
| 21. | 4.21 | <p>The Committee are concerned to note that the Government is yet to receive the utilization certificate for funds released during 2001-02 from Mumbai under the Mega City Scheme. For the year 2000-01 also the utilization certificate on Mega City Scheme of Mumbai was supplied to the Government of India on 13th March, 2002 after a delay of one full year. In view of these persistent delays, the Committee recommend that the Government should further strengthen the existing monitoring mechanism to impress upon the State Governments to furnish utilization certificates regularly and in time.</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| 22. | 4.25 | <p>The Committee note that the TCPO is yet to release a little over Rs. 5 crore to the executing agency NRSA under the urban mapping scheme. The mapping of 10 towns targeted to be covered in the 9th plan has been spilled over to the 10th plan. They further note that the physical progress of the scheme in defence and sensitive areas, is delayed because of want of clearance from Government. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter regarding clearance should be taken up at the appropriate level with the concerned Ministries. Besides, the cities where no such clearance is required should be given priority so as to cover more and more cities under the scheme.</p> |
| 23. | 4.32 | <p>The Committee appreciate the total release of central share of funds to the States under AUWSP during 2000-2001 and the increase in allocation of funds to Rs. 143 crore during 2002-2003 under the Programme. While taking note of the fact that Rs. 118.29 crore as on 27th March, 2002 is lying unspent with the implementing agencies and further increase in outlay for 2002-2003, the Committee find that some of the States like Jharkhand, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have utilised less than 50 per cent funds available with them whereas Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Nagaland and Punjab have not released the matching State share.</p> <p>The Committee recommend that the Government should persuade these States to utilise the available funds and release their matching contribution on time. They also recommend that Government should make every effort to utilise the entire funds made available for this Scheme.</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| 24. | 4.35 | <p>The Committee note the findings of the recent studies which reveal existence of problems related to fluorosis and arsenic which are detected in the water supply of more than 19 States and feel that a coordinated effort at the National level is required to be taken to tackle the health hazards caused due to their presence. They, therefore, would like to recommend that the Government should set-up a fluorosis and arsenic control cell at the Central level comprising of officials and experts of both Rural and Urban Ministry and other concerned Ministries like Health, Water Resources, etc. Besides, they strongly recommend to the Government to pay more attention to water quality R&D, and set-up research institutes and laboratories exclusively for this purpose. Sufficient outlay should be provided during 10th Plan in this regard.</p> |
| 25. | 4.38 | <p>The Committee are surprised to find that the cities located in Union territories having less than 20,000 population are not being covered under AUWSP at present. According to the Government, the reason for not covering the said towns under AUWSP is, these being predominantly rural in character and having been covered under RGNDWM of Ministry of Rural Development. In this regard, they would like to be apprised of the number of such small towns, Union territory wise under which AUWSP is not applicable. They would also like the Department of Urban Development to ensure from the Ministry of Rural Development about the application ARWSP and MNP to these cities and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|--|
| 26. | 4.44 | <p>The Committee express their displeasure over the fact that only Rs. 10 crore have been released to HUDCO during 2001-2002 under the Low Cost Sanitation for liberation of Scavengers Scheme against the budget estimate of Rs. 39.80 crore. They find that the physical progress of the scheme in the last 13 years of its operation, is not at all satisfactory as out of the 72 lakh units identified in urban areas a little over 14 lakh units have been completed so far. Moreover, HUDCO which is doing pioneering work for housing in this country, has not so far been able to give momentum to the Low Cost Sanitation Scheme. They, therefore, recommend that Government should restructure the scheme in the 10th Five Year Plan in such a way that the task of liberation and rehabilitation of scavengers in the country is achieved in a time-bound manner.</p> |
| 27. | 4.54 | <p>The Committee note that the actual construction work for the Delhi MRTS project Phase-I could start nearly three and half years later, on October 1998 which as per the study made by the RITES, should have been commenced on 1st April, 1995. Similarly, during the 9th Plan, as per calculation of the Government, there has been 3 per cent shortfall in the Plan targets, which is due to delay in the appointment of consultants and the delay in finalising the contracts. The Committee hope that as stipulated, the Phase-I of the Project should be completed by March, 2005 without any time and cost overrun. They would, therefore, strongly recommend that proper planning and time schedule should be drawn and strictly adhered to and adequate outlay be made available to the project on time.</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| 28. | 4.59 | <p>The Committee note that the proposal to connect new colonies around Delhi like the one at Dwarka is under examination by the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation at present. They find that a large number of houses completed by the Cooperative Group Housing Societies in Dwarka are not being occupied due to the lack of good connectivity. They hope that the final decision in respect of connecting Dwarka and other new colonies by Metro is taken expeditiously by the Government. They also note that the Government is considering to replace some of the corridors already approved under the project viz. Trinagar-Nangloi corridor. They would like to be apprised of the reasons for the said change. Besides, the Committee are of the view that the Government should think of connecting more and more areas through MRTS by sanctioning more projects and not by replacing the already approved projects keeping in view the acute transport problem being faced by the city commuters. Time schedule for the above may be drawn expeditiously and the Committee be informed about the action taken.</p> |
| 29. | 4.70 | <p>The Committee appreciate the increase in the annual allocation of the Central share in the BE 2002-2003 by Rs. 5 crore. They also note that so far, NCRPB has extended financial assistance for implementation of 148 development projects in three participatory States and counter Magnet areas with the help of contributions received from the different Central Government Ministries, State Governments and market borrowings. However, they are at pains to point out that</p> |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| | | <p>the Board has failed to achieve the allocation of IEBR during the 9th Five Year Plan. As the development of the NCR is completely dependent upon the assistance given by the Board, the Committee would recommend that the Government should find out ways and means to achieve the targets set in this regard by the Planning Commission during 10th Five Year Plan and more so in the eleven priority towns under National Capital Region.</p> |
| 30. | 4.73 | <p>The Committee are concerned to note that the NCRPB has failed in its task to achieve the target of containing the growth of NCT-Delhi within a manageable population size of 112 lakh by the year 2001. They are distressed to note the reasons put forward by the Board that the said Regional plan is basically a policy document which gives the direction for the future growth of the region in the form of land use, economic and other policy to be followed. This explanation of the Government is unacceptable to the Committee. They would like the Board to intimate, immediately corrective steps proposed to be taken during 2002-03, in order to achieve the targets in letter and spirit, as set for it in the policy documents such as the Regional plans.</p> |
| 31. | 4.78 | <p>The Committee note that Rs. 800 crore were suggested by sub-Group on NCR issues set for the 9th Plan allocation initially. The allocation was scaled down to only Rs. 200 crore, against which NCRPB has released Rs. 224 crore. Further, except for Ministries of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation and Communications, other Ministries like Surface Transport and Railways are yet to earmark the</p> |

1

2

3

funds for NCR in their respective budgets. The Committee would, therefore, like the Government to impress upon the Planning Commission to substantially step up the allocation for NCRPB in the 10th Five Year Plan and also to persuade other concerned ministries to earmark their contribution for NCR in their budgets separately.

32. 4.86

The Committee find from the reply furnished by the Department that there is a backlog of 32442 houses under the three different schemes of DDA. Further, they also note that 26836 houses are being built and likely to be completed by March, 2002. They are concerned to note such a huge backlog of houses with DDA. Equally disturbing is the fact that the number of backlog in case of LIG and Janta houses schemes is more than that of MIG category. They feel that the DDA has failed in its committed liability to provide housing to the lower income groups. They take it seriously and would like to be apprised of the action taken by DDA to clear the said backlog. They would also like to be apprised year-wise position of the said backlog in each of the schemes. They also strongly recommend that the said backlog should be cleared in the minimum possible time and sufficient funds should be provided for the purpose.

33. 4.87

The Committee also note that DDA had recently launched a scheme to allot houses to retired Government employees and under this scheme 2,000 dwelling units have already been allotted to the applicants. They find that the representative of DDA had stated during the course of evidence that another such scheme is proposed to be launched. The Committee would like to recommend to take decision about this and launch the scheme expeditiously.

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)

Corrigenda to the 35th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on 'Demands for Grants (2002-2003)' of the Department of Urban Development

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Para No.</u> | <u>Line</u> | <u>For</u> | <u>Read</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------|---|------------------------|
| Contents | - | 12 from below | <u>add</u> of Demands <u>before</u> for Grants | |
| (i) | - | 4 from below | <u>add</u> of Demands <u>before</u> for Grants | |
| - do - | - | | | |
| (iii) | - | 13 from ABOVE | <u>add</u> for before 2002-03 | |
| (iv) | - | 9 from below | Bunglaow | Bungalow |
| 2 | 1.6 | 4 from above | <u>delete</u> matters after transports | |
| 4 | 2.4 | 9 | way of | way |
| 5 | 2.7 | 3 from below | a per | as per |
| | | 1 from below | <u>add</u> strength <u>after</u> staff | |
| 6 | 2.12 | 2 from above | areas | area |
| | 2.14 | 3 from above | stated | started |
| | | 4 from above | lakhs | laks |
| 11 | 3.2 | 5 from above | <u>add</u> expenditure <u>after</u> actual | |
| | | 10 from above | <u>add</u> expenditure <u>after</u> actual | |
| | | 10 from above | developmental | development |
| 14 | 3.9 | 7 | <u>delete</u> the word in terms of | |
| 16 | 3.17 | 10 from above | 'From Unit | Form Unit |
| | - | 15 from above | <u>add</u> Bhubaneshwar <u>after</u> Book Press | |
| 17 | 3.19 | 7 from above | <u>add</u> expenditure <u>before</u> Actual | |
| | | 16 from above | <u>add</u> expenditure <u>before</u> Actual | |
| 19 | 3.23 | 6 from above | Trample | Temple |
| 24 | 4.12 | 4 from above | Unspent Opening | Unspent/Opening |
| 27 | 4.27 | 1 from above | A per | As per |
| 30 | 4.38 | 10-11 from above | application ARWSP | application of ARWSP |
| 31 | 4.41 | 11 from above | targets of schemes | targets of the schemes |
| 36 | 4.59 | 6 from above | conductinity | connectivity |
| 38 | 4.63 | 3 from above | <u>add</u> show <u>after</u> statements | |
| | | 19 from above | <u>add</u> * <u>after</u> actual expenditure | |
| | | 2 from below | : | , |
| | | | contrabution | contribution |
| 40 | 4.67 | 4 from done | IBER | IEBR |
| | 4.70 | 3 from above | extend | extended |
| 42 | 4.78 | 4 from above | Ministeres | Ministries |
| 77 | 3.4 | 2 from below | developmental | development |
