

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2017-2018)**

**42**

**SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA**

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

*[Action taken on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha)  
on 'Demands for Grants (2017-18) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development)']*

**FORTY SECOND REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

**FORTY SECOND REPORT**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**(2017-2018)**

**(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

*[Action taken on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Demands for Grants (2017-18) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development)'.]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 06.03.2018

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 06.03.2018



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

*March, 2018/ Phalguna, 1939 (Saka)*

CRD No 139

*Price : Rs.*

© 2018 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

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

## CONTENTS

	Page No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2017-2018) .....	(ii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(iii)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	15
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	24
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	25
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	29

## ANNEXURES

I. Extract of Minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee held on 15 February, 2018	30
II. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty Sixth Report (16 <sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development.....	32

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2017-2018)**

**Dr. P. Venugopal -- Chairperson**

**MEMBERS  
Lok Sabha**

2. Shri Sisir Kumar Adhikari
3. Shri Kirti Azad
4. Shri Harishchandra Chavan
5. Shri Biren Singh Engti
6. Shri Gokaraju Ganga Raju
7. Shri Vijay Kumar Hansdak
8. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
9. Shri Manshankar Ninama
10. Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal "Nishank"
11. Smt. Mausam Noor
12. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
13. Dr. Anbumani Ramadoss
14. Smt. Renuka Butta
15. Dr. Yashwant Singh
16. Dr. Naramalli Sivaprasad
17. Shri Balka Suman
18. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
19. Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tasa
20. Shri Ajay Mishra (Teni)
21. -Vacant\*

**Rajya Sabha**

22. Shri Munquad Ali
23. Smt. Shanta Chhetri
24. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
25. Shri Javed Ali Khan
26. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra
27. Shri Narayan Lal Panchariya
28. Shri A.K. Selvaraj
29. Shri A. V. Swamy
30. Shri K.T.S. Tulsi
31. Shri Lal Sinh Vadodia

**Secretariat**

- |    |                    |   |                            |
|----|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. | Shri Abhijit Kumar | - | Additional Secretary       |
| 2. | Shri S. Chatterjee | - | Director                   |
| 3. | Smt. Emma C. Barwa | - | Deputy Secretary           |
| 4. | Shri Inam Ahmed    | - | Senior Committee Assistant |

---

\* Vacancy created due to sad demise of Shri Chintaman Navsha Wanaga on 30.01.2018

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2017-2018) having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present the 42<sup>nd</sup> Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Second Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on 'Demands for Grants (2017-18) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development).

2. The Thirty Second Report was presented to the Lok Sabha on 20 March, 2017 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 19 September, 2017.

3. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 15 February, 2018.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in **Appendix-II**.

NEW DELHI;  
16 February, 2018  
27 Magha, 1939 (Saka)

DR. P. VENUGOPAL  
*Chairperson,*  
Standing Committee on Rural Development

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2017-18) deals with the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in their Thirty Second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Demands for Grants (2017-2018) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development)'.

2. The Thirty-Second Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 March, 2017 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. The Report contained 14 Observations/Recommendations.

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

- (i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:  
Serial Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Total:10  
**Chapter-II**

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

Total: 00  
**Chapter-III**

- (iii) Observation/Recommendation in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:  
Serial Nos. 3, 4, 7 and 8

Total: 04  
**Chapter-IV**

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

Total:00  
**Chapter-V**

4. **The Committee desire that Action Taken Notes on the Observations/ recommendations contained in Chapter I of this Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.**

5. **The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of their Observations/Recommendations that require reiteration or merit comments.**

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 3)**

#### **MGNREGA**

6. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"The Committee note that MGNREGA is a flagship demand driven programme of the Government of India with the main objective to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security to the needy through guaranteed 100 days of unskilled labour.

In this context, the Committee pointed out that Labour is one of the main component in the work done under MPLADS Funds and that there was feasibility of exploring the option of tagging the MPLADS Fund with MGNREGA so that the convergence of funds may create a wider resource pool for much more creation of work. The Committee feel that this convergence would only augment the fulfillment of objectives of providing more number of persons with work and income. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the DoRD should pursue the idea of convergence of MPLADS funds with MGNREGA and concretise a holistic plan as early as possible. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by DoRD in this regard."

7. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"Para-6, of Schedule-1 of MGNREGA read as, "The State Government shall take concrete steps to achieve effective inter-departmental convergence till the last mile implementation level of the works under the Scheme with other Government Schemes/ programmes so as to improve the quality and productivity of assets and bring in synergy to holistically address the multiple dimensions of poverty in a sustainable manner". Accordingly, convergence can be done between MGNREGA and other government schemes including MPLADS. Works to be taken up are finalised and prioritised in Gram Sabha as per section 16 of MGNREGA Act 2005."



**8. The Committee had noted that since 'Labour' was one of the main component in the work done under MPLADS fund, there was feasibility of exploring the option of tagging the MPLADS fund with MGNREGA so that the convergence of funds may create a wider resource pool for much more creation of work and in this context had recommended the Department of Rural Development (DoRD) to pursue the idea of convergence of MPLADS funds with MGNREGA by concretizing a holistic plan as early as possible. In their action taken reply, DoRD, while quoting para 6 of schedule I of MGNREGA have stated that convergence can be done between MGNREGA and other Government Schemes including MPLADS. However, to the utter dismay of the Committee, the reply of the DoRD ends up abruptly at this juncture without revealing any concrete measure to shape this idea into ground-reality. Simply accepting the fact of feasibility of convergence of different programmes of the Government is not what the Committee expects from DoRD. The Committee desired DoRD to take pro-active role in materialising the concept of convergence of MPLADS fund with MGNREGA into a well chalked out strategy for being implemented without delay. Thus, the Committee reiterate its recommendation and urge the DoRD to work upon this idea and make a holistic plan for the enactment of convergence of MPLADS fund with MGNREGA.**

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 4)**

**9. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-**

"The Committee view with concern that the disparity in States' minimum wages and minimum wages ensured under MGNREGA still exist in many States which creates discrepancy at ground level in the implementation of MGNREGA provisions. The Committee was informed by the DoRD that a committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Mahendra Dev was constituted to look into the issue of difference in minimum wages under States and

MGNREGA and that there was a need for concerted discussions with the different States before arriving at a logical final conclusion in the matter.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should expeditiously reach to a consensus regarding the parity in minimum wages under the States and MGNREGA and the Committee would also like to be apprised about the progress made in this regard."

10. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"Comparison of the notified wage rate for unskilled manual work under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) with minimum agricultural wages in the States/UTs for FY 2016-17 indicate that the MGNREGA notified wage rate in 17 States/UTs are lower than the agricultural wage rate. The Mahendra Dev Committee submitted its report to the Government on 25-01-2014. The report was examined in consultation with Ministry of Finance and it was decided not to consider for change in the Base Wage Rate in the present context.

The Ministry had set up a Committee under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary with representatives of relevant Central Ministries and five State Governments to examine the issue of Alignment of MGNREGA Wages with Minimum Agricultural Wages. The MGNREGA Wages were notified under Section 6.1 of the MGNREGA Act on 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2009. For the States where minimum agricultural wages were less than Rs. 100/- MGNREGA wages were notified as Rs. 100/-. On 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2009 only for 4 States, viz. Goa, Haryana, Mizoram and Kerala had minimum wages for agricultural labour was higher than Rs. 100/- and these were protected by December, 2009 Notification. Since then, MGNREGA wages have been indexed to Consumer Price index for agricultural labour. The present divergence between MGNREGA wages and minimum wages for agricultural labour is on account of the fact that the States do not follow a scientific and uniform system of indexation of wage rates while MGNREGA wages are increased based on changes in Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labours."

**11. During examination of the Demands for Grants (2017-18), the Committee had noted with concern about the disparity in the States' minimum wages and minimum wages ensured under MGNREGA which created discrepancy at ground level in the implementation of MGNREGA provisions. Therefore, the Committee had recommended the Ministry to expeditiously reach upon a consensus**

regarding the parity in minimum wages under the States and MGNREGA. Responding in their Action Taken Reply, the DoRD have stated that the Mahendra Dev Committee constituted earlier to look into the issue of difference in minimum wages under States and MGNREGA had submitted its report to the Government on 25.01.2014 which was examined in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and it was decided not to consider for change in the base wage rate in the present context. The DoRD have further submitted that the present divergence between MGNREGA wages and minimum wages for agricultural labour is on account of the fact that the States do not follow a scientific and uniform system of indexation of wage rates while MGNREGA wages are increased based on changes in the Consumer Price Index for agricultural labours. Taking into note the response of the DoRD, the Committee finds itself amused at the sheer-helplessness elicited by the reply in handling such an important aspect concerning the flagship programme of the MoRD. An issue of such importance has the potential of undermining the popularity and success of MGNREGA scheme requires a much more pragmatic approach by the DoRD. It is felt by the Committee that there is a need for concerted discussion and persuasion to all the States to reach upon a consensus for eradicating this discrepancy in wages. Therefore, the Committee while reiterating its recommendation implore upon DoRD to ensure all measures needed to bring a parity of minimum wages in States and wage ensured under MGNREGA.

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 7)**

#### **NRLM-(DDU-GKY)**

12. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"The Committee observed that under the DDU-GKY, sub-scheme of NRLM , skill development programmes to build the skills of rural youths through short training were being implemented to place the rural youths in relatively high wage employment sectors of the economy. The Committee, however, felt that much diversified set of skills, specific to the areas like Eco-Tourism, Organic Farming in Hilly areas and other skills based on the already existing practices in that geographical location needed to be encouraged and promoted for a wider coverage and success of the programme. Thus, the Committee expects the DoRD to look into the skilling component of the DDU-GKY in a much more pragmatic and practical manner to enhance the ambit and commercial utility of the Programme."

13. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"DDU-GKY guidelines provides for each state to undertake Skill Gap Assessment studies. These studies are aimed identifying Gram Panchayat wise demand for skills and placement, and match the same with potential for placements. This study also facilitates identification of jobs in sectors specific to the geographic location.

At present DDU-GKY is being implemented in 28 States, including States with hilly areas. Important trades covered in training include Sales Person ( Retail), Accounting, Sewing Machine Operator, Hospitality Assistant, BPO Voice, Food & Beverage Service-Steward, BPO- Non Voice, DTP and Print Publishing Assistant, Sales Associate, Security Guard(General) & Personal Security Guard."

**14. While examining the DDU-GKY component of NRLM during the examination of Demands for Grants (2017-18), the Committee felt that there was ample scope for diversifying the sets of skills in such a manner that is relevant to the area specific and are already in prevalence in those areas, such as Eco Tourism/Organic Farming in hilly areas wherein local populace who have already an inbuilt skill-set for such trades which could be honed further for being commercially viable. The Committee had, therefore, recommended to look**

into the skilling component in a much more practical manner. The DoRD in its Action Taken Reply have elaborated that States undertake skill gap assessment studies under which Gram Panchayat wise demands for skills and placement are identified. The DoRD have further outlined the trades covered in training at present. The Committee note the provision and implementation aspect of DDU-GKY at present as elicited by the DoRD in its reply. Having taken into consideration the role of States and Gram Panchayats *vis-a-vis* the DDU-GKY on ground, the Committee finds that the desired results are not forthcoming. The Observation/recommendations of the Committee echo the sentiments of the beneficiaries through the Committee and DoRD is expected to act proactively instead of passing the 'baton' to the State machinery only. The Committee, therefore, strongly reiterate its recommendation and impresses upon the DoRD to suitably incorporate the recommendations of the Committee in such a way to enhance the ambit and commercial utility of the DDU-GKY component of NRLM.

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 8)**

##### **PMAY-G**

15. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"The Committee acknowledge that "Housing For All" by 2022 is a very noble and Welfare oriented vision of the Government. Such endeavour which aims at weeding out one of the main aspects contributing to the abject poverty of rural populace of the country, i.e. homelessness needs to be supported by a robust mechanism ensuring the success of the Scheme. However, to its utter dismay, the Committee find that there are still a large number of cases of leftover homeless families from the list of beneficiaries under PMAY-G. The non-inclusion of needy beneficiaries needs to be looked into on an urgent and judicious basis, else, the Scheme may never realise its potential.

The Committee, therefore, strongly urge DoRD to devise suitable mechanism for the assessment of data pertaining to the list of beneficiaries so that the aggrieved leftover needy beneficiaries may also be included on priority basis."

16. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"Ensuring that genuine beneficiaries, who have been left out from the Permanent Wait List, receive their entitlements under the scheme is a key focus area of the Ministry. An elaborate procedure has been devised to ensure that fair opportunity is provided to every household which claims to be eligible under PMAY-G.

The Gram Sabha may record a separate list in the Gram Sabha resolution with reasons about households not included in the system generated priority list, but otherwise found eligible during the proceedings of the Gram Sabha. Claimants other than those endorsed in the Gram Sabha resolution for inclusion in the list, may submit their claims directly to the Competent Authority appointed by the State/UT. The Competent Authority shall enquire into the list, as endorsed by the Gram Sabha, as well as the representations received directly and submit report to the Appellate Committee at the district level. Based on the merit of the claim, the Appellate Committee may recommend including these households in the universe of beneficiaries of PMAY-G. The detailed procedure for submission of reports by Competent Authority and disposal of cases by the Appellate Committee, including timely disposal, will be decided by the respective State/ UT.

The list of households proposed to be included in the universe, as recommended by the Appellate Committee, will be prepared Gram Panchayat and community wise. The provision for capturing details of deserving households which are to be included/added to the priority lists has been provided in AwaasSoft. The decision on inclusion of these households into the Permanent Wait List shall be made after obtaining the approval of Competent Authority in the Central Government on recommendation of the State Government. All State/UTs have been advised to compile data on exclusion and send a consolidated report on households recommended for inclusion to facilitate the Ministry towards this end."

**17. "Housing for all" by 2022, a noble and welfare vision of the Government has been acknowledged by the Committee. However, the Committee found that there were still a large number of cases of leftover homeless families from the list of beneficiaries under PMAY-G. The non-inclusion of needy beneficiaries needed to be looked into on an urgent and judicious basis for the realization of the goal of the Scheme. The Committee had, therefore, recommended to devise suitable**

mechanism to include the aggrieved leftover needy beneficiaries within the ambit of the programme. In its action taken reply, the DORD has admitted the need to ensure that fair opportunity be provided to every household which claims to be eligible under PMAY-G. They have further elaborately explained the procedure which has been created to look into this aspect of the programme and have accordingly advised all states/UTs to compile data on exclusion and send a consolidated report to the Ministry. The Committee, while taking into consideration the efforts undertaken by the DORD and acknowledging the procedure put in places still are of the view that the vision " Housing for all" by 2022 is a time-bound objective and any mechanism put in place to augment the speedier rectification of anomalies in the scheme needed to be accorded a top - priority within a time - bound deadline. In wake of this situation, the Committee feel that the efforts needed to include the leftover beneficiary in the universe of PMAY-G scheme requires war-footing measures. Thus, the Committee, reiterate its recommendation for the inclusion of leftover needy beneficiaries from the universe of PMAY-G on top priority basis.

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 9)**

18. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"The Committee is of the firm view that the terrain and geographical challenges for the hilly areas are completely different from the plain areas. Tougher landscapes increases the technical aspect of constructing houses alongwith the enhancement in cost/labour factor. Parameters for house construction and other logistic requirements are completely different from land to hills and thus the hills require special attention under PMAY-G.

The Committee, therefore, strongly feels that the assistance component under PMAY-G needs to be reviewed and looked into with practical perspective considering the challenges in the hilly areas in the form of an increase in the cost of labour and materials. Thus, the Committee recommend that the DoRD may relook at the unit assistance for houses to be constructed under PMAY-G in the Plains/Hills separately and increase the assistance amount per unit, in a judicious manner accordingly."

19. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"Realising the need to compensate for higher input and labour costs on account of geography, climate and terrain related challenges, higher unit assistance of Rs 1,30,000 is being provided to beneficiaries in eight North Eastern and three Himalayan States which are pre dominantly hilly. Additionally, 95 days worth of unskilled wages is being provided for the construction of each house, in convergence with MGNREGS, which is higher than 90 days provided in plain areas. To ease financial obligation on hilly States which are fiscally constrained, the sharing pattern between the Centre and State has been fixed at 90:10.

To lower cost of transportation and procurement, the Ministry has been encouraging States to consider production and use of locally available materials for construction of houses. States have been advised to identify SHGs to undertake local production of construction material like fly ash bricks and cement stabilized mud blocks in convergence with MGNREGS.

To provide beneficiaries with a menu of cost effective and locally appropriate designs, the Ministry in collaboration with UNDP and IIT, Delhi has developed a zone wise catalogue of house design typologies incorporating disaster resilient features and locally available material for 10 States including Manipur and Himachal Pradesh. The per unit cost of these design typologies range from Rs 1.08 lakh to Rs 1.71 lakh and Rs 1.79 lakh to Rs 1.97 lakh in Himachal Pradesh and Manipur respectively. To bridge the gap between unit cost and assistance provided under the scheme, the Ministry is working towards facilitating willing beneficiaries to avail a loan of upto Rs 70,000 from financial institutions."

**20. Taking into consideration the terrain and geographical challenges that are faced during the construction of houses under PMAY-G, the Committee felt that the assistance component under PMAY-G needed to be reviewed and looked into with practical perspective. Thus, the Committee had recommended the DoRD to relook at the unit assistance for houses to be constructed under PMAY-G in the hills separately. In their action taken reply, the DoRD have enumerated a slew of measures being taken by them to address the concerns in House-building in the hilly areas under PMAY-G scheme. The Committee while appreciating the reply and efforts undertaken by the DoRD have taken note of the specific effort of DoRD wherein the Ministry is working towards facilitating willing beneficiaries to avail a loan of upto Rs. 70, 000 from financial institutions and the Committee**



**desire that such good effort should be expeditiously formalised for an effective and plausible implementation befitting the goal envisaged therein.**

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 11)**

#### **PMGSY**

21. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"The Committee feel concerned to note the deplorable condition of the roads constructed under PMGSY after few years itself. The poor state of maintenance and repairs of the roads was viewed very seriously by the Committee. It was noted by the Committee that though there is provision for statutory maintenance of Roads after 5 years under the maintenance policy to be done by the state machinery yet there seems to be nonadherence to the guidelines under PMGSY resulting in the pitiable condition of the roads. The Committee, therefore, taking strong view of the non-compliance of the relevant PMGSY guidelines in this regard, implore upon the Department of Rural Development to look into the matter earnestly and spruce up the supervision/monitoring/maintenance in coordination with the State Governments so that the quality of roads constructed under PMGSY does not get diluted and defeat the very purpose of rural connectivity."

22. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA) and the Ministry of Rural Development have extended support to the States in the maintenance management of rural roads. Accordingly, a Model Policy Framework for Maintenance of Rural Roads along with a Guidance Note for the States has been finalized in close consultation with the States and circulated among all States. Based on these documents, the States are required to formulate, notify and implement State Rural Road Maintenance Policies to suit State specific needs. So far, 20 States (Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Punjab, Odisha, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal) have notified such rural road maintenance policies. In addition, National Quality Monitors (NQMs) are regularly deputed, by the Ministry, to all States to inspect the quality of roads under the five year maintenance period. The States are required to submit Action Taken Reports (ATR), in respect of such inspections of the NQMs."

**23. With deep concern, the Committee had noted the deplorable condition of the roads constructed under PMGSY after few years itself. Harping upon the non-adherence to the guidelines under PMGSY, the Committee in its recommendation**

implored upon the DoRD to look into the matter earnestly and spruce up the supervision / monitoring / maintenance of roads constructed under PMGSY in coordination with the State Governments. The DoRD in their action taken reply have submitted that a model policy framework for maintenance of rural roads alongwith a guidance note for the states has been finalized in close consultations with the states & circulated among all states. Based on these documents the States need to formulate, notify and implement State Rural Road maintenance policies to suit state specific needs. So far, 20 states have notified such rural road maintenance policies. Moreover, National Quality Monitors (NQM) are regularly deputed, by the Ministry, to all states to inspect the quality of roads under the 5 years maintenance period. The Committee having taken into their cognizance, the praise-worthy efforts being undertaken by the DoRD in ensuring the monitoring / maintenance of roads constructed under PMGSY effectively are still of the view that states being the major player in the maintenance aspect of the constructed roads under PMGSY need to be constantly kept on their toes and that the DoRD should relentlessly pursue the supervision / monitoring / maintenance of the roads constructed under PMGSY on a sustained basis.

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 14)**

#### **DISHA**

24. The Committee in their afore-said recommendation had recommended as under:-

"District Development Coordination and Monitoring Committee (DISHA) in each constituency of the Members of Parliament is supposed to convene regular meetings wherein representatives of Railway, Bank, Telecom sector, etc. alongwith District officials update the Member of Parliament regarding the ongoing schemes, its status and various related issues. The primary aim of these Committees and their meetings are monitoring and supervision by the Members of Parliament regarding development scheme of his/her constituency.

However, the Committee is aghast to know about the casual approach towards convening of DISHA meetings and the non-appearance

of all concerned authorities in such meetings. This makes the entire objective redundant, and, hence the Committee taking strong view, impress upon the Department of Rural Development to ensure the effective usage of the DISHA monitoring committees at the District level."

25. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated as under:-

"The Ministry of Rural Development has been pursuing the matter with all the State Governments for holding DISHA meetings as stipulated in the Guidelines. Though, the Guidelines require that the meetings of the Disha should be held at least once in every Quarter, only 706 DISHA meetings were reported during 2016-17. Hon'ble MRD had written a letter No. Q-13016/06/2016-VMC (pt) dated 31st March, 2017 to Chief Ministers/Administrators of States/UTs to instruct concerned officers to ensure that the meetings of DISHA are held as per the Guidelines. Secretary (Rural Development) vide letters. No. Q-13016/2/2016-VMC dated 26th July, 2016 and No. Q-13016/1/2016-VMC(Pt) dated 12th January, 2017 and 15th March, 2017 had requested states to ensure DISHA meetings as per guidelines. Thus, the matter has been taken with the States/UTs at the highest level and efforts will be further continued in this regard.

Initiative has been taken to develop a web based monitoring system for effective implementation of DISHA which will be made available to all members of the DISHA committee to begin with details of district wise progress in implementation of schemes being monitored under DISHA. The ultimate aim is to develop an API based system to enable the DISHA portal to automatically capture the update on the implementation of schemes included under DISHA. Thus, the DISHA application will be a single source of information to DISHA stakeholders, for all identified Programs/Schemes that come under the participating Ministries/Department."

**26. The Committee was distressed to know about the casual approach towards convening of District Development Coordination and Monitoring Committee (DISHA) Meetings in each constituency of the Members of Parliament and the non-appearance of all concerned authorities in such meetings for the evaluation of the status of ongoing Schemes in the District. Hence, the Committee had impressed upon the DoRD to ensure the effective usage of the DISHA monitoring committees at the District level. In their action taken reply, the Committee note that the DoRD, while admitting to the fact that only 706 DISHA**

meetings were reported during 2016-17, have initiated remedial measures which *inter-alia* include developing of a web based monitoring system for effective implementation of DISHA which will make available to all members of the DISHA Committee district wise progress in implementation of schemes along with development of API based system to enable the DISHA portal to automatically capture the update on the implementation of schemes included under DISHA. Lauding the well meant efforts of DoRD, the Committee are of the view that till the time such novel measures are translated into real-time events with expeditious functionality, the purpose behind the concept would not serve the end and as such, in the fitness of things, the Committee expresses its desire and propel the DoRD to succeed in its measures to make DISHA an effective platform for the purpose of monitoring of schemes.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **RECOMMENDATION WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 1)**

During the scrutiny of Demands for Grants of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development), the Committee found that against an allocation of Rs. 3,99,926.00 crore for the 12th Five year plan, the Department was allocated Rs. 3,85,289.00 crore based on availability of funds. Out of the total allocated funds at the R.E stage, i.e. Rs.3,53,116.42 crore for the 12th Plan, an amount of Rs. 3,35,131.84 crore was spent till February, 2017 which constituted more than 94.90% of actual allocation. However, considering the very short amount of time left for the closure of XIIth Plan, the Committee feel that the DoRD should go all out in bridging the gap between the allocated funds (RE) for the 12th Plan vis-a-vis 66 expenditure in the remaining time. The Committee, while stressing the need for the proper utilisation of funds recommend the DoRD to ensure that expenditure should meet the desired results and it is outcome oriented.

#### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

Ministry has adopted a good governance framework using data of SECC-2011, Jandhan, Aadhaar, Mobile, space technology, social auditing and empowering citizens to report on quality of work and assets created under the Programmes/ schemes of the Department. To ensure transparency in governance of rural development programmes DoRD has introduced determination of eligibility under entitlement programmes through the data of Socio Economic and Caste Census data alongwith validation of eligibility in Gram Sabha. Measures like use of information technology/ space technology, direct benefit transfer, aadhaar linkage has resulted in better implementation of the schemes. Total expenditure by DoRD during the 12th Plan period is Rs. 3,48,465.64 crore as against the RE allocation of Rs 3,53,016.42 crore during the 12th plan period which constitutes utilization of 98.71% of the total funds allocated.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 2)**

The Committee have been apprised of the fact that the Government has accorded highest priority to the rural development and the Finance Minister has announced in Mission Antyodaya to make 50 ,000 Gram Panchayats and 1 Crore households as poverty free. The expenditure on Rural Development including expenditure incurred by other Ministries on School Education, Health and Family Welfare, Food and Public Distribution System, Women and Child Development, grants of the 14th Finance Commission and state share for centrally sponsored schemes amount to close to Rs. 5 Lakh crore in rural areas. The Government would be moving to a convergent action plan incorporating schemes of different departments under an umbrella GP Development Plan to make 50,000 GPs and 1 Crore households poverty free by 2nd October, 2019, the 150th birth anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi.

The Committee while appreciating the vision and approach of the Government in the upliftment of rural life feel that mere convergence of funds will not suffice until and unless it is supported with convergence of efforts, approach, purpose and intentions on the part of all the stakeholders in a synergical manner and desire that the DoRD should play a pro-active role in realising this dream mission and work out a thorough and efficient mechanism to meet the desired objective.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

Ministry has been instrumental in pooling human resources acting as frontline workers available at the grass root level like Community Resource Person, ASHA, ANMs, GRS along with partnering with support institutions like Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Technical Institutes, Agricultural Universities, KVIC, MSME, Commissioner Handloom and Handicrafts, Resources Centres of Excellence etc. for better implementation of the Mission. Timely capacity building of the human resources is critical in attaining the objective of the Mission. Skilled professionals from Technical Universities and management apprentices will be engaged in finding locally suitable technological solutions; establishing rural enterprises based on management principles will be given high priority. Continued emphasis has been laid on local level planning through Gram Panchayat Development Plan where informed choices are made by the community resulting in better delivery of public services.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 5)**

MGNREGA is a demand driven Welfare Scheme for the rural poor. Grievance Redressal needs to be faster and efficient so that the rural masses do not get discouraged in enrolling themselves under MGNREGA. Considering this view, the Committee note that the appointment of requisite number of Ombudsmen is a long pending issue and needs to be dealt with in an earnest manner. The Committee, thus, recommend for the faster completion of the process regarding appointment of Ombudsmen in all the States for effective grievance redressal.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

The Ministry has regularly requested the State Governments to expedite the appointment of Ombudspersons in a time bound manner. The Ministry also held a VC with all States on 12th June, 2017 on the status of appointment of Ombudspersons. The States have assured that the appointment of Ombudspersons will be expedited.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 6)**

The Committee note with regret that an important aspect of linkage of Aadhar Numbers with the bank account of labourers under MGNREGA Scheme was still not complete and was lagging behind drastically in certain States. The Committee strongly emphasise and recommend for the speedier completion of the Aadhar Linkage procedure to make the system of payment to the Labourers in their bank accounts in a more transparent manner, obviating any scope of fraud/malpractices.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

The Ministry has taken steps and is regularly reviewing the progress with the States through regular meetings, Video conference and regular communications to State Governments.

However, it is important to note that in some States, the enrolment by UIDAI is not 100% and banks have also not seeded the Aadhaar number of all the MGNREGA workers into their bank account.

The DBT progress made in this FY is as under:

FY 17-18	01.04.17	13.07.17	Increase
Active workers	10.17 Cr	10.67 Cr	+ 50 lakhs
Aadhaar Seeding in MIS	8.50 Cr	9.10 Cr	+ 60 lakhs
ABP Enabled	4.40 Cr	5.29 Cr	+ 89 lakhs

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 9)**

The Committee is of the firm view that the terrain and geographical challenges for the hilly areas are completely different from the plain areas. Tougher landscapes increases the technical aspect of constructing houses alongwith the enhancement in cost/labour factor. Parameters for house construction and other logistic requirements are completely different from land to hills and thus the hills require special attention under PMAY-G.

The Committee, therefore, strongly feels that the assistance component under PMAY-G needs to be reviewed and looked into with practical perspective considering the challenges in the hilly areas in the form of an increase in the cost of labour and materials. Thus, the Committee recommend that the DoRD may relook at the unit assistance for houses to be constructed under PMAY-G in the Plains/Hills separately and increase the assistance amount per unit, in a judicious manner accordingly.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

Realizing the need to compensate for higher input and labour costs on account of geography, climate and terrain related challenges, higher unit assistance of Rs 1,30,000 is being provided to beneficiaries in eight North Eastern and three Himalayan States

which are pre dominantly hilly. Additionally, 95 days worth of unskilled wages is being provided for the construction of each house, in convergence with MGNREGS, which is higher than 90 days provided in plain areas. To ease financial obligation on hilly States which are fiscally constrained, the sharing pattern between the Centre and State has been fixed at 90:10.

To lower cost of transportation and procurement, the Ministry has been encouraging States to consider production and use of locally available materials for construction of houses. States have been advised to identify SHGs to undertake local production of construction material like fly ash bricks and cement stabilized mud blocks in convergence with MGNREGs.

To provide beneficiaries with a menu of cost effective and locally appropriate designs, the Ministry in collaboration with UNDP and IIT, Delhi has developed a zone wise catalogue of house design typologies incorporating disaster resilient features and locally available material for 10 States including Manipur and Himachal Pradesh. The per unit cost of these design typologies range from Rs 1.08 lakh to Rs 1.71 lakh and Rs 1.79 lakh to Rs 1.97 lakh in Himachal Pradesh and Manipur respectively. To bridge the gap between unit cost and assistance provided under the scheme, the Ministry is working towards facilitating willing beneficiaries to avail a loan of upto Rs 70,000 from financial institutions.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 20 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 10)**

The Committee appreciated the laudable efforts of the Department of Rural Development for using 'Green Technology' for Road Construction under PMGSY. It was learnt that in 'Green Technology', Fly Ash, Plastic Waste, Nano Technology, Jute Materials were used for the construction of Roads. The use of plastic wastes is not only environment friendly but also lowers the cost of construction by about Rs. 60,000/- to 80,000/- per kilometer, so far 3000 kms of Roads have been constructed using green technology under PMGSY.

The Committee while noting this paradigm shift towards Green Technology, expect the Department of Rural Development to continue its efforts in a sustained manner in expanding the usage of Green Technology 72 in the entire country for road construction.

Thus, the Committee strongly urge the Department of Rural Development to enhance its usage of Green Technology in a much more wider manner for the construction of roads under PMGSY.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

In order to promote use of non conventional construction materials, environment friendly and fast construction technologies in the construction of rural roads under PMGSY, the National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA), Ministry of Rural



Development has issued 'Guidelines on Technology Initiatives', to all States. The States are required to propose at least 15% of the length of annual proposals using any such technologies. Some of the cost effective and environment friendly technologies/materials include-waste plastic, flyash, iron & copper slag, natural geotextiles, cold mix gabions and bio-engineering for hill slopes stabilization, cell filled concrete, etc. In the first 14 years of PMGSY (from 2000-2014), 806.93 km of road was constructed using such technologies. During the period 2014-15 to 2015-16, 2,634.02 km of road using these technologies/materials were constructed and in 2016-17 a total of 4,113.13 km of such roads have been constructed under PMGSY.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 11)**

The Committee feel concerned to note the deplorable condition of the roads constructed under PMGSY after few years itself. The poor state of maintenance and repairs of the roads was viewed very seriously by the Committee. It was noted by the Committee that though there is provision for statutory maintenance of Roads after 5 years under the maintenance policy to be done by the state machinery yet there seems to be nonadherence to the guidelines under PMGSY resulting in the pitiable condition of the roads. The Committee, therefore, taking strong view of the non-compliance of the relevant PMGSY guidelines in this regard, implore upon the Department of Rural Development to look into the matter earnestly and spruce up the supervision/monitoring/maintenance in coordination with the State Governments so that the quality of roads constructed under PMGSY does not get diluted and defeat the very purpose of rural connectivity.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA) and the Ministry of Rural Development have extended support to the States in the maintenance management of rural roads. Accordingly, a Model Policy Framework for Maintenance of Rural Roads along with a Guidance Note for the States has been finalized in close consultation with the States and circulated among all States. Based on these documents, the States are required to formulate, notify and implement State Rural Road Maintenance Policies to suit State specific needs. So far, 20 States (Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Punjab, Odisha, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal) have notified such rural road maintenance policies. In addition, National Quality Monitors (NQMs) are regularly deputed, by the Ministry, to all States to inspect the quality of roads under the five year maintenance period. The States are required to submit Action Taken Reports (ATR), in respect of such inspections of the NQMs.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 23 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 12)**

The Committee observed that there is no provision of funding in the scheme, Saansad Adarsh Gram Yojana, which is a visionary Scheme for the adoption and upliftment of villages on a model basis by the Members of Parliament. In this context, the Committee were constrained to note that despite the maximum efforts of Members of Parliament, there seems to be total absence of requisite coordination between DoRD and the State Governments about the manner to achieve the desired goals envisaged under the SAGY Scheme. Although, many projects were agreed upon under the village development plan, however, to its utter dismay, the Committee found that even after a long passage of time, there seems to be no headway in moving forward with these plans causing lot of hardships to the Members of Parliament who are answerable to their constituency. Also issues ranging from poor coordination with State machinery in priority implementation of Yojanas in the SAGY villages to the lack of monitoring of schemes in such villages are quite prominent which defeats the very purpose behind SAGY.

The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the villages under SAGY be given priority for the implementation of Yojanas/Schemes of the Ministry by ensuring coordination with the State Government and real time monitoring of their implementations.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

In order to ensure effective implementation of Saansad Adarsh Gram Yojana, State Governments have constituted State Level Empowered Committee (SLEC) headed by Chief Secretary consisting of the relevant Departments which would supplement the central SAGY guidelines and issue State specific instructions which take into account different state schemes, review Village Development Plans & their timelines, identify bottlenecks and review implementation of the scheme. 32 States/UTs have notified constitution of SLEC headed by Chief Secretary.

The States/UTs have also nominated a State Nodal Officer who ensures smooth coordination with the Department of Rural Development. The District Collectors/DMs act as the District Nodal Officers of Gram Panchayats adopted under SAGY. The District Collectors, in turn, appoint a competent official of sufficient seniority as Charge Officer for the SAGY Gram Panchayat to coordinate the implementation of SAGY at the local level and be fully responsible and accountable for implementation of Village Development Plan.

At the national level, a separate, web based monitoring system has been put in place for the scheme covering all aspects and components. The system has the interface enabling the Hon'ble Member of Parliament, State Governments, and other key stakeholders to give suggestions/comments, and even raise queries or complaints, which would be promptly responded to by the implementing authorities. The GPs

prepare the Village Development Plan (VDP) which contains prioritised time-bound activities for being implemented through convergence of various Central and State Government schemes apart from leveraging inputs from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). In order to keep track of the progress of projects listed in the VDP, a Tracking Template has been developed and the progress is monitored online. The Ministry has developed a 35-point impact monitoring tool named 'Panchayat Darpan' to gauge the impact of SAGY in the GPs. Progress is assessed through outcome indicators broadly covering basic amenities, education, health, sanitation, livelihood, women empowerment, financial inclusion, food security, social security and e-governance. The impact is assessed on quarterly (22 indicators), half yearly (7 indicators) and yearly basis (6 indicators).

The Ministry has taken following initiatives for the effective implementation of the scheme:-

- (i) 21 Schemes have been amended by various Ministries /Departments of Government of India to give priority to SAGY Gram Panchayat projects
- (ii) Compilation of 223 Central Sector/ Centrally Sponsored and 1806 State Schemes for convergence under SAGY for the benefit of Members of Parliament, District and Village level officials about the different schemes for multitude of purposes at the GP level.
- (iii) Developing a 35 point outcome indicator covering basic amenities, education, health, sanitation, livelihood, women empowerment, financial inclusion, food security, social security and e-governance to gauge the impact of SAGY in the GPs.
- (iv) Encouraging wider access for tapping resources and the strengths of the Private, Voluntary and Cooperative sectors (PVC Sectors) and hosting on SAGY website the proposals received from the States/UTs for access by the interested agencies.
- (v) Publishing of a document named 'SAHYOG' as an indicative guidance document with the essential information on the existing social security schemes collated from respective Ministries to enrich the knowledge of villagers and village level functionaries to achieve 100% enrollment into the social/financial Security Schemes in SAGY GPs.
- (vi) Coordinating with other Central Ministries/ Departments to ensure provision of four key basic services viz. power, drinking water, roads and education in all SAGY GPs.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 13)**

The Committee took into cognizance the issues concerning with the pension schemes under the National Social Assistance Programmes. Taking into consideration specifically the situation in the Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension Scheme (IGNDPS), it came to the fore that there existed few contradictory parameters regarding the eligibility of disabled persons to be treated as beneficiary. While the State Government considers 40% Disability for the eligibility, the Central Government

consider 80%. This is a peculiar situation wherein the needy are deprived off the benefits of the 74 Scheme. There needs to be uniform parameters for the universal coverage of beneficiaries in the Schemes.

Thus, the Committee strongly recommend the Department of Rural Development to utilise the Socio Economic and Caste Census (SECC) in a holistic and judicious manner for the determination of eligibility and coverage of beneficiaries under its different schemes and to ensure a faster remedial measure for the wider coverage of disabled person under the scheme.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

For identification of beneficiaries under various schemes included in National Social Assistance Programme, an uniform criteria has been adopted across the country. However, some States as measure of top up came out with varying criteria for pension schemes administered by those states through their own resources. However, the Ministry has got the scheme evaluated. Recommendations inter-alia include suggestion for shifting the base of selection of beneficiaries from Below Poverty Line (BPL) list to Socio Economic Caste Census (SECC) data 2011 in the implementation of NSAP schemes. Shifting to SECC data along with revised eligibility criteria, shall increase the number of beneficiaries and thereby financial implications will be manifold. While finalizing the views of the Government on the subject, concerns of the Hon'ble Standing Committee will be kept in consideration.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 14)**

District Development Coordination and Monitoring Committee (DISHA) in each constituency of the Members of Parliament is supposed to convene regular meetings wherein representatives of Railway, Bank, Telecom sector, etc. alongwith District officials update the Member of Parliament regarding the ongoing schemes, its status and various related issues. The primary aim of these Committees and their meetings are monitoring and supervision by the Members of Parliament regarding development scheme of his/her constituency.

However, the Committee is aghast to know about the casual approach towards convening of DISHA meetings and the non-appearance of all concerned authorities in such meetings. This makes the entire objective redundant, and, hence the Committee taking strong view, impress upon the Department of Rural Development to ensure the effective usage of the DISHA monitoring committees at the District level.

### **REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT**

The Ministry of Rural Development has been pursuing the matter with all the State Governments for holding DISHA meetings as stipulated in the Guidelines. Though, the Guidelines require that the meetings of the Disha should be held at least

once in every Quarter, only 706 DISHA meetings were reported during 2016-17. Hon'ble MRD had written a letter No. Q-13016/06/2016-VMC (pt) dated 31st March, 2017 to Chief Ministers/Administrators of States/UTs to instruct concerned officers to ensure that the meetings of DISHA are held as per the Guidelines. Secretary (Rural Development) vide letters. No. Q-13016/2/2016-VMC dated 26th July, 2016 and No. Q-13016/1/2016-VMC(Pt) dated 12th January, 2017 and 15th March, 2017 had requested states to ensure DISHA meetings as per guidelines. Thus, the matter has been taken with the States/UTs at the highest level and efforts will be further continued in this regard.

Initiative has been taken to develop a web based monitoring system for effective implementation of DISHA which will make available to all members of the DISHA committee to begin with details of district wise progress in implementation of schemes being monitored under DISHA. The ultimate aim is to develop API based system to enable the DISHA portal to automatically capture the update on the implementation of schemes included under DISHA. Thus, the DISHA application will be single source of information to DISHA stakeholders, for all identified Programs/Schemes that come under the participating Ministries/Department.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P) dated 19 September, 2017]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 26 of Chapter I of the Report)

**CHAPTER III**

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

**- NIL -**

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 3)**

The Committee note that MGNREGA is a flagship demand driven programme of the Government of India with the main objective to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security to the needy through guaranteed 100 days of unskilled labour.

In this context, the Committee pointed out that Labour is one of the main component in the work done under MPLADS Funds and that there was feasibility of exploring the option of tagging the MPLADS Fund with MGNREGA so that the convergence of funds may create a wider resource pool for much more creation of work. The Committee feel that this convergence would only augment the fulfillment of objectives of providing more number of persons with work and income. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the DoRD should pursue the idea of convergence of MPLADS funds with MGNREGA and concretise a holistic plan as early as possible. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by DoRD in this regard.

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

Para-6, of Schedule-1 of MGNREGA read as, "The State Government shall take concrete steps to achieve effective inter-departmental convergence till the last mile implementation level of the works under the Scheme with other Government Schemes/ programmes so as to improve the quality and productivity of assets and bring in synergy to holistically address the multiple dimensions of poverty in a sustainable manner". Accordingly, convergence can be done between MGNREGA and other government schemes including MPLADS. Works to be taken up are finalised and prioritised in Gram Sabha as per section 16 of MGNREGA Act 2005.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P)]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 08 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 4)**

The Committee view with concern that the disparity in States' minimum wages and minimum wages ensured under MGNREGA still exist in many States which creates discrepancy at ground level in the implementation of MGNREGA provisions. The Committee was informed by the DoRD that a committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Mahendra Dev was constituted to look into the issue of difference in minimum wages

under States and MGNREGA and that there was a need for concerted discussions with the different States before arriving at a logical final conclusion in the matter.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should expeditiously reach to a consensus regarding the parity in minimum wages under the States and MGNREGA and the Committee would also like to be apprised about the progress made in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

Comparison of the notified wage rate for unskilled manual work under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) with minimum agricultural wages in the States/UTs for FY 2016-17 indicate that the MGNREGA notified wage rate in 17 States/UTs are lower than the agricultural wage rate. The Mahendra Dev Committee submitted its report to the Government on 25-01-2014. The report was examined in consultation with Ministry of Finance and it was decided not to consider for change in the Base Wage Rate in the present context.

The Ministry had set up a Committee under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary with representatives of relevant Central Ministries and five State Governments to examine the issue of Alignment of MGNREGA Wages with Minimum Agricultural Wages. The MGNREGA Wages were notified under Section 6.1 of the MGNREGA Act on 1st December, 2009. For the States where minimum agricultural wages were less than Rs. 100/- MGNREGA wages were notified as Rs. 100/-. On 1st December, 2009 only for 4 States, viz. Goa, Haryana, Mizoram and Kerala had minimum wages for agricultural labour was higher than Rs. 100/- and these were protected by December, 2009 Notification. Since then, MGNREGA wages have been indexed to Consumer Price index for agricultural labour. The present divergence between MGNREGA wages and minimum wages for agricultural labour is on account of the fact that the States do not follow a scientific and uniform system of indexation of wage rates while MGNREGA wages are increased based on changes in Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labours.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 11 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 7)**

The Committee observed that under the DDU-GKY, sub-scheme of NRLM , skill development programmes to build the skills of rural youths through short training were being implemented to place the rural youths in relatively high wage employment sectors of the economy. The Committee, however, felt that much diversified set of skills, specific



to the areas like Eco-Tourism, Organic Farming in Hilly areas and other skills based on the already existing practices in that geographical location needed to be encouraged and promoted for a wider coverage and success of the programme. Thus, the Committee expects the DoRD to look into the skilling component of the DDU-GKY in a much more pragmatic and practical manner to enhance the ambit and commercial utility of the Programme.

### **Reply of the Government**

DDU-GKY guidelines provides for each state to undertake Skill Gap Assessment studies. These studies are aimed identifying Gram Panchayat wise demand for skills and placement, and match the same with potential for placements. This study also facilitates identification of jobs in sectors specific to the geographic location.

At present DDU-GKY is being implemented in 28 States, including States with hilly areas. Important trades covered in training include Sales Person ( Retail), Accounting, Sewing Machine Operator, Hospitality Assistant, BPO Voice, Food & Beverage Service-Steward, BPO- Non Voice, DTP and Print Publishing Assistant, Sales Associate, Security Guard(General) & Personal Security Guard.

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P)]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 14 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 8)**

The Committee acknowledge that "Housing For All" by 2022 is a very noble and Welfare oriented vision of the Government. Such endeavour which aims at weeding out one of the main aspects contributing to the abject poverty of rural populace of the country, i.e. homelessness needs to be supported by a robust mechanism ensuring the success of the Scheme. However, to its utter dismay, the Committee find that there are still a large number of cases of leftover homeless families from the list of beneficiaries under PMAY-G. The non-inclusion of needy beneficiaries needs to be looked into on an urgent and judicious basis, else, the Scheme may never realise its potential.

The Committee, therefore, strongly urge DoRD to devise suitable mechanism for the assessment of datas pertaining to the list of beneficiaries so that the aggrieved leftover needy beneficiaries may also be included on priority basis.

### **Reply of the Government**

Ensuring that genuine beneficiaries, who have been left out from the Permanent Wait List, receive their entitlements under the scheme is a key focus area of the

Ministry. An elaborate procedure has been devised to ensure that fair opportunity is provided to every household which claims to be eligible under PMAY-G.

The Gram Sabha may record a separate list in the Gram Sabha resolution with reasons about households not included in the system generated priority list, but otherwise found eligible during the proceedings of the Gram Sabha. Claimants other than those endorsed in the Gram Sabha resolution for inclusion in the list, may submit their claims directly to the Competent Authority appointed by the State/UT. The Competent Authority shall enquire into the list, as endorsed by the Gram Sabha, as well as the representations received directly and submit report to the Appellate Committee at the district level. Based on the merit of the claim, the Appellate Committee may recommend including these households in the universe of beneficiaries of PMAY-G. The detailed procedure for submission of reports by Competent Authority and disposal of cases by the Appellate Committee, including timely disposal, will be decided by the respective State/ UT.

The list of households proposed to be included in the universe, as recommended by the Appellate Committee, will be prepared Gram Panchayat and community wise. The provision for capturing details of deserving households which are to be included/added to the priority lists has been provided in AwaasSoft. The decision on inclusion of these households into the Permanent Wait List shall be made after obtaining the approval of Competent Authority in the Central Government on recommendation of the State Government. All State/UTs have been advised to compile data on exclusion and send a consolidated report on households recommended for inclusion to facilitate the Ministry towards this end..

[O.M. No. H-11020/05/2017-GC(P)]

**Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 17 of Chapter I of the Report)

**CHAPTER V**

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

**- NIL -**

**NEW DELHI;  
16 February, 2018  
27 Magha, 1939 (Saka)**

**DR. P. VENUGOPAL  
*Chairperson,*  
Standing Committee on Rural Development**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2017-2018)**

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
THURSDAY, THE 15<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2018

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in New Committee Room 'No.3', Parliament House Annexe Extension Building, Block 'B' (PHA-'B'), New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Dr. P. Venugopal -- *Chairperson*

**MEMBERS**

**Lok Sabha**

2. Shri Sisir Adhikari
3. Shri Harishchandra Deoram Chavan
4. Shri Vijay Kumar Hansdak
5. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
6. Shri Manshankar Ninama
7. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
8. Dr. Yashwant Singh
9. Shri Ajay Misra (Teni)

**Rajya Sabha**

10. Smt. Shanta Chhetri
11. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
12. Shri Javed Ali Khan
13. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra
14. Shri Narayan Lal Panchariya
15. Shri Lal Sinh Vadodia

**Secretariat**

1. Shri Abhijit Kumar - Additional Secretary
2. Shri S. Chatterjee - Director
3. Smt. Emma C. Barwa - Deputy Secretary

XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

2. XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

3. Thereafter, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee convened for consideration of three Draft Reports of the Committee on action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained on Demands for Grants (2017-18) in respect of Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development), Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development), and Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation and XXX XXX XXX.

4. Draft Reports were taken up for consideration one-by-one and after discussions, the Committee adopted the Draft Reports. The Committee then authorized the Chairperson to finalize the aforesaid Draft Reports and present the same to the Parliament.

*[Witnesses were then called in]*

5. XXX XXX XXX XXXX

6. XXX XXX XXX XXXX

7. XXX XXX XXX XXXX

8. XXX XXX XXX XXXX.

[XXX XXX XXX XXXX]

A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

XXX: Not related with the subject concerned.

**APPENDIX – II**

[Vide para 4 of Introduction of Report]

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE  
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT  
(16<sup>TH</sup> LOK SABHA) OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

I.	Total number of recommendations:	14
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government : Serial Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14	
	Total:	10
	Percentage:	71.4 %
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies : NIL	
	Total:	00
	Percentage:	0 %
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee :  Serial No. 3, 4, 7, and 8	
	Total:	4
	Percentage:	28.6 %
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited : NIL	
	Total:	00
	Percentage:	0 %