

NINTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF URBAN EMPLOYMENT
AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 24 April, 2000
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 24 April, 2000



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
April, 2000/Vaisakha 1922 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

Corrigenda to the 9th Report
(13th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
6	2.4	6 from bottom	Woman	Women
10	2.18	9	State	state
13	2.25	4 from bottom	meagure	meagre
20	2.49	12 from bottom	<u>add 'of' after</u> 'Ministry'	
30	3.13	6	benifited	benefitted
	3.14	2	this	the
31	3.16	5	within	with
33	3.21	5	Minister	Ministers
36	4.10	1	<u>add 'to' after</u> 'Asked'	
41	-	4, Col 8	150,00	150,00,00
		9, Col 11	1,00	10,00
43	-	8, Col 11	2350	2400
		14, Col 6	6500	8500
44	-	4, Col 11	154	1545
51	-	3, Col 3	621.58	321.58
53	-	6	UBSB	UBSP
57	-	1 from bottom	260.16	260.18
62	-	19, Col 3	1355	1365
		23, Col 3	7029	17029
63	-	15, Col 3	6	16
		16, Col 3	19	39
		Col 5	0.095	0.005
65	8 and 9	2 and 3 respectively	ration	ratio
67	18	9	diagonose	diagnose
			afflicting	afflicting
72	-	3	SHELTERS	SHELTER
		13, Col 5	55.51	52.51
74	-	9, Col 8	451	461
78	-	6, Col 10	195	120
		7, Col 2	1,090,695	1,080,695
		7, Col 10	120	195
		14, Col 4	766,596	756,596
85	-	14	Read the name of member as 'Shri A. Brahmanaiah'	
98	-	6	<u>delete</u> 'we'	
101	-	3	dischotomy	dichotomv

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
CHAPTER II	Urban Poverty Alleviation Programmes	6
	(A) Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana	6
	(B) National Slum Development Programme	17
	(C) Night Shelter Scheme	21
CHAPTER III	Housing	26
CHAPTER IV	New Programmes/Schemes	34
	(A) New Schemes proposed/dropped during Ninth Plan	34
	(B) Development of Urban Indicators Programme	35
	(C) National Slum Policy	37

APPENDICES

I.	Financial Provision	40
II.	State-wise details of Central funds released under SJSRY	46
III.	State-wise details of expenditure under SJSRY	48
IV.	State-wise details of funds position of SJSRY	50
V.	State-wise status of accounts under earlier UPA Programmes	53

	PAGE
VI. State-wise details of funds diverted under SJSRY to better performing States	54
VII. State-wise details of release of States share under SJSRY	56
VIII. State-wise details of urban towns where house to house survey conducted under SJSRY	58
IX. State-wise details of persons benefitted under UWEP of SJSRY	60
X. State-wise details of persons benefitted under USEP of SJSRY	62
XI. Suggestions of States for modification of SJSRY guidelines	64
XII. Details of schemes sanctioned under Night Shelter Scheme	72
XIII. State-wise details of shelterless households	75
XIV. Details of shelterless households in Metro Cities	77
XV. State-wise details of DUs sanctioned by HUDCO for EWS/LIG	79
XVI. State-wise details of DUs completed/in progress by HUDCO for EWS/LIG	82
XVII. Minutes of 11th sitting of the Committee held on 30.3.2000	85
XVIII. Minutes of 15th sitting of the Committee held on 11.4.2000	87
XIX. Statement of Observations/Recommendations	92

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri A. Brahmanaiah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakrabortty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
10. Prof. Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
13. Shri R.L. Jalappa
14. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
15. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
16. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
17. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
- *18. Shri Punnulal Mohale
19. Shrimati Ranee Narah
20. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
21. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
22. Shri Chandresh Patel
23. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
- **24. Prof. (Smt.) A.K. Premajam

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 6.4.2000 *vice* Shri Vijay Goel

**Nominated *w.e.f.* 24.1.2000

(iv)

25. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
26. Shri Nikhulananda Sar
27. Shri Maheshwar Singh
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

- *31. Shri S. Agni Raj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri C. Apok Jamir
- §36. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
37. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
- **38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
- §39. Dr. Mohan Babu
40. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
41. Shri N. Rajendran
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
44. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

*Nominated *w.ef.* 16.3.2000

**Died on 13.1.2000

§Ceased to be a member of the Committee *w.ef.* 2nd April, 2000 consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha

ABBREVIATIONS

BE	—	Budget Estimates
BMTPC	—	Building Material and Technology Promotion Council
BMS	—	Basic Minimum Services
BPL	—	Below Poverty Line
CBO	—	Community Based Organisations
DCB	—	Delhi Cantonment Board
DU	—	Dwelling Units
DUDA	—	District Urban Development Agency
DWCUA	—	Development of Women and Children in Urban Areas
EWS	—	Economically Weaker Section
HFI	—	Housing Finance Institution
HUDCO	—	Housing & Urban Development Corporation
LIG	—	Low Income Group
MCD	—	Municipal Corporation of Delhi
NCHF	—	National Cooperative Housing Federation of India
NDMC	—	New Delhi Municipal Council
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHB	—	National Housing Bank
NHHP	—	National Housing & Habitat Policy
NP	—	Non Plan
NSDP	—	National Slum Development Programme
NSP	—	National Slum Policy

(vi)

RE	—	Revised Estimate
SJSRY	—	Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana
SUDA	—	State Urban Development Agency
UEPA	—	Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation
UNCHS	—	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements
UPA	—	Urban Poverty Alleviation
USEP	—	Urban Self Employment Programme
UT	—	Union Territories
UWEP	—	Urban Wage Employment Programme

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Ninth Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation.

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation on 30th March, 2000.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 11th April, 2000.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation for placing before them the requisite material in connection with the examination of the subject. The Committee also wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views.

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

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2000
29 Chaitra, 1922 (Saka)

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

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The erstwhile Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation of the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment has been renamed as Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation *w.e.f.* 16th October, 1999.

1.2 The Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation is mainly entrusted with the following responsibilities:

- (i) Formulation of housing policy and programme (except rural Housing); review of implementation of Plan Scheme etc.;
- (ii) Implementation of Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) *w.e.f.* 1.12.1997;
- (iii) Human settlements including UN Commission for Human Settlements, International cooperation and technical assistance in the field of Housing and Human Settlements; and
- (iv) Collection and dissemination of data on housing and reduction of building costs etc.

1.3 The estimated strength of establishment of the Ministry as on 1st March, 2000 stands at 136 with a provision of Rs. 189.30 lakh for 2000-2001.

ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2000-2001)

Budget at a Glance

(Rs. in crore)

	Revenue	Capital	Total
Charged	—	—	—
Voted	234.01	165.00	399.01

1.4 A total provision of Rs. 399.01 crore for 2000-2001 has been made in respect of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation under Demand No. 87. The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Lok Sabha on 14th March, 2000.

1.5 The detailed Demands for Grants show that the total demand (voted) under Demand No. 87 is Rs. 399.01 crore of which Rs. 234.01 crore is on the Revenue side and Rs. 165 crore on the Capital side. The details of financial requirements for different programme/activity-wise and object/head-wise are shown in *Appendix I*.

1.6 The comparative budget allocations, net of recoveries of Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 and Budget Estimates and actuals for 1998-99 are given below:

Comparative Budget Proposals

(Rs. in crore)

	1998-99 BE		1999-2000 BE		1999-2000 BE		2000-2001 BE		Total BE
	Plan (Actuals)	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan (% change over BE 1999-2000)	
Revenue	218.00 (174.99)	4.21 (4.29)	195.00	9.32	135	9.44	224.50	9.51	234.01
Capital	110.00 (110.00)	5.00 (3.57)	150.00	10.00	150.00	8.00	155.00	10.00	165.00
Total	328.00 (284.99)	9.21 (7.86)	345.00	19.32	285.00	17.44	379.50 (10.0)	19.51 (0.98)	399.01

1.7 From the above comparative statement, it is seen that on the Revenue side there has been an increase of Rs. 29.50 crore (about 15%) in BE 2000-2001 over BE 1999-2000 which was at Rs. 195 crore, while the Non-plan expenditure of Rs. 9.51 crore in BE 2000-2001 is marginally higher over BE 1999-2000 of Rs. 9.32 crore. However, in the Capital section, the allocation at Rs. 155 crore in BE 2000-2001 shows an increase of Rs. 5 crore (about 3%) over BE 1999-2000 allocation of Rs. 150 crore on the plan side, while on the non-plan side there is no change in the BE figures of 2000-2001 over that of 1999-2000.

1.8 The allocations proposed for 2000-2001 in respect of some major schemes/programmes *vis-a-vis* the BE and RE 1999-2000 are shown as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Scheme/Programme	BE 1999-2000	RE 1999-2000	BE 2000-2001
<i>Revenue Section</i>				
1.	SJSRY	180.65	126.35	168.00
<i>Capital Section</i>				
1.	Equity to HUDCO for Housing	150.00	150.00	155.00

1.9 The Ministry stated in a written note that the plan outlays for BE 1999-2000 at Rs. 345 crore was reduced to Rs. 285 crore in RE 1999-2000 and that Expenditure incurred upto 15th March, 2000 (upto February, 2000 in case of SJSRY) stands at Rs. 1999.81 crore (Rs. 42.83 crore for SJSRY).

1.10 Asked what are the reasons for the low utilisation of funds during the current financial year, the Ministry stated in a written reply as under:—

“There has been low utilisation of funds under the major Scheme of SJSRY and in the Provision for infrastructural facilities in the Displaced Persons’ Colonies in West Bengal. This could be attributed to the previous balances with the State Governments etc. under the SJSRY Scheme and also because there are problems relating to Bank Finance. In the case of Provision for infrastructural facilities in the Displaced Persons’ Colonies in West Bengal, the requisite approval of the Cabinet for covering additional colonies has not been received and hence, no expenditure could be incurred”.

1.11 When asked the reasons for reduction in RE 1999-2000 to the extent of Rs. 60 crore on the Plan and Rs. 1.88 crore on Non-Plan side, the Ministry in a written note stated:—

“While submitting the Ministry’s proposal for RE 1999-2000, the amounts proposed were Plan Rs. 344.67 crore and Non-Plan Rs. 17.44 crore. In regard to Non-plan allocation, it may be stated that MOF had issued general instructions for effecting 10% cut in Non-Plan Non-Salary expenditure. Reduction in RE was made as a result of review meeting held in the MOF under the chairmanship of Secretary (Expenditure)...”

1.12 Asked further, if the overall hike of 10% in the Plan outlay during 2000-2001 be sufficient to attain the targets under different schemes of the Ministry, the Ministry stated in a written reply as under:—

“Against the BE Plan 1999-2000 of Rs. 345 crore, the BE 2000-2001 is Rs. 379.50 crore. This includes a provision of Rs. 38 crore earmarked for the benefit of North Eastern Region including Sikkim which is a first time entry. Thus there is no increase as such. Nonetheless the requirements of the Plan schemes of the Ministry is considered adequate.”

1.13 It may be seen that under the major Head Sectt-General Services the allocation for other charges on the non-plan side increased from Rs. 4.26 lakh in BE 1999-2000 to Rs. 6.26 lakh in RE 1999-2000 and Rs. 8.35 lakh in BE 2000-2001. The reasons for nearly 100% increase in allocation under this head is attributed to the formation of separate Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation under an independent Cabinet Minister with more funds being provided under Other Charges resulting in the increased provision.

1.14 The performance in respect of some of the major schemes/ programmes under implementation by the Ministry of UEPA are discussed in the succeeding chapters.

1.15 The scrutiny of the provisions in Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation shows that in comparison to an allocation of Rs. 364.32 crore in BE 1999-2000, the outlay at Rs. 399.01 crore in BE 2000-2001 shows an overall hike of Rs. 34.69 crore. There is an overall hike of 10% in the Plan outlay for 2000-2001 which stands at Rs. 379.50 crore over

the BE of Rs. 345 crore in 1999-2000. While there is an increase of Rs. 29.50 crore on the Revenue side (Plan), the Capital section (Plan) shows an increase of Rs. 5 crore which comes to about an increase of 15% and 3% respectively. There is only a marginal increase in Non-plan (Revenue side) outlay and in the Capital Section (Non-Plan) there is no change in the allocations in BE 2000-2001 over that of 1999-2000. Further, the Committee observe that the outlay for the major scheme of SJSRY at Rs. 168 crore shows a decline of Rs. 12.65 crore over the BE figure of Rs. 180.65 crore for 1999-2000. However, in the Capital section, the outlay for equity to HUDCO for Housing at Rs. 155 crore shows an increase of Rs. 5 crore in BE 2000-2001 over the outlay envisaged in 1999-2000 at Rs. 150 crore.

1.16 The Committee are constrained to observe that while on the one hand there is an increase in the total outlay in BE 2000-2001 over BE 1999-2000, on the other hand, the reduction of outlay at RE stage in 1999-2000 to the extent of Rs. 60 crore on the Plan side, at Rs. 1.88 crore on the non-plan side, presents quite an alarming picture. According to the Ministry, the reasons for the reduction of the outlays at RE stage are on the instructions of Ministry of Finance for imposing a cut of 10% on non-plan, non-salary expenditure.

1.17 The Committee however, do not agree with the view of the Government that the reduction of outlay at RE stage on plan side could be attributed to low spending by the Ministry especially in SJSRY where alone the reduction between BE and RE 1999-2000 is to the tune of Rs. 54.30 crore which in itself is a result of huge unspent balances with States of the earlier UPA programmes and the negative role and non-cooperative attitude of bankers. The Committee are of the opinion that this alone is the major cause for further lower allocation for SJSRY in BE 2000-2001. The Committee, therefore, are of the considered opinion that the Ministry should take necessary corrective steps to arrest this trend of lower utilisation and consequent lower allocations resulting in a vicious circle which would be difficult for the Ministry to break in future. The Committee also recommend that to monitor the situation and to arrest this trend, frequent review meetings should be held preferably at Minister's level. The Committee desire that they be apprised of the steps taken in this direction.

CHAPTER II

URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES

The Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation is entrusted with the responsibility of taking steps to alleviate Urban poverty—a major challenge facing the country calling for an imaginative new approach with the aim to feed, educate, house and employ the teeming millions of impoverished city dwellers. The Ministry is monitoring the implementation of the Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) *w.e.f.* 1.12.1997.

A. Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana

2.2 The Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) consists of two special schemes, namely:—

- (i) The Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP)
- (ii) The Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP)

2.3 The Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) seeks to provide gainful employment to the urban unemployed or under-employed through encouraging the setting up of self-employment ventures or provision of wage employment. This programme relies on creation of suitable community structures on the UBSP pattern and delivery of inputs is through the medium of urban local bodies and such community structure.

2.4 The SJSRY is funded on a 75:25 basis between Centre and the States.

(a) The Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP)

2.5 This programme has three components:

- (i) Assistance to individual urban poor beneficiaries for setting up gainful self-employment ventures.
- (ii) Assistance to groups of urban poor women for setting up gainful self-employment ventures. This sub-scheme is called "The Scheme for Development of Woman and Children in the Urban Areas (DWCUA).
- (iii) Training of beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries and other persons associated with the urban employment programme for upgradation and acquisition of vocational and entrepreneurial skills.

2.6 The programme is applicable to all urban towns in India. The programme is being implemented on a whole town basis with special emphasis on urban poor clusters.

(b) The Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP)

2.7 This programme seeks to provide wage employment to beneficiaries living below the poverty line within the jurisdiction of urban local bodies by utilising their labour for construction of socially and economically useful public assets. The programme applies to urban local bodies, having population less than 5 lakh as per the 1991 Census.

2.8 The material labour ratio for works under this programme is to be maintained at 60:40. The prevailing minimum wage rate, as notified from time to time for each area, have to be paid to beneficiaries under this programme.

Financial performance under SJSRY

2.9 Total outlay for the scheme during 9th Five Year plan is Rs. 1009 crore. Year-wise outlay during the 9th Five Year Plan for the Scheme is as under:—

1997-98	Rs. 102.54 Crore
1998-99	Rs. 162.28 Crore
1999-2000	Rs. 180.65 Crore (BE)
1999-2000	Rs. 126.35 Crore (RE)
2000-2001	Rs. 168.00 Crore (BE)

2.10 For the year 1997-98 and 1998-99, the entire budgeted amount was released to the States/UTs. For the year 1999-2000, out of Rs. 126.35 crore (RE), a sum of Rs. 40.47 crore (as on 31.12.1999) has been released so far to States/UTs on the basis of their performance. The Ministry stated that during 1998-99 and 1999-2000, the BE outlays were reduced because of economy cut. The expenditure incurred under the Yojana, upto February, 2000 was Rs. 42.83 crore. Statements showing release of central funds and expenditure incurred (upto 15.3.2000) State-wise under SJSRY are indicated in Appendices II & III.

2.11 When asked about the reasons for such poor utilization of funds under SJSRY during 1999-2000 and its impact on performance of the Yojana, the Ministry stated that majority of States had unspent balances from earlier UPA schemes for implementation of SJSRY which resulted in low utilisation of SJSRY funds and that performance under various sub-schemes of the Yojana will not be adversely affected.

2.12 During examination of Demands for Grants 1999-2000, on the question of reduced outlay at Rs. 180.65 crore for SJSRY for 1999-2000, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence that the problem will be overcome with the help of unspent balances with States brought over from the earlier Urban Poverty Alleviation Schemes.

2.13 The Ministry reported in April, 1999 that as on 30.11.1997, a total of Rs 433.73 crore (provisional) remained unspent with States. However, the unspent balances for the same period have now been reported to be of the order of Rs. 500.83 crore (provisional). The State-wise details of unspent balances under the Yojana are at *Appendix IV*.

2.14 On the status of contradictions in the amount of unspent balances available with State Governments as on 30.11.1997 under the Yojana as given in the 23rd Report of the Committee and as now furnished to the Committee, the Ministry in post-evidence reply stated as follows:—

“The status of unspent balances mentioned in the 23rd Report of the Committee was based on the provisional figures as per the records available in this Ministry. During the earlier reporting, no unspent balances were accounted for in respect of a number of States/UTs due to non-availability of information from such States/UTs. Even though the States/UTs have since started reporting figures regarding unspent balances, final figures are still not available except for a few States which have since settled their accounts. The details of the States, where the accounts in respect of the earlier UPA Programmes are finally closed, are at *Appendix V*. In the case of States/UTs where the accounts are not yet settled, the final figures could still undergo change.”

2.15 On the reasons for failure of the States to utilise the earlier unspent balances fully the Ministry in a written reply stated as follows:—

“The States have failed to utilise the earlier unspent balances fully due to the following reasons:—

- (a) The Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) is a new scheme, which has come into existence only on 1.12.1997 by replacing the earlier urban poverty alleviation schemes viz. NRY, UBSP and PMIUPEP, with some new features.
- (b) The lack of Infrastructural support due to non-setting up of SUDAs, DUDAs expeditiously, by the States.
- (c) Frequent administrative reshuffle of the personnel involved in the scheme.
- (d) States required more time to conduct fresh surveys for identifying target groups under this scheme.
- (e) Staff employed needed training for successful implementation of the Scheme.
- (f) Training of staff and conducting of surveys took almost a year and the actual implementation of the Scheme started only in November/December, 1998.
- (g) States faced difficulties in getting adequate financial cooperation from the bankers who had a crucial role in the implementation of the scheme.
- (h) Banks were reluctant to sanction the loans to the prospective beneficiaries under USEP component of SJSRY without any collateral security etc.
- (i) States gave low priority to this scheme.”

2.16 The Committee observe that SJSRY is the major Urban Poverty Alleviation Programme under implementation by the Government in all States/UTs. The Committee, however, are constrained to observe that SJSRY which is being implemented from 1.12.1997 in the revised format after merging the earlier UPA

Programmes, has not picked up momentum. The outlay for SJSRY at BE stage has been decreasing over the last two years. The Committee note that the expenditure as on February, 2000 was a meagre Rs. 42.83 crore out of a reduced RE 1999-2000 of Rs. 126.35 crore while BE 1999-2000 was Rs. 180.65 crore. The Ministry attributed the poor utilisation of funds under SJSRY to huge unspent balances with States and at the same time asserted that performance under sub-schemes of the Yojana would not be adversely affected by reduced allocations which appears to be totally contradictory to each other.

2.17 Further, the Committee note with regret that the status of unspent balances of the previous UPA programmes with States under the Yojana shows an increase from Rs. 433.73 crore (provisional) to Rs. 500.83 crore (provisional) for the same period i.e. as on 30.11.1997, which is further likely to undergo change as final figures are still not available from all States. The Committee observe that States have failed to utilise the unspent balances of earlier UPA programmes fully for various reasons out of which the chief reason is that the infrastructural support was lacking due to non-setting up of SUDAs and DUDAs, frequent reshuffling of personnel, insufficient training, difficulty in getting adequate cooperation from bankers and their reluctance to sanction loans to prospective beneficiaries under USEP and to top them all, according low priority to SJSRY by the States.

2.18 The Committee find that their apprehensions as expressed by them in their 23rd Report (12th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) with regard to negative role of bankers and their attitude of non-cooperation etc. have again become one of the prime *raison d'être* for the slow progress of the Yojana. They, therefore, desire that the Ministry should take steps to motivate the States to accord high priority to the implementation of the Yojana as the Ministry themselves were unhappy with the way the Yojana started and also is not fully satisfied with the State of its implementation by States. The Ministry should take up with the Ministry of Finance with regard to the negative and non-cooperative attitude of banks. The Committee also feel that the huge unspent balances with States under SJSRY could be due to the reason that USEP funds are not utilised by all ULBs. They desire that at least 50% of USEP funds should be spent by the ULBs on the urban wage employment programme under SJSRY. They desire to be apprised of the steps taken in this regard.

2.19 On the question as to why the funds are being released to States who have not even identified towns or completed the survey in the towns, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence as under:—

“We have taken a tough stand this year. It was a new scheme that started on 1.12.1997. The way the scheme started was a very unhappy one. It was to have a Municipality Urban Cell, District Urban Development Authority and a State Urban Development Authority. It took a lot of time to put in place this structure. But the community development societies which are actually supposed to be at the bottom of planning approach, took a lot of time in the States. So, for one-and-a-half years, we did take a lenient view. We have taken a tough stand this year. We are not giving the second instalment to those States which are badly doing. We are releasing money to those who have done relatively better. I am not saying those States are doing well. We can also take a stand like the Ministry of Finance and cut the money. What will happen is that the Budget will lapse and the next year budget will be cut. Ultimately, the sufferer is the poor people. I seek your support in giving a push to the programme so that we can also take recourse to cutting the Budget.”

2.20 The Secretary of the Ministry stated during evidence that the States of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnatka, Kerala, M.P., Orissa, Himachal Pradesh, and Maharashtra are the better performing States in regard to SJSRY Scheme. They have performed with about 40 to 50 per cent and that their performance is rewarding.

2.21 During 1997-98 and 1998-99, no diversion of Central funds under SJSRY was effected. However, during 1999-2000 a sum of Rs. 3434.68 lakh has been diverted to the better performing States/UTs as indicated in *Appendix VI*.

2.22 When asked as to why inspite of availability of a huge unspent balance of Rs. 500.83 crore, the central share of Rs. 297.56 crore was released from 1.12.1997, the Ministry stated in a written reply as under:—

“(a) The SJSRY scheme was started at the fag end of 1997 i.e. 01.12.1997. Since the scheme was in its infancy, the funds were released during the year 1997-98 and 1998-99. During the year 1999-2000, the funds have been released to the states in accordance with their reported performance.

- (b) The SJSRY is being implemented on a whole town basis in all the 3768 urban agglomerations/towns (as per 1991 census), whereas the earlier UPA programmes were not implemented uniformly throughout the country. While Nehru Rozgar Yojana (NRY) was implemented in all the urban towns, the Urban Basic Services for the Poor (UBSP) was implemented only in 360 towns whereas the Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme (PMI UPEP) was applicable only to Class II towns which was later extended to districts in North Eastern States and Garhwal and Kumaon regions.
- (c) The number of prospective beneficiaries under SJSRY was expected to be much higher than those who were eligible under the three old UPA programme viz. NRY, UBSP and PMIUPEP.
- (d) In the new SJSRY scheme, the subsidy amount involved per beneficiary is also much higher than in the earlier programmes.

In view of the position explained above, it was estimated that more funds would be required for implementation of the scheme, therefore, the additional funds were released during 1997-2000 inspite of the States having a large unspent balance of Rs. 500.83 crore."

2.23 During the current financial year (1999-2000), the States have reported (upto 15.3.2000) release of an amount of Rs. 2.60 crore. The State-wise details are at *Appendix VII*.

2.24 The reasons for such low levels of State share under the Yojana was due to the low priority accorded to this scheme (SJSRY) by the States which initially had led to the shortfall in the release of required State share. However, with the momentum in the implementation of the Scheme picking up, the States have started releasing the requisite State share and as on date there is only a shortfall of Rs. 2407.96 lakh (25%) against the matching State share of Rs. 9918.79 lakh to be provided against Central Share of Rs. 29756.37 lakh released till 15.03.2000.

2.25 The Committee note that funds under SJSRY are being provided in the ratio of 75:25 by Centre and States. They are distressed to note that till this year, the Ministry was releasing the funds to even those States who have not even identified the towns or completed the house to house surveys in identified towns. The Ministry admitted that for the past one-and-half years, they had taken a lenient view in this regard. Out of 25 States and 6 UTs, only the States of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh and Maharashtra are performing relatively better. The Ministry have also sought indulgence of the Committee with respect to stopping the second instalment of funds to States which are performing badly. The Committee also note in this context that a sum of Rs. 34.35 crore has been diverted to the better performing States/UTs and that inspite of availability of previous unspent balances of Rs. 500.83 crore (Provisional), Central share to the tune of Rs. 297.56 crore (cumulative) was released to States. The Ministry further stated this was done on the estimation that more funds would be required for implementation of the Yojana. It is worthwhile to mention here that during 1999-2000 the States have released (upto 15.3.2000) a meagure sum of Rs. 2.60 crore as their share towards the Yojana. There is a shortfall of Rs. 24.08 crore (25%) against the matching State share of Rs. 99.19 crore till 15.3.2000.

2.26 The Committee are dismayed to note this sorry state of affairs with respect to release of Central funds, the status of matching State share and the abundance of unspent balances with States under the Yojana. They cannot but conclude that the Government while taking a lenient view in the initial stage have not bothered to check the status of unspent balances with States resulting in a situation where the amount of unspent balances with the states is nearly three hundred percent more than the current year's allocation of Rs. 168 crore for the Yojana. The Committee are of the opinion that the Government need not look up to them for arresting this trend of under-spending by States. The Committee urge upon the Government to devise suitable strategies for enforcing the currently operative guidelines with added vigour so that the States fully utilise the amounts released to them for SJSRY and consequently the Government is not compelled to take tough stand on effecting cuts in their budget.

Physical Progress Under SJSRY

2.27 In the initial stage house to house survey, spatial mapping and establishment of Community structures in all towns are being done. The physical targets are being fixed by the State Governments in accordance with the general Guidelines on the scheme and beneficiary Survey.

2.28 The Ministry had not specified any time frame for completion of work of house to house surveys in all towns or the same to be done in a phased manner. The matter regarding house to house survey was left to the States/UTs. However, the States/UTs have been requested from time to time to complete the house to house survey as early as possible.

2.29 SJSRY guidelines specify that a house to house survey for identification of genuine beneficiaries will be done. Non-economic parameters will also be applied to identify the urban poor in addition to the economic criteria of the urban poverty line. Community structures like the CDSs will be involved in this task under the guidance of the Town Urban Poverty Eradication Cell/Urban Local Body. For ease of operation, if desired, the house to house survey and beneficiary identification can be got done by the State nodal agency through any identified body at the ULB/Community level specially empowered in this behalf.

2.30 The physical progress so far reported under SJSRY by the States is given as under:—

No. of urban poor identified under Scheme	324.15 lakh
Community Structures:	
(a) No. of house to house Survey conducted in town	3,382 lakh
(b) No. Community Development Society formed	5,154
(c) No. of Community organizer appointed	2,113
(d) No. of different level of functionaries trained	1,75,489

**Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP) and
Development of Women and Children in Urban Areas (DWCUA)**

(a) No. of beneficiaries assisted to set-up micro Enterprises	1,60,887
(b) No. of DWCUA groups formed	6,108
(c) No. of women beneficiaries assisted under DWCUA groups to setup Community Self Employment Ventures	4,540
(d) No. of persons trained for skill upgradation	1,29,551
(e) No. of Thrift and Credit Societies formed	19,047

Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP)

(a) No. of mandays of work generated	154.72 lakh
--------------------------------------	-------------

The State/UT-wise details of some of the above items is given at *Appendices VIII to X.*

2.31 The Committee note that house to house surveys, spatial mapping and establishment of Community structures etc. are being done as preliminary stages towards implementing the SJSRY. However, the States have been given the flexibility to fix physical targets in accordance with the Guidelines of the scheme and taking into account the status of beneficiary survey. It is, however, disconcerting to note that while allowing flexibility to States to complete house to house surveys in a phased manner, no time frame has been specified for completing the survey. The Committee observe from the State-wise details of the progress made under different components of the Yojana that while some States have done well, there are others where no progress or negligible progress has been made and certain States have not even reported about the progress made.

2.32 The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should closely interact with the States which are lagging behind in implementation of SJSRY and if feasible, take assistance of the enumerators deployed by the States for carrying out the decennial Census work, for completion of the house to house survey work under the Yojana so that within next six months the exercise is completed. The Government should also take adequate measures to see that the physical progress attained is commensurate with the expenditure incurred by the states under the Yojana.

2.33 The Ministry monitors the SJSRY by holding periodic reviews and field level checking of the progress by undertaking of tours by the officers of the Ministry.

2.34 The SJSRY Scheme is under review and it is expected that the existing deficiencies in the Scheme will be soon removed. Change in the guidelines of the scheme is expected to improve the implementation of the scheme and the Ministry would require more funds in future to effectively contribute to the alleviation of urban poverty.

2.35 A Committee has been set up on 22.12.1999 to review the guidelines of SJSRY in totality and its composition is as under:—

- (i) Joint Secretary (UEPA) — Chairman
- (ii) Representative of the Planning Commission — Member
- (iii) Representative of Integrated Finance — Member
- (iv) Secretary to Government of Uttar Pradesh — Member
- (v) Secretary to Government of Andhra Pradesh — Member
- (vi) Secretary to Government of West Bengal — Member
- (vii) Deputy Secretary (UEPA) — Member Secretary

2.36 On the basis of the difficulties faced by the States in implementing the SJSRY scheme, they have suggested some basic changes in the SJSRY guidelines, a gist of such suggestions have been summarised and are placed at *Appendix XI*.

2.37 The revision of guidelines is under active consideration of this Ministry in consultation with Planning Commission and State Governments and are likely to be finalised shortly.

2.38 The SJSRY is monitored by holding periodic reviews and field level checking by officers of the Ministry. The Committee note that the Yojana is under review with a view to change the guidelines of the Yojana. A seven member Committee headed by Joint Secretary (UEPA) has been constituted on 22.12.1999 to review the guidelines of SJSRY in totality in view of the difficulties faced by States in implementing the SJSRY. This review is under active consideration

of the Government. It is expected that after the review of the Guidelines of the Yojana, the implementation would improve and the Ministry would require more funds in future to effectively alleviate urban poverty. The Committee note that the Government have not specified any deadline for the review Committee to complete their task. The Committee urge that the review of the guidelines of the Yojana be completed within a stipulated time frame by the Committee without further delay.

B. National Slum Development Programme

2.39 National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) was launched in August, 1996 to provide an additionality to the normal central assistance to the States/UTs for slum development.

2.40 The objectives of this programme is to provide adequate satisfactory water supply sanitation, primary education facilities, health care, pre-primary, adult literacy and non formal education facilities etc. The focus is on community infrastructure, provision of shelter, empowerment of urban poor, women, training skill upgradation and advocacy and involvement of NGOs, CBOs, private institutions and other bodies.

2.41 The Scheme is applicable to all the State and Union Territories. funds are allocated to State on the basis of urban slums by the Planning Commission at the beginning of each financial year. *Inter se* allocation between states is made directly by the Department of Expenditure. The outlay for the programme is provided for in the Grant of Department of Expenditure.

2.42 Monitoring of NSDP is being done by the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation on quarterly basis by seeking information in the Management Information System (MIS) proforma circulated by the Ministry to all States/UTs.

2.43 The Planning Commission issued guide-lines at the time of launching of the Programme in August, 1996. These guidelines were revised in December, 1997.

2.44 During the years 1996-1999, Rs. 930 crore have been allocated to States/UTs under NSDP.

2.45 An amount of Rs. 385.08 crore has been allocated under NSDP for BE and RE 1999-2000. For BE 2000-2001 the Planning Commission has allocated an amount of Rs. 365.81 crore. Out of the allocated amount of Rs. 385.08 crore for 1999-2000, an amount of Rs. 332.08 crore has been released so far to the State/UTs.

2.46 On the question of the current status of the programme with regard to fund allocation/monitoring implementation etc. in the light of Committee's earlier recommendations on the subject, the Ministry in a detailed note stated as under:—

"A meeting was held by the Planning Commission on 8.2.2000 with the officers of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) and Secretary/Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation to streamline the allocation and release of funds under National Slum Development Programme (NSDP). It was decided that the NSDP will continue to be in the form of Additional Central Assistance (ACA) and is to be treated at par with the Additional Central Assistance under Basic Minimum Services (BMS). These are essentially State Plan Scheme as per the existing procedure, funds cannot be released directly to the Agencies/Departments concerned but only to the Finance Department of the State. However, the proposal for allocation and release of funds by the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation was not agreed to.

The matter regarding release of funds has since been revised by the Planning Commission and it was felt that unless physical/financial reports are made available to the Ministry of UEPA on a quarterly basis, further release of funds would not be possible. The Planning Commission has further emphasised that compliance of the NSDP guidelines especially *clause 4* may be adhered to with effect from the next financial year. Clause 4 of the guidelines is reproduced below:—

'However releases to States shall be made by the Department of Expenditure only after the nodal Department reviews expenditure, the physical progress of works and other performance criteria. The Department of Expenditure shall release funds to the States on the basis of recommendations of the nodal Department.'

As decided in the meeting the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation has also written to the Ministry of Finance to write to all the State Finance Departments conveying the monitoring mechanism as detailed in the Planning Commission's letter dated 18.2.2000."

2.47 On the question of lack of coordinated approach to the implementation of the NSDP as pointed out by the Committee in their 3rd and 23rd Reports (12th Lok Sabha) and 2nd and 5th Action Taken Reports (13th Lok Sabha), the Secretary of the Ministry stated during evidence as follows:—

“They said no to it as in that case it has to be a Centrally Sponsored Scheme”.

2.48 Asked further as to the manner in which this problem could be resolved, the Secretary stated during evidence as noted below:—

“We could not do it to our satisfaction. We said that let it be given to us and let the funds be on our budget. We said that we would release those funds to the District Urban Development Agency and to the State Urban Development Agency. Then we shall release the funds and monitor the progress of various programmes. But they did not agree to it. First of all, they said there cannot be any more Centrally sponsored schemes because all the State Governments are opposed to the Central sponsored schemes. They said it has to be done through State plan schemes. They have only conceded to the extent that before releasing the next instalment to the State Government they would get clearance from us. We would tell them the position regarding physical achievement. We could know the physical achievement position through our Field Officers. We could also come to know whether they are utilising the funds for the purpose it was released.”

2.49. The Committee observe that the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation is monitoring the implementation of NSDP, launched in August, 1996 to provide an additionality to the normal central assistance to States/UTs for slum development. The Committee in their 3rd and 23rd Reports (12th Lok Sabha) have already expressed their displeasure with regard to the peculiar nature and complex arrangement of the different aspects of allocations and release of funds and monitoring of the programme and the lack of a coordinated

approach to the whole problem by the Government. They had further reiterated their earlier recommendation that Government should take steps to evolve a coordinated approach to its implementation in their 2nd and 5th Action Taken Reports (13th Lok Sabha) to enable proper monitoring of the programme by the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The Committee, however, are distressed to point out that their recommendations have not been taken by the Government in right spirit as it is their considered opinion that lack of an integrated approach would do more harm than good. The funds under this programme continued to be released by the Department of Expenditure (DoE) while the monitoring of the programme is continued to be done by the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The continuing dichotomy in this regard has a serious damaging effect on the implementation of the NSDP. In case, if the Department of Expenditure would like to retain with them the function relating to release of funds under this programme, then the function relating to monitoring of the programme should be transferred to the Department of Expenditure for effective implementation of NSDP. The Committee, therefore, desire the Government to take a firm decision in this regard within 3 months and communicate to the Committee, the action taken in this direction. The Government have also stated that since matching contribution is involved in all centrally sponsored schemes, the States are not interested in more and more centrally sponsored programmes. The Government have stated that this is one of the reasons for keeping the NSDP funded by DOE and monitored by Ministry UEPA. The Committee are not inclined to accept the specious plea of the Government that in case of funding and monitoring of a programme if done by a single Ministry, the programme will become a centrally sponsored scheme. In case, the States are not agreeable to more and more centrally sponsored schemes, the Government may consider placing this NSDP as a programme in the State sector. However, the dichotomy as aforesaid shall have to be removed. They feel that the guidelines for implementation of NSDP should be changed. They, further desire that the guidelines be modified to provide for an active role for the wards committees in implementing the NSDP.

C. Night Shelter Scheme

2.50 This scheme was launched in 1988-89 to ameliorate the shelter condition of absolutely shelterless and pavement dwellers in metropolitan cities. Since 1990-91, this scheme is being implemented through HUDCO. In the light of various suggestions from the implementing agencies, this scheme was modified in 1992 in consultation with the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. The present scheme has the following components:—

- Construction of Night Shelter—Central Subsidy @Rs. 1,000/- and HUDCO loan of Rs. 4000/- per beneficiary is being given.
- Construction of pay and use toilet — Central Subsidy @ Rs. 350 per user is being provided.

2.51 No target has been fixed as the scheme is a demand driven one. Since inception till 31.12.1999, HUDCO has sanctioned a total number for 90 schemes of the construction of 18550 beds, 22585 WCs, 1442 baths and 1669 urinals.

State-wise details of the 90 schemes sanctioned by HUDCO under the Night Shelter Scheme (as on 1.3.2000) are indicated in the progress report of the scheme at *Appendix XII*.

2.52 The State-wise details of absolutely shelterless persons in various States as per Census of 1991 is indicated in *Appendix XIII*.

2.53 On the question of the number of absolutely shelterless people as per Census of 1991 in the metro cities, the Ministry in a post evidence reply stated as follows:—

“The authentic number of absolutely shelterless people is not available. The 1991 census however gives the number of absolutely shelterless households *i.e.* households occupying no room in the 23 Metro Cities as 6950. City-wise break-up of households by number of rooms occupied as per H-3 Table of 1991 Census Report is given at *Appendix XIV*.”

2.54 Asked whether the Ministry has commissioned any survey/ study to know the exact number of absolutely shelterless and pavement dwellers in metro cities, the Ministry in written reply stated as noted below:—

“The guidelines of the scheme provide that systematic survey would be undertaken in cities/towns by the local municipal bodies. Surveys would cover aspects like socio economic characteristics, occupation, household composition, present dwelling/working location so that appropriate programmes and projects can be formulated in this sector. As such the concerned implementing agencies viz. local municipal bodies or other State sponsored/recommended agencies are responsible for assessing actual local needs through specific surveys and formulate the scheme according to felt needs. Therefore, this Ministry has not conducted any survey/study to know the exact number of absolutely Shelterless and pavement dwellers. However, the Census of India provides the data about absolutely shelterless persons in various cities. This forms the base for continuing the scheme for a longer period.”

2.55 The Budgetary provision and expenditure incurred under Night Shelter scheme during the last four years upto 15.3.2000 are as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Provision	Actual Expenditure (Release to HUDCO)
1996-97	0.60	0.60
1997-98	1.00	1.00
1998-99	1.00	1.00
1999-2000	1.00	1.00

Against Rs. 1 crore in BE and RE 1999-2000 for the scheme, a sum of Rs. 3.40 crore has been envisaged for BE 2000-2001.

2.56 On the reasons for such steep hike in allocation for the scheme for the current year, the Ministry stated in reply as noted below:—

“As on 28.2.2000, HUDCO has sanctioned 90 schemes involving Central subsidy of over Rs. 35.61 crore. As against this, this Ministry has released subsidy of Rs. 8.20 crore only including the release of Rs. 1.00 crore during the current financial year. As such there is a wide gap of Rs. 27.41 crore between requirement and availability of funds. As a matter of fact a substantially higher allocation is required to cover this gap as well as to take care of new schemes that would be received during the next year. However, the allocation of Rs. 3.40 crore has been provided for 2000-2001. This may need to be stepped up further at RE stage.”

2.57 When asked in what manner the Government be able to meet the expenditure on account of the proposed subsidy component of Rs. 35.61 crore with a meagre allocation of Rs. 3.40 crore, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence as under:—

“There are three reasons which we have to see. When we talk of night shelter we have to keep different kinds of people in mind. They could be temporary residents and the persons who are making them their permanent house. They do not go out and it becomes another problem for us. Then there is a problem of maintaining these night shelters. If we entrust this job to the municipalities and if they neglect it, it becomes a stinking place.

So, we are now revising the guidelines and saying that these night shelters will be entrusted to the clubs and non-Government organisations. We will give some grant and they will take care of the maintenance part. Secondly, we are also having pay and use toilets. This is a major necessity for the urban areas. In the metropolitan cities nothing could be done through *shauchalayas*. We are making provisions for pay and use toilets. They can charge a little amount. We have not yet received much response.

Once the guidelines are revised, it will improve. We have requested the Planning Commission to increase the subsidy against the schemes already sanctioned. They have said that if the implementation of the scheme improves in the Ninth Plan, they will enhance the release in the Tenth Plan. So, we have to see that the scheme picks up.”

2.58 On the question of adequacy of the present scheme of provision of Night Shelter to the footpath dwellers in metro cities, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence as noted below:—

“Night shelter is given exclusively for women or for men separately. It is a temporary solution to the shelterless people. Instead of their sleeping on the footpath, we have provided the night shelter with toilets, bathroom, etc., at a cost of Re. 1 to Rs. 1.50 per night per head. But what we have seen is that most of the time husband, wife and children, the whole family live together at the night shelter. For family unit, night shelter is not the right solution. They would be only scattering themselves here and there. Even in a slum area jhuggi they will be having some kind of a kutchra house. They can be recognised and taken care of under some scheme. But these absolutely shelterless families cannot be covered under the present schemes.”

2.59 The Committee note that a scheme to provide night shelter and sanitation facilities to absolutely shelterless and pavement dwellers in metropolitan cities was launched in 1988-89. The Scheme is being implemented through HUDCO. No targets are fixed, as it is demand driven. Till now, a total of 90 schemes have been sanctioned by HUDCO for construction of 18,550 beds, 22585 WCs 1442 baths and 1669 urinals. As per Census of 1991, there are 2,17,000 shelterless families in States and 6950 households without a single room in 23 metro cities. The Committee, however, find that the Ministry has not sponsored/conducted any study about the houseless households but the matter has been left to ULBs for assessment of actual local needs.

2.60 The outlay for the scheme has been increased from Rs. 1 crore in BE 1999-2000 to Rs. 3.40 crore in 2000-2001. The subsidy component in the scheme amounts to Rs. 35.61 crore out of which only Rs. 8.20 crore have been released leaving a wide gap of Rs. 27.41 crore. The Committee note further that the Planning Commission contended that the releases for the scheme would be enhanced in the Tenth Plan, if the implementation of the Scheme improves in the current plan period. The Committee recommend that steps be taken to bridge the gap in the subsidy component of the Scheme by stepping up outlay at the RE stage. It is proposed to entrust the implementation of Scheme to clubs and NGOs who are expected to maintain these night shelters. The Committee desire that before the task is entrusted to NGOs etc., the modalities thereof may be worked out and adequate publicity is given so that public awareness is created amongst the users as well as service providers.

2.61 Furthermore, the Committee find that the scheme in its present form is inadequate to cater to the absolutely shelterless families in metro cities as the present scheme is meant to provide shelter primarily to the individual foot-path dwellers who could take shelter during night and for their other basic civic needs. The Committee, therefore, recommend that after obtaining basic data about the number of shelterless families in States including the metro cities, the Government should take steps to evolve/devise a scheme/programme to cater to the requirement of such absolutely shelterless families. They desire that the concept of 'Night Shelter' should be redefined to include the shelterless families of footpath dwellers instead of catering to individual footpath dwellers with a view to preventing disintegration of the families of footpath dwellers and broadbasing the provision of the service.

2.62 The scheme has been reviewed by the Working Group on Housing set up by the Planning Commission to formulate strategy for Urban Housing for the Ninth Plan. The group had recommended continuation of this scheme during the Ninth Plan for the following reasons:—

1. The Scheme aims at providing some kind of shelter, although temporary, to the absolutely shelterless in dire need of shelter.
2. The sanitation component of the scheme would provide for such needs of pavement dwellers and would also keep our cities, particularly metropolitan cities, clean.
3. The Scheme provides security to the shelterless women and children. The progress for the scheme is monitored through periodic reports, State-wise.

2.63 To enhance the scheme's performance, the guidelines, pertaining to the scheme are again under revision in consultation with the concerned agencies and State Governments. The guidelines of the scheme have been circulated to Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance. They are likely to be finalised soon.

2.64 The Committee note that the scheme has been reviewed by the Working Group on housing set up by the Planning Commission to formulate strategies for Urban Housing which recommended that it may be continued during Ninth Plan. The guidelines of the scheme are again under revision in consultation with all concerned to improve its effectiveness. The Committee recommend that the guidelines of the scheme be finalised at an early date to improve the performance of the scheme.

CHAPTER III

HOUSING

Although housing is basically a State level activity, the Union Government is responsible for the formulation of the broad policy framework of Housing Sector and overseeing the effective implementation of the Social Housing schemes, particularly for the economically weaker sections of the society.

3.2 A new Housing and Habitat Policy, 1998 was formulated and laid before the Parliament on 29.7.1998. The objectives of the policy are *inter alia* to create surpluses in housing stock and facilitate construction of 2 million additional dwelling units every year as per Government's programme.

3.3 As per this programme, it is proposed to facilitate construction of 20 lakh additional units every year, with emphasis on EWS and LIG sections of the population as also the needs of SC/ST and other vulnerable groups. Out of 20 lakh additional houses, 7 lakh houses will be constructed in urban areas and remaining 13 lakh in rural areas. This would require an additional annual investment of around Rs. 4000 crore. An action plan for implementation of the new policy for achievement of targets has been drawn up and the progress is being monitored closely.

3.4 The following revised targets for HUDCO, Cooperative Sector, NHB and others have been fixed for the year 1999-2000:

HUDCO	—	4.00
Cooperatives	—	1.10 lakh
HFI's	—	2.00 lakh (approx.)
Others	—	0.25 lakh
Total	—	7.35 lakh

3.5 HUDCO is the premier techno-financing institution engaged in financing housing and urban infrastructure in the country. HUDCO is the only Housing Finance Institution (HFI) in the country which earmarks substantial portion of its loaning operations for weaker sections. 55% of HUDCO's housing loans are meant for EWS/LIG housing for which loans are given at highly subsidized rates of 9% and 12% respectively much below the cost of raising resources. Government of India provides equity support to HUDCO to help it in its efforts to finance shelter needs of the weaker sections in the urban and rural areas.

3.6 The outlay for the period 1997-98 to 2000-2001 towards equity support to HUDCO for Housing is as follows:

Year	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-2001 (proposed)
Amount (Rs. in crore)	35.00	110.00	150.00	155.00

3.7 The equity is released against the authorised capital according to the budget provision available. No target has been fixed in respect of financial outlays. However, HUDCO signs a Memorandum of Understanding with the Ministry for each financial year, indicating the quantum of loans to be sanctioned and released for housing and urban infrastructure.

3.8 As on 31.12.1999, cumulatively, HUDCO has sanctioned loans to the extent of Rs. 27347 crore for housing and urban infrastructure on schemes envisaging 9121216 dwelling units, 506591 residential plots and 48,34,454 sanitation units.

3.9 The Committee observe that the Union Government is responsible for formulation of the overall policy framework for Housing Sector and overseeing the effective implementation of the social housing scheme with special emphasis on the Economically Weaker Sections of the society, though Housing *per se* is a State level activity. The new Housing and Habitat Policy, 1998 aims at creating surpluses in housing stock and help in construction of 2 million additional DUs every year. It is further observed that HUDCO is the principal agency of Government to facilitate construction of 7 lakh additional DUs in Urban areas. To attain this end, the

Government is providing Equity Support to HUDCO for Housing and cumulatively an amount of Rs. 295 crore has been provided during 1997-98 to 1999-2000. A sum of Rs. 155 crore has been earmarked for the purpose during 2000-2001. HUDCO has in turn sanctioned loans for Housing, cumulatively to the extent of Rs. 27,347 crore (as on 31.12.1999) for construction of 91,21,216 DUs and 506,591 residential plots. The Committee expect that with the equity support that is being provided to HUDCO for Housing, Government would be in a position to attain the target of facilitating construction of an additional 7 lakh DUs in Urban areas of the country with particular emphasis on housing for EWS/LIG sections of the society. The Committee further recommend that with a view to providing EWS/LIG houses only to the needy, the Government should persuade the authorities responsible for allotting these houses to develop objective parameters for identifying the genuine beneficiaries for the purpose of allotment.

3.10 Separate targets are fixed for sanction and releases of loans for EWS/LIG alongwith number of EWS/LIG units to be constructed each year. HUDCO has been meeting all these targets during the past four years.

3.11 The targets (original) and achievements for the year 1998-99 and 1999-2000 and targets for 2000-2001 under two million housing programme are given in the following tables:—

1998-1999 (As on 31.3.1999)

Agency	Target	Sanctioned	Completed units	In progress
HUDCO	400000	430399	11451	26919
Cooperatives	150000	175000	175000	0
HFI's	100000	136000	0	136000
Others	50000	17000	17000	0
Total	700000	758399	203451	162919

1999-2000 (As on 28.2.2000)

Agency	Target	Sanctioned	Completed units	In progress
HUDCO	400000	429503	69921*	149065*
Cooperatives	110000	110000	58184	52816
HFI's	200000	200000	—	150000
Others	25000	25000	—	25000
Total	735000	764503	128105	376881

* Cumulative figures for 1999-2000

2000-2001

Agency	Target
Hudco	400000
Cooperatives	150000
HFI's	100000
Others	50000
Total	700000

Only physical targets are annually fixed as the thrust is on provision of additional DUs.

3.12 The State-wise details of the DUs sanctioned for EWS/LIG separately by HUDCO, the cumulative number of units completed and those in progress for the years 1998-99 and 1999-2000 are indicated in *Appendix XV* and *XVI*.

3.13 The Ministry had issued instructions to its Senior Officers to visit various States and monitor the progress of Housing Schemes with particular reference to the achievements of various States in achieving the target laid down for them. These field visits are aimed at giving a feedback about the number of houses constructed, quality of construction and number of people benefited.

3.14 On the reasons for slow progress in respect of the targets set for HUDCO this Ministry stated in written note as under:—

“HUDCO has been entrusted with facilitating construction of 4 lakh dwelling units every year under the 2 Million Housing Programme. Against this, 11,451 units were completed in 1998-99 and 26,919 units were in progress. Cumulatively, as on 28.2.2000, a total number of 2.19 lakh units were completed/in progress. HUDCO has been making all out efforts to make the programme a success. Being a financial agency, HUDCO can only sanction/provide requisite financial assistance by way of loans. The actual implementation of the programme/construction of additional dwelling units is to be undertaken by the respective State Governments. It has been observed that many of the State Governments are not forthcoming to take-up construction of additional dwelling units which has been a major impediment for the success of the programme.”

3.15 On the question of the difficulties being faced by the Government in the implementation of the two million housing programme, during evidence, the Secretary stated as follows:—

“Of late, we are finding it difficult. The State Governments are in a poor shape because of the implementation of the Pay Commission’s Report. They are finding it difficult to provide guarantee to the State Housing Boards for borrowing loans from HUDCO. It is not only HUDCO but also even other agencies like banks, etc., are also offering loan. So, in spite of the fact that the rates of interest are coming down quite significantly, there are not many takers for loan, especially from the economically weaker sections of the society and the LIG. EWS means those persons whose earning are less than Rs. 2,500 per month. So, they find it very difficult and for them, we have sanctioned a loan limit of Rs. 40,000 and 20 Sq. Metres.

There are various things. Some State Governments say that with that amount of money, it is very difficult to locate land in urban areas. We have found that if you give them land, they sell it away at higher rates. In Chandigarh, they have been given built up houses. Multi-storeyed buildings have come up because it has changed several hands through power of attorney. That is one problem.

The second problem is that in many cases in Calcutta, Chandigarh and Mumbai, there are migrant labourers. They have not come to stay. They have no intention to stay there permanently on rent. The collection of rent is also an arduous problem. Otherwise, we have been able to achieve the general housing figures."

3.16 On the question of beneficiary participation and their satisfaction with the implementation of the 2 million housing programme the representative of the Ministry during evidence stated as under:—

"As regards implementation, wherever it is done within participation of community based organisation like NGO, other directly or indirectly the satisfaction level is high.

Our experience is that whenever people's participation is ensured there is a high level of satisfaction."

3.17 The Committee note that keeping in view the target of Housing in the Government's programme of constructing 2 million additional DUs in the country, HUDCO has been entrusted with the job of facilitating construction of 4 lakh DUs out of the 7 lakh additional DUs that are proposed to be added to the housing stock. The Committee also note that out of the target of 4 lakh DUs for the year 1998-99 and 1999-2000 under the 2 million Housing Programme, HUDCO has been able to facilitate construction of only 69921 DUs (cumulatively) out of 859,902 DUs (cumulatively) sanctioned during the above period. Construction of about 149065 DUs (cumulatively) is reported to be in progress as on 28.2.2000. For the year 2000-2001 also, the target for HUDCO has been fixed at 4 lakh DUs.

3.18 The Committee are however, constrained to find that despite the thrust on physical targets, the performance on this front has left much to be desired. As on 28.2.2000, a total of 2.19 lakh units were either completed or are in progress out of the targets set for HUDCO which amounts to less than 25% of the sanctioned DUs for these two years. The plea of HUDCO that it is only a facilitator in the whole programme while the States are to be blamed for the tardy progress is unacceptable to them when viewed in the context of the better performance of the Cooperatives, HFIs and others during the same period. This becomes all the more incomprehensible to them, when Government itself admits that the satisfaction levels are high when there is direct or indirect participation of the beneficiary either through CBOs or NGOs. The Committee recommend that Government should take concrete measures to boost the participation of the beneficiaries of the programme which in their opinion would go a long way in improving the performance of the scheme to come to their expectations. The Committee also desire that measures are taken to overcome the difficulties that are being encountered in the implementation of the 2 million Housing programme at an early date.

3.19 Performance of the scheme is monitored regularly. Review meetings at the level of Secretary and Minister ensures steady progress of the programme. An All India Review was scheduled for 25th February, 2000 with State Ministers and Secretaries in-charge of Housing, participating in the meetings. However the meeting could not be held as per schedule and it is expected that it will be held shortly.

3.20 Planning Commission had reviewed this programme as part of mid-term review of the 9th Plan. The Planning Commission had observed that the States of Karnataka and Kerala have done very well under the two million housing programmes. The Commission was of the view that greater emphasis appears to have been laid on achievements made and finances required to complete the targets under the two million housing programme in the urban areas.

3.21 The Committee observe that the implementation of the Housing programme is monitored by holding review meetings at the level of Secretary and the Minister to ensure steady progress. They note that an All India Review of the 2 million Housing programme by the State Minister and Secretaries was scheduled for 25.2.2000, but that could not be held. Apart from it, the Planning Commission had reviewed the programme as part of its mid-term review of 9th Plan. The Planning Commission observed that only the States of Karnataka and Kerala have done well under 2 million Housing programme in urban areas.

3.22 The Committee expect that the scheduled All India Review meeting by State Ministers and Secretaries in-charge of Housing would soon deliberate on the shortcomings observed in the implementation of the programme and Government would thereafter devise methods and take suitable remedial steps to overcome the drawbacks noticed. The Committee also desire that other States that are not performing upto the desired level of expectation in the implementation of 2 million Housing Programme in Urban areas be motivated to improve their performance. They desire to be apprised of the outcome of the All India Review and other measures taken in this direction.

CHAPTER IV

NEW PROGRAMMES/SCHEMES

A. New schemes proposed/dropped during Ninth Plan

The following new schemes were proposed by the Ministry for implementation during the Ninth Plan:

1. Saving Linked Housing Scheme with LIC support and HUDCO loans for Urban and Rural Poor.
2. Prime Minister's Awaas Yojana for Urban Poor affected by natural calamities.
3. Development of Urban Indicators.

4.2 Of the above, it had been decided to drop the schemes at Sl. Nos. 1 and 2 above as sufficient funds were not forthcoming. However, scheme at Sl. No. 1 above is being continued this year with a token provision of Rs. 1 lakh.

4.3 When asked about the reasons for a token provision of Rs. 1 lakh that is proposed in Demand for Grants 2000-2001 for the Saving Linked Housing Scheme (with LIC support and HUDCO loans for Urban and Rural Poor) which has been dropped on the ground that funds were not forthcoming, the Ministry in reply stated as under:—

“The token provision of Rs. 1 lakh was made for the scheme of Saving Linked Housing Scheme with LIC support and HUDCO loans for Urban and Rural Poor with the expectation that the scheme will be examined further from all points of view and implemented after the necessary approvals are obtained. However, this scheme has been abandoned.”

4.4 The Committee observe that Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation had proposed to introduce three new schemes *viz.* (i) Saving Linked Housing Scheme for Urban and Rural Poor; (ii) PM's Awaas Yojana for Urban poor affected by natural calamities;

and (iii) Development of Urban Indicators. The Committee observed with regret in their 23rd Report (12th Lok Sabha) that these three programmes/schemes were not approved by the Planning Commission even in the third year of the Ninth Plan and that a sum of Rs. 1 lakh was allocated for each scheme in Demands for Grants 1999-2000. They had also cautioned the Government to desist from such signal allocations and adhoc approach which would not give any tangible results. The Committee, however, find to their astonishment that again a sum of Rs. 1 lakh has been earmarked in Demands for Grants 2000-2001 for the scheme at Sl. No. 1 above which incidentally has been dropped on the ground that funds for the programme were not forthcoming and that Government wanted the scheme to be examined from all points of view. The Committee again urge the Government not to propose any scheme to Planning Commission without first doing the requisite spade work necessary for it to get clearance from all concerned.

B. Development of Urban Indicators Programme

4.5 A set of key indicators relating to housing and urban services was prescribed by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) for assessing the current conditions in housing and urban infrastructure as well as the progress in some other social sectors. These well-tested set of indicators are an essential component of the planning, implementation and management process.

4.6 The indicators are a useful tool for policy formulation and in managing the housing and urban infrastructure development policies and programmes of the Central, State and City Governments. An extensive training agenda is to be developed and training undertaken at decentralised levels. As a first step action has to be initiated for capacity building in the local and city Government agencies for developing and making use of the indicators.

4.7 It is proposed to extend financial support to the local bodies in the State as well as some NGOs for initial capacity building exercise. The State Government may provide suitable provision in their 5-year plan proposals for providing financial assistance to those organisations that will be made responsible for actual data collection and processing for this programme. The National Building Organisation being the technical arm of the Ministry shall play the key role in coordinating the activities in this regard. The Ninth Plan outlay proposed for the Programme was Rs. 10 crore.

4.8 The Ministry stated that as the scheme was not approved by the Planning Commission, no provision of the funds was made in RE 1999-2000. Against a provision of Rs. 1 lakh for BE 1999-2000, the programme has been provided Rs. 32 lakh for the year 2000-2001.

4.9 The salient features of the programme are:

1. National Building Organisation will act as the nodal agency for collection, coordination, collation and dissemination of data in respect of Urban and Housing Indicators;
2. Sponsoring of studies to Research institutions involved in the field;
3. Train manpower at municipal level to develop Urban and Housing Indicators at micro level;
4. Data in respect of Urban and Housing Indicators shall be collected at the State/Municipality level and transmitted to NBO; and
5. States/Metros shall be given grants.

4.10 Asked what extent State or city level administrations are involved in the implementation of the programme, the Ministry replied as follows:—

“As now Information will be directly collected by National Buildings Organisation from the City level administrators through INSAT, city level administrators shall be made directly responsible for collecting and transmitting the data.”

4.11 The Committee note that the Scheme of Development of Urban Indicators proposed for implementation in the 9th Plan period has finally got underway. A provision of Rs. 32 lakh for 2000-2001 has been made against Rs. 1 lakh in BE 1999-2000. The programme aims to develop these Urban Indicators as useful tools for policy formulation and in managing Housing and Urban Infrastructure development policies with active participation of Central, State and City Governments. The capacity building of ULBs is proposed to be further strengthened by developing and making use of these indicators. NBO has been made the nodal agency to collect, collate and disseminate information from city administrations directly through INSAT. The Committee hope the programme now implemented through NBO would help in formulation and management of Housing and Urban infrastructure policies and programmes to a large degree in future.

C. National Slum Policy

4.12 The Committee were informed during the course of evidence on Demands for Grants 2000-2001 that the Ministry had prepared a draft National Slum Policy (NSP). The draft NSP had been circulated to the States, Union Territories and also some interested NGOs.

4.13 The Committee were further informed during evidence that in view of the recent Supreme Court judgement on the subject in WP(C) No. 888 of 1996 the Ministry is facing certain impediments in formulating the National Slum Policy specially with regard to the applicability of the judgement to Delhi and the role of agencies like MCD, NDMC, DCB and other related ministries/agencies etc. The Ministry have also further sought opinion of the Ministry of Law on the above points as also whether the said judgement/orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are mandatory or advisory and the territorial jurisdiction of the court's said orders. The copies of the Supreme Court ruling have also been circulated to all State Governments to solicit their views.

4.14 The Supreme Court in their judgement of 15th February, 2000 in the above cited case have issued certain directions to the Union of India, Government of NCT of Delhi, MCD, NDMC, DCB and other related agencies/Ministries etc. with regard to keeping the city of Delhi clean, levy of fine on persons for littering the city and the modality of imposing fine, identification of sites for land fills, prevention of fresh encroachments/unauthorised occupation of public land for purpose of dwelling resulting in creation of slums, improve sanitation in existing slums and taking appropriate steps for solid waste management etc. These directions of the Supreme Court are intended for implementation by the above agencies in the city of Delhi.

4.15 The main objectives of the proposed National Slum Policy are:—

- (a) to create awareness amongst public and Government of the underlying principles guiding the process of slum development and improvement and the options available therefor;
- (b) to strengthen the legal and policy framework to facilitate the process of slum development and improvement on a sustainable basis; and
- (c) to establish a framework for involving all concerned for efficient and smooth implementation of Policy objectives.

4.16 When asked in what way the Supreme Court judgment is proving to be an impediment in formulating the National Slum Policy, the Ministry in a post evidence reply stated as under:—

“The Draft National Slum Policy endorses an upgrading and improvement approach in all slums. It does not advocate the concept of slum clearance except under strict guidelines set down for resettlement and rehabilitation in respect of certain slums located on untenable sites. Whereas, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its verdict given in case of *M/s Almitra and Others vs. Union of India*, directed Union of India through Ministry of Urban Development, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, etc. to take appropriate steps to improve the sanitation in the existing slums till they are removed and the land reclaimed.

The Ministry is in touch with the Ministry of Law on the applicability of the draft National Slum Policy in view of the verdict given by the Supreme Court in the case of *M/s Almitra and Others vs. Union of India*.”

4.17 The opinion of the Ministry of Law on the applicability of the judgment to Delhi and elsewhere is awaited.

4.18 Asked further by when the States are likely to give their opinion on the draft National Slum Policy, the Ministry Stated in a post evidence reply as follows:—

“This Ministry has circulated a copy of draft National Slum Policy to all States/UTs/NGOs/concerned Ministries. After the judgement of the Supreme Court, this Ministry has also circulated a copy of the verdict to all the States/UTs for their comments in the month of March, 2000. Efforts are being made by this Ministry to get early response from the States/UTs.”

4.19 The Committee note that the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation had as early as April, 1999 prepared a draft National Slum Policy. The draft NSP had been circulated to States, UTs and certain interested NGOs etc. The Committee, however, regret to note that the Government had not stipulated any time frame for the States/UTs and NGOs to give their comments on the draft NSP. The Committee were further informed during the course of evidence on Demands for Grants of the Ministry that formulation of NSP is held up due to the recent Supreme Court judgment in the case of *M/s Almitra and Others vs. Union of India* with regard to improving the sanitary conditions in the existing slums till they are removed and the encroached land reclaimed.

4.20 They are at a loss to understand the stand taken by Government that this judgment of the Supreme Court is an impediment in formulation of the NSP while a plain reading of the operative portion of Supreme Court's judgment shows that it pertains only to the redressal of problems of sanitation and other related matters pertaining to the city of Delhi. The Government has linked up formulation of NSP with the applicability of the judgment to whole of India and the mandatory or advisory nature of the directions of the Supreme Court. The Committee were informed by Government that a copy of the verdict has been circulated to States/UTs and also for the opinion of Ministry of Law on the territorial jurisdiction and the mandatory/advisory nature of the Supreme Court's judgment. The Committee recommend that after obtaining the opinion of the Ministry of Law on a priority basis, the Government should take steps not only to expeditiously formulate the said draft NSP but also take urgent steps towards operationalising the directions of the Supreme Court with respect to providing a clean and healthy environment to the residents of Delhi. They would like to be apprised of the steps taken in this direction at an early date. The Committee also desire that the National Slum Policy immediately after evolution, should be placed before the Parliament for approval.

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2000

29 Chaitra, 1922 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I

FINANCIAL PROVISION

MINISTRY OF URBAN EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

(A) Programme/Activity Classification

(Rs. in thousands)

Sl.No.	Programme/Activity	Budget Estimates 1999-2000			Revised Estimates 1999-2000			Budget Estimates 2000-2001		
		Plan	Non-Plan	Total	Plan	Non-Plan	Total	Plan	Non-Plan	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Secretariat-General Services	80,00	53,00	1,33,00	80,00	56,00	1,36,00	90,00	60,00	1,50,00
2.	N.B.O. including Research & Survey Schemes	3,52,00	84,00	4,36,00	3,25,00	84,00	4,09,00	3,50,00	86,00	4,36,00
3.	UNCHS International Co-operation Activities (IYSH)	60,00	35,00	95,00	60,00	44,00	1,04,00	57,00	45,00	1,02,00
4.	Grants in Aid NCHF	20,00	—	20,00	20,00	—	20,00	20,00	—	20,00
5.	Displaced Persons Colonies in West Bengal	5,00,00	—	5,00,00	10,00	—	10,00	6,50,00	—	6,50,00
6.	Financing Housing Schemes for Central Govt. Employees through Housing Agencies	—	100,000	100,000	—	8,00,00	8,00,00	—	10,00,00	10,00,00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
7.	Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana	179,85,00	—	179,85,00	125,55,00	—	125,55,00	167,10,00	—	167,10,00
8.	Finance to Public Sector Companies-Equity-Housing	150,00,00	—	150,00,00	150,00,00	—	150,00	155,00,00	—	155,00,00
9.	Night Shelter Scheme	1,00,00	—	1,00,00	1,00,00	—	1,00,00	3,40,00	—	3,40,00
10.	Building Material and Technology Promotion Council	4,00,00	—	4,00,00	3,50,00	—	3,50,00	4,00,00	—	4,00,00
11.	Central Govt. Employees Welfare Housing Orgn.	—	10,00	10,00	—	10,00	10,00	—	10,00	1,00
12.	Saving Linked Housing Scheme	1,00	—	1,00	—	—	—	1,00	—	1,00
13.	PM's Awas Yojana for Urban Pooors affected by natural calamities	1,00	—	1,00	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.	Development of Indicators Programme	1,00	—	1,00	—	—	—	32,00	—	32,00
15.	Interest Subsidy for areas affected by Natural Calamities	—	2,50,00	2,50,00	—	2,50,00	2,50,00	—	2,50,00	2,50,00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
16.	Interest Subsidy for Construction of 2 million Houses	—	5,00,00	5,00,00	—	5,00,00	5,00,00	—	5,00,00	5,00,00
17.	Lumpsum provision for North East & Sikkim	—	—	—	—	—	—	38,00,00	—	38,00,00
	Total	345,00,00	19,32,00	364,32,00	285,00,00	17,44,00	302,44,00	379,50,00	19,51,00	399,01,00

Sl.No.	Programme/Activity	Budget Estimates 1999-2000			Revised Estimates 1999-2000			Budget Estimates 2000-2001		
		Plan	Non-Plan	Total	Plan	Non-Plan	Total	Plan	Non-Plan	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
OBJECT HEADWISE CLASSIFICATION										
01.	Salaries	4500	11369	15869	4500	11369	15869	4500	11570	16070
02.	Wages	40	50	90	40	50	90	40	50	90
93.	Overtime Allowance	150	80	230	150	80	230	150	70	220
11.	Domestic Travel Expenses	1200	350	1550	1200	450	1650	1750	650	2350
12.	Foreign Travel Expenses	—	200	200	—	200	200	—	200	200
13.	Office Expenses	1400	550	1950	1400	550	1950	1900	550	2450
16.	Publicatioins	100	370	470	100	370	470	100	370	470
28.	Professional Services	200	—	200	200	—	200	200	—	200
31.	Grant-in-aid	1930700	1005	1931705	1333500	1005	1334505	1845200	1005	1846205
32.	Contributions	11200	3500	14700	6500	4400	12900	10700	4500	15200

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
33. Subsidies		100	75000	75100	—	75000	75000	100	75000	75100
42. Lumpsum provision		—	—	—	—	—	—	38,00,00	—	380000
50. Other Charges		410	726	1136	410	926	1336	410	1135	154
54. Investments		1500000	—	1500000	1500000	—	1500000	1550000	—	1550000
55. Loan and Advances		—	100000	100000	—	80000	80000	—	100000	10000
Grand Total		3450000	193200	3643200	2850000	174400	3024400	3795000	195100	3990100

44

DEMAND NO. 87—URBAN EMPLOYMENT & POVERTY ALLEVIATION

2052. Secretariat General Services		8000	5300	13300	8000	5600	13600	9000	6000	15000
2216. Housing		93500	87900	181400	85500	88800	174300	120000	89100	209100
2552. North-Eastern Areas		—	—	—	—	—	—	380000	—	380000
3475. Other General Economic Services		64500	—	64500	64500	—	64500	62900	—	62900
3601. Grants-in-aid to State Governments		1758700	—	1758700	1166700	—	1166700	1654000	—	1654000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
3602.	Grants-in-aid to UT Governments	25300	—	25300	25300	—	25300	19100	—	19100
4216.	Capital outlay on Housing	1500000	—	1500000	1500000	—	1500000	1550000	—	150000
6216.	Loans for Housing	—	100000	100000	—	80000	80000	—	100000	100000
Total: Demand No. 87—Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation		3450000	193200	3643200	2850000	174400	3024400	3795000	195100	3990100

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Grants-in-aid to UT Governments	25300	—	25300	25300	—	25300	19100	—	19100	19100
Capital outlay on Housing	1500000	—	1500000	1500000	—	1500000	1550000	—	1500000	1500000
Loans for Housing	—	100000	100000	—	80000	80000	—	100000	100000	100000
Total: Demand No. 87—Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation	3450000	193200	3643200	2850000	174400	3024400	3795000	195100	3990100	

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT SHOWING STATE-WISE RELEASE OF CENTRAL
FUNDS UNDER SJSRY DURING THE YEAR 1999-2000

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Amount
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1398.08
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	88.65
3.	Assam	191.07
4.	Bihar	408.63
5.	Goa	28.72
6.	Gujarat	340.62
7.	Haryana	182.23
8.	Himachal Pradesh	70.91
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	97.76
10.	Karnataka	1340.11
11.	Kerala	448.32
12.	Madhya Pradesh	1836.21
13.	Maharashtra	715.38
14.	Manipur	44.24
15.	Meghalaya	27.30

1	2	3
16.	Mizoram	146.30
17.	Nagaland	82.34
18.	Orissa	460.83
19.	Punjab	160.99
20.	Rajasthan	330.23
21.	Sikkim	30.02
22.	Tamil Nadu	514.00
23.	Tripura	82.52
24.	Uttar Pradesh	2344.02
25.	West Bengal	285.52
26.	A&N Islands	71.97
27.	Chandigarh	0.00
28.	D&N Haveli	54.06
29.	Daman & Diu	47.66
30.	Delhi	19.00
31.	Pondicherry	29.60
	Total	11877.29

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT SHOWING STATE-WISE EXPENDITURE UNDER SJSRY DURING THE YEAR 1999-2000

(Upto 15.3.2000)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Amount
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1646.73
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	123.36
3.	Assam	0.00
4.	Bihar	451.65
5.	Goa	127.45
6.	Gujarat	520.33
7.	Haryana	158.34
8.	Himachal Pradesh	688.86
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	155.58
10.	Karnataka	540.84
11.	Kerala	738.64
12.	Madhya Pradesh	1888.87
13.	Maharashtra	1619.83
14.	Manipur	0.00

1	2	3
15.	Meghalaya	25.74
16.	Mizoram	205.58
17.	Nagaland	114.13
18.	Orissa	671.56
19.	Punjab	764.52
20.	Rajasthan	356.18
21.	Sikkim	51.50
22.	Tamil Nadu	4959.67
23.	Tripura	85.16
24.	Uttar Pradesh	5518.72
25.	West Bengal	1646.79
26.	A&N Islands	44.91
27.	Chandigarh	7.66
28.	D&N Haveli	47.11
29.	Daman & Diu	5.91
30.	Delhi	20.43
31.	Pondicherry	25.28
	Total	23211.33

APPENDIX IV

STATE-WISE FUNDS POSITION (CUMULATIVE) UNDER SJSRY (SINCE INCEPTION) (AS ON 15.03.2000)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Provi-sional Reported unspent balance of old Schemes as on 30.11.1997	Central Share released under SJSRY from 1.12.1997	State Share released for 97-98 and 98-99	Total (3+4+5)	Expendi-ture reported	Balance Funds available with the States/ UTs
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2026.10	2516.61	823.95	5366.66	2505.96	2860.70
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	510.44	126.36	12.07	654.87	155.84	499.03
3.	Assam	1693.22	1554.53	11.72	3259.47	0.50	3258.97
4.	Bihar	3052.32	1463.71	159.96	4675.99	963.77	3712.22
5.	Goa	221.90	61.77	5.15	288.82	127.45	161.37

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6.	Gujarat	2662.33	1490.76	919.46	5072.55	871.85	4200.70
7.	Haryana	621.58	252.35	56.25	630.18	274.23	355.95
8.	Himachal Pradesh	698.03	137.78	45.86	881.67	693.28	188.39
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	696.18	143.66	10.68	850.52	182.24	668.28
10.	Karnataka	4371.61	2104.39	616.85	7092.85	802.81	6290.04
11.	Kerala	1029.44	730.18	193.36	1952.98	824.24	1128.74
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3053.96	2784.62	211.95	6050.53	4024.13	2026.40
13.	Maharashtra	4860.44	3915.33	1148.51	9924.28	1778.32	8145.96
14.	Manipur	540.50	358.31	0.00	898.81	0.00	898.81
15.	Meghalaya	311.47	218.99	0.00	530.46	78.14	452.32
16.	Mizoram	72.22	246.31	88.71	407.24	251.75	155.49
17.	Nagaland	681.19	156.32	63.73	901.24	165.32	735.92
18.	Orissa	1043.88	666.27	309.34	2019.49	1502.12	517.37

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
19.	Punjab	1541.47	257.41	16.87	1815.75	1093.81	721.94
20.	Rajasthan	3160.17	1092.43	212.22	4464.82	888.62	3576.20
21.	Sikkim	106.16	54.79	12.33	173.28	65.94	107.34
22.	Tamil Nadu	7514.66	2736.84	799.76	11051.26	8472.44	2578.82
23.	Tripura	80.67	315.28	68.71	464.66	160.46	304.20
24.	Uttar Pradesh	6930.64	3942.23	1251.07	12123.94	8451.22	3672.72
25.	West Bengal	2158.87	1528.15	446.86	4133.88	2786.02	1347.86
26.	A&N Islands	29.45	234.56	N.A.	264.01	85.55	178.46
27.	Chandigarh	77.70	129.40	N.A.	207.10	10.87	196.23
28.	D&N Haveli	73.31	58.44	N.A.	131.75	146.73	-14.98
29.	Daman & Diu	81.65	134.63	N.A.	216.28	25.52	190.76
30.	Delhi	199.24	235.31	0.00	434.55	56.93	377.62
31.	Pondicherry	276.60	108.65	25.46	410.71	32.85	377.86
Total		50083.40	29756.37	7510.83	8735.00	37478.91	49871.69

APPENDIX V**SWARNA JAYANTI SHAHARI ROZGAR YOJANA****STATE/UTS WHERE THE EARLIER UPA PROGRAMME
ACCOUNTS ARE CLOSED**

Sl.No.	Name of State/UT	Closure of Accounts		
		NRY	UBSB	PMIUPEP
1.	Andhra Pradesh	No	Yes	No
2.	Assam	No	Yes	No
3.	Goa	Yes	Yes	No
4.	Himachal Pradesh	No	Yes	No
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	No	Yes	No
6.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	No
7.	Kerala	No	No	Yes
8.	Madhya Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes
9.	Maharashtra	No	Yes	No
10.	Meghalaya	No	Yes	No
11.	Mizoram	Yes	Yes	No
12.	Nagaland	No	Yes	No
13.	Orissa	No	Yes	No
14.	Punjab	No	Yes	Yes
15.	Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	Yes
16.	Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.	Uttar Pradesh	No	Yes	No
18.	Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	NA
19.	Daman & Diu	No	Yes	NA
20.	Pondicherry	No	Yes	Yes

APPENDIX VI

SWARNA JAYANTI SHAHARI ROZGAR YOJANA (SJSRY)

DETAILS OF AMOUNT DIVERTED TO BETTER PERFORMING STATES/UTS (1999-2000)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of State/UT	Amount Diverted
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	493.40
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	39.20
3.	Bihar	88.50
4.	Goa	10.14
5.	Gujarat	89.50
6.	Haryana	73.42
7.	Himachal Pradesh	27.57
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	45.71
9.	Karnataka	515.11
10.	Kerala	135.56
11.	Madhya Pradesh	707.53
12.	Maharashtra	31.62
13.	Mizoram	43.07
14.	Nagaland	28.72

1	2	3
15.	Orissa	181.51
16.	Punjab	48.70
17.	Rajasthan	73.06
18.	Sikkim	14.22
19.	Tamil Nadu	22.72
20.	Tripura	2.44
21.	Uttar Pradesh	716.58
22.	West Bengal	12.62
23.	A&N Islands	6.50
24.	D&N Haveli	20.28
25.	Daman & Diu	7.00
	Total	3434.68

APPENDIX VII

SJSRY—STATE SHARE RELEASED IN 1999-2000

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of State	Central Share released during 1999-2000 (1st Instalment)	State Share required	State Share released	Shortfall of State share
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	312.67	104.22	Nil	104.22
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	10.36	3.45	Nil	3.45
3.	Assam	191.07	63.69	Nil	63.69
4.	Bihar	178.40	59.47	Nil	59.47
5.	Goa	6.43	2.14	Nil	2.14
6.	Gujarat	180.62	60.21	Nil	60.21
7.	Haryana	30.69	10.23	10.23	Nil
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12.30	4.10	4.10	Nil
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	7.81	2.60	Nil	2.60
10.	Karnataka	253.85	84.62	84.61	0.01
11.	Kerala	150.10	50.03	Nil	50.03
12.	Madhya Pradesh	345.67	115.22	Nil	115.22
13.	Maharashtra	469.82	156.61	Nil	156.61
14.	Manipur	44.24	14.75	Nil	14.75
15.	Meghalaya	27.30	9.10	Nil	9.10

1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	Mizoram	51.04	17.01	7.60	9.41
17.	Nagaland	18.83	6.28	Nil	6.28
18.	Orissa	82.72	27.57	Nil	27.57
19.	Punjab	53.86	17.96	Nil	17.96
20.	Rajasthan	142.00	47.33	Nil	47.33
21.	Sikkim	3.30	1.10	Nil	1.10
22.	Tamil Nadu	337.57	112.52	Nil	112.52
23.	Tripura	63.56	21.19	6.61	14.58
24.	Uttar Pradesh	772.78	257.60	147.03	110.57
25.	West Bengal	187.51	62.50	Nil	62.50
26.	A&N Islands	44.47	NA	NA	NA
27.	Chandigarh	—	NA	NA	NA
28.	D&N Haveli	3.27	NA	NA	NA
29.	Daman & Diu	20.66	NA	NA	NA
30.	Delhi	19.00	6.34	Nil	6.34
31.	Portdicherry	18.60	6.20	Nil	6.20
Total		4046.50	1324.04	260.16	1063.86

APPENDIX VIII**STATEMENT SHOWING STATE-WISE NUMBER OF URBAN TOWNS
AND HOUSE TO HOUSE SURVEY CONDUCTED UNDER SJSRY**

Sl. No.	Name of State/U.T.	No. of towns	No. of towns where house to house survey conducted
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	116	116
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	17	NR
3.	Assam	79	35
4.	Bihar	170	12
5.	Goa	14	10
6.	Gujarat	149	138
7.	Haryana	82	82
8.	Himachal Pradesh	48	48
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	70	25
10.	Karnataka	215	215
11.	Kerala	58	58
12.	Madhya Pradesh	410	410
13.	Maharashtra	244	244
14.	Manipur	NR	NR

1	2	3	4
15.	Meghalaya	NR	NR
16.	Mizoram	15	13
17.	Nagaland	9	5
18.	Orissa	102	102
19.	Punjab	131	131
20.	Rajasthan	183	183
21.	Sikkim	46	46
22.	Tamil Nadu	721	720
23.	Tripura	13	13
24.	Uttar Pradesh	684	684
25.	West Bengal	122	108
26.	A&N Islands	1	1
27.	Chandigarh	1	1
28.	D&N Haveli	1	1
29.	Daman & Diu	2	2
30.	Delhi	1	99 JJ Clusters
31.	Pondicherry	5	NR
Total		3709	3391

NR = Not Reported

APPENDIX IX

**STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITTED UNDER
UWEP OF SWARNA JAYANTI SHAHARI ROZGAR YOJANA**

Sl. No.	Name of State/U.T.	No. of mandays generated under Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP) (In lakhs)
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5.76
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1.04
3.	Assam	Not Reported
4.	Bihar	4.65
5.	Goa	0.64
6.	Gujarat	1.97
7.	Haryana	0.44
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3.99
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.15
10.	Karnataka	6.40
11.	Kerala	1.79
12.	Madhya Pradesh	15.16
13.	Maharashtra	6.79
14.	Manipur	Not Reported

1	2	3
15.	Meghalaya	0.25
16.	Mizoram	0.92
17.	Nagaland	0.27
18.	Orissa	14.78
19.	Punjab	2.56
20.	Rajasthan	3.60
21.	Sikkim	0.44
22.	Tamil Nadu	40.03
23.	Tripura	1.50
24.	Uttar Pradesh	29.37
25.	West Bengal	11.60
26.	A&N Islands	0.39
27.	Chandigarh	*
28.	D&N Haveli	0.62
29.	Daman & Diu	0.04
30.	Delhi	*
31.	Pondicherry	0.15
Total		155.30

* Not applicable

APPENDIX X

**STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITTED
UNDER DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF SWARNA JAYANTI
SHAHARI ROZGAR YOJANA**

Sl. No.	Name of State/U.T.	No. of beneficiaries assisted under Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP)	No. of mandays generated under Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP) (In lakhs)	No. of beneficiaries covered under Community Structures (In lakhs)
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	13111	5.76	34.93
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	NIL	1.04	N.R.
3.	Assam	NIL	N.R.	0.32
4.	Bihar	590	4.65	4.28
5.	Goa	132	0.64	N.R.
6.	Gujarat	6899	1.97	8.89
7.	Haryana	1355	0.44	0.80
8.	Himachal Pradesh	263	3.99	0.12
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1711	0.15	0.07
10.	Karnataka	802	6.40	8.35
11.	Kerala	7029	1.79	10.26
12.	Madhya Pradesh	42404	15.16	7.23
13.	Maharashtra	12654	6.79	14.44
14.	Manipur	NIL	N.R.	N.R.

1	2	3	4	5
15.	Meghalaya	414	0.25	N.R.
16.	Mizoram	978	0.92	0.40
17.	Nagaland	NIL	0.27	0.01
18.	Orissa	4873	14.78	12.07
19.	Punjab	2728	2.56	9.25
20.	Rajasthan	9216	3.60	9.46
21.	Sikkim	33	0.44	N.R.
22.	Tamil Nadu	3035	40.03	12.41
23.	Tripura	38	1.50	0.06
24.	Uttar Pradesh	50914	29.37	56.23
25.	West Bengal	845	11.60	50.41
26.	A&N Islands	NIL	0.39	N.R.
27.	Chandigarh	50	*	N.R.
28.	D&N Haveli	6	0.62	N.R.
29.	Daman & Diu	19	0.04	0.095
30.	Delhi	100	*	6.33
31.	Pondicherry	199	0.15	2.00
Total		170492	155.30	248.33

* Not Applicable N.R. = Not Reported

APPENDIX XI

REFERENCES/SUGGESTIONS SUBMITTED BY VARIOUS STATES REGARDING MODIFICATION OF SJSRY GUIDELINES

Name of the State	Suggestions as received
1	2
Orissa Kerala Chandigarh Maharashtra	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The subsidy under SJSRY which is now 15% of the project cost subject to the limit of Rs. 7,500/- should be raised at least 25% of the project cost with a limit of Rs. 12,500/-2. Higher subsidy to the tune of 50% of the project cost may be provided to SC/ST category.
(Regarding Subsidy under USEP)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. At present subsidy is being provided only to those beneficiaries who avail loan through banks for USEP components. Subsidy may be made available for small loans availing from CDS Thrift & Credit Societies also for the same purpose (without linkages to banks) as such beneficiaries are now denied of this benefit.4. Subsidy @ Rs. 1000/- per member of Thrift and Credit Societies admissible after one year of its successful operation. The provision needs to be made to allow atleast 50% after registration, of admissible subsidy after 6 months. This will help building confidence in members of the society.5. In Kerala under USEP special attention is being given to SC/STs and disabled persons, specially for disabled persons a

1	2
<p>Orissa Punjab Madhya Pradesh Haryana</p> <p>(Regarding UWEP)</p>	<p>special provision of 5% is reserved given till they are fully covered. Similarly a special reservation of "Twice the percentage of SC/ST population in the 1991 census in the ULB" is made. It may be suggested that the subsidy for beneficiaries belonging to the categories of SC/ST and disabled may be enhanced to 50% of the project cost of Rs. 10,000 per beneficiary which ever is lower, so as to enable them to get the maximum benefit under the scheme.</p> <p>6. In respect of SC/ST beneficiaries, subsidy under Swarna Jayanti Swarojgar Yojana is 50% and 10,000/- respectively whereas no such relaxation is provided to SC/ST beneficiaries under SJSRY.</p> <p>7. The amount provided under Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP) under SJSRY which is now limited to 34% of total allocation should be raised at least to 50% so as to ensure guaranteed employment to the urban poor.</p> <p>8. Under UWEP component it is earmarked that material labour ration for works under this programme shall be maintained at 60:40 ratio whereas in practice it is difficult to adhere to this ratio it should be at 50:50 ratio.</p> <p>9. Under UWEP, the material labour ratio is required to be maintained at 60:40. The State Govt. has suggested that the ration may be allowed to revise, keeping in view the fixed minimum wages prevailing in the districts from time to time.</p>

1	2
	10. Under the wage employment programme, the ratio between material and labour is at present 60:40. This ratio should be modified to 50:50 and instead of minimum wages, wages at the prevailing market rate should be paid.
	11. Under UWEP component, the material labour ratio is 60:40 it should be revised to 50:50.
Orissa	12. Release of funds under scheme by Government of India should be on Quarterly basis.
Kerala Medhya Pradesh Punjab Rajasthan Delhi	13. For the purpose of skill development the average unit cost allowed for training may be enhanced to Rs. 2,500/- per trainee for the reason that some services requiring special and technical skills would be rather expensive.
	14. Average expenditure of Rs. 2,000/- per trainee under USEP includes all costs <i>i.e.</i> material, trainer's fee etc. but in this regard it is submitted that there should be break up of Rs. 2,000/- on the NRY pattern so as to give justice to the beneficiary.
(Regarding Training)	15. Average expenditure of Rs. 2000/- per trainee under USEP includes all costs, <i>i.e.</i> , material, trainer's fee etc. but in this regard it is suggested by the State Govt. that there should be breakup of Rs. 2000/- on the NRY pattern so as to give justice to the beneficiary and this process will make the expenditure checking more easy in audit.

1	2
	16. For the purpose of skill upgradation/to encourage the members are rewarded with a small kit to start the business, the ceiling of Rs. 2000/- per beneficiary may be enhanced to Rs. 4000/- per beneficiary (Rajasthan State has not indicated the amount clearly).
Kerala	17. As per the existing guidelines, under IEC component, States can utilise upto 2% of their allocation for activities under this component. This provision may be modified to the extent that States may be permitted to utilise upto 2% of total allocation (<i>i.e.</i> Central + State share) for the activities under IEC.
Kerala Haryana Chandigarh	18. Managerial support. The services of one or two IRMA (Institute of Rural Management) graduates may be engaged on contract basis for identifying technically feasible and economically viable projects for DWCUA units as well as for the individual beneficiaries. During the course of implementation of the projects, they can also help to diagnose the ailments afflicting the projects like low investment, erratic projects behaviour, marketing maladies etc. and to intervene to remedy these ills.
Regarding DWCUA	19. Under the DWCUA scheme a group consisting of at least 10 urban poor women is eligible for subsidy. The group should be allowed for 5 women and above.
	20. For DWCUA group a minimum of 10 Urban Poor women are required to start and economic activity. This number needs to be reduced as it is quite difficult in the first instance to motivate 10 Women (BPL) and then to keep them together for a longer duration.

1	2
Punjab Meghalaya Madhya Pradesh Haryana Chandigarh Maharashtra	21. At present only those beneficiaries who are under matric are eligible to avail the assistance under USEP whereas in Punjab State generally beneficiaries are matriculate or possessing higher education, so minimum education qualification should be matric.
	22. The education limit of beneficiaries under USEP may be raised to matric or above.
	23. The guidelines of SJSRY prescribed that to avoid duplication with ongoing Prime Minister's Kojgar Yojana (PMRY) for the Self Employment component of SJSRY shall not applied to beneficiaries educated beyond the 9th standard. Central Government has revised the parameters of PMRY show that the educational qualification which was matric (pass or fail) has been relaxed upto 8th standard. To avoid overlapping educational qualification under SJSRY needs to be relaxed.
(Regarding Educational Qualification)	24. The present stipulation of education upto 9th standard for assistance under self employment programme should be done away with.
Haryana	25. The allocation of A&OE limit of 5% of the total funds may be reconsidered. Separate provisions for salaries of the staff and A&OE should be allowed as per actual expenditure by the SUDA.
	26. While making allocations, the allocation for the administrative expenditure should be indicated separately, as this would facilitate better maintenance of accounts and its submission to the Union Government.

1	2
(Regarding A&OE)	27. Funds under A&OE are being deducted and are to be added at the submission of the U.Cs and no separate U.C. for A&OE is to be submitted. It is difficult to add the amount in the components at the time of the submission of the U.Cs. Hence to maintain the sanctity and overlapping of accounting procedure, old procedure (NRY) may be adopted to.
Madhya Pradesh	28. The training programme should be modelled on TRYSEM.
Madhya Pradesh Chandigarh	29. In community structures indicated under the SJSRY Neighbourhood Group, Neighbourhood Society and Community Development Society have been clearly explained. The Neighbourhood Group is an informal body while Neighbourhood Committee and Community Development Committees are formal structures. Therefore, clear cut guidelines should be issued about the procedure to be followed in their elections, constitution and management. At the Neighbourhood and community level open election could be considered.
(Regarding Community Structure)	30. The guidelines stipulate that a maximum expenditure of Rs. 100/- per member for the first year and Rs. 75/- per member for each subsequent year will be allowed for the activities connected with CDSs. The concept needs elaboration, as certain activities e.g. sanitation, health care etc. are of common nature and cannot be confined to benefit the BPL families only. An illustrative list of activities will be useful.

1	2
	31. No minimum or maximum limit for contribution from members of T&C Society has been fixed. It could be anything between Rs. 10/- to Rs. 50/- some minimum monthly contribution needs to be fixed.
Punjab	32. It should be clarified in the guidelines that the tool kit is provided to the trainee, after successfully completing the training, if from the Rs. 2000/- or from the infrastructure support funds.
Chandigarh	33. Some cash incentive needs to be given to RCVs/Executive Members of CDSs. This will provide them some motivation for doing voluntary job.
	Banking Problems
Haryana	34. The bank procedures need simplification to avoid harassment to the beneficiaries. Although RBI has issued instructions for not obtaining any security for providing loan upto project cost of Rs. 50,000/-, yet some banks insists upon collateral security. Fresh instructions need to be issued to banks.
	35. A meeting of the screening committee should be held at UPE Cell level and the applications should be forwarded to banks after screening. A list of defaulters may be circulated to all the banks so that the beneficiaries are not required to obtain NOC from all the banks.
	36. LDM should be involved at the time of identification of beneficiaries. The concerned bank should obtain NOC from other banks instead of asking the beneficiary to collect it from all the banks.

-
37. The targets are calculated taking into account the maximum project cost of Rs. 50,000/-, which is reduced in some cases due to viability of the projects. Due to this the physical targets are achieved but financial targets remain unachieved. The bankers should be advised to achieve financial targets though it may increase the physical targets.
38. The main reason for the apathy of bankers is delay in the recovery of loans. The bankers may associate DUDAs and ULBs to help them in the recovery of loans.

(Non-cooperative attitude of Bankers has also been pointed out by most of the States/UTs from time to time.)

APPENDIX XII

**STATUS OF SANCTIONS OF SHELTER & SANITATION FACILITIES FOR FOOTPATH DWELLERS
IN URBAN AREAS UNDER NIGHT SHELTERS SCHEME**

Cumulative as on 1.3.2000

(Rs. in Lacs)

State	No. Of SCH	Project Cost	Loan Amount	Subsidy Sanction	Unit Sanctioned			Loan Release	
					Beds	WC	Bath		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A&N Islands	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Andhra Pradesh	3	338.27	220.68	12.00	2096	50	30	0	213.58
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Assam	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Bihar	9	324.87	210.22	55.51	5251	0	0	0	130.25
Chandigarh	2	56.04	0.00	4.74	474	0	0	0	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Delhi	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
D and N Haveli	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Gujarat	1	410.48	283.17	86.27	0	733	255	319	0.00
Goa, Daman Diu	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Himachal Pradesh	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Haryana	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Jammu & Kashmir	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Karnataka	0	0	0.0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Kerala	3	50.68	30.10	3.58	358	0	0	0	29.15
Lakshdweep	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Meghalaya	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Maharashtra	33	8046.88	2261.20	2456.58	0	17660	52	449	0.0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Manipur	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Madhya Pradesh	16	1981.26	703.15	692.73	6877	3215	644	615	198.29
Mizoram	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Nagaland	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Orissa	2	25.20	13.12	3.28	328	0	0	0	6.09
Punjab	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Pondicherry	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Rajasthan	17	642.65	57.04	230.69	1219	927	451	286	9.69
Sikkim	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Tamil Nadu	1	9.24	6.00	1.50	150	00	0	0	6.00
Tripura	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00
Uttar Pradesh	3	107.15	76.28	17.97	1797	0	0	0	49.07
West Bengal	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00
Total	90	11992.72	3860.96	3561.85	18550	22585	1442	1669	642.12

APPENDIX XIII

STATE-WISE DETAILS OF SHELTERLESS HOUSEHOLDS

State/Union Territory	Houseless Households
1	2
Andhra Pradesh	27,000
Arunachal Pradesh	Neg.
Assam	700
Bihar	7,300
Goa	2,000
Gujarat	17,000
Haryana	2,000
Himachal Pradesh	1,000
Karnataka	15,000
Kerala	4,000
Madhya Pradesh	16,000
Maharashtra	39,000
Manipur	Neg.
Meghalaya	Neg.
Mizoram	Neg.
Nagaland	Neg.
Orissa	7,000

1	2
Punjab	4,000
Rajasthan	8,000
Sikkim	Neg.
Tamil Nadu	8,000
Tripura	100
Uttar Pradesh	22,000
West Bengal	21,000
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	400
Chandigarh	2,000
Dadara and Nagar Haveli	Neg.
Daman & Diu	Neg.
Delhi	12,200
Lakshadweep	Neg.
Pondicherry	1,000
Total	2,17,000

Note: "Neg" — Negligible
(Source:—Census of India, 1991)

APPENDIX XIV

HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF ROOMS OCCUPIED AS PER H-3 TABLE OF 1991 CENSUS IN METRO CITIES

City Name	Total Households	Rooms							Unspecified Rooms
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6 & above	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Visakhapatnam	220,320	—	110,440	62,235	28,850	11,335	3,385	2,945	1,130
Hyderabad	687,820	40	205,860	213,780	123,015	76,650	31,980	32,625	3,870
Patna	164,490	20	40,560	50,060	33,625	18,885	8,525	12,785	30
Ahmedabad	664,765	15	265,050	200,620	104,350	60,595	14,635	17,645	1,855
Rajodara	218,890	—	64,670	69,010	44,555	25,715	6,355	7,990	595
Burat	284,935	10	140,005	74,135	39,170	17,760	4,820	7,580	1,455
Bangalore	794,065	5	309,970	248,050	118,745	57,850	23,530	21,010	14,905
Cochi	210,340	5	20,425	45,620	52,685	41,065	24,130	23,630	2,780
Indore	181,475	20	57,110	52,435	36,585	16,905	7,390	10,785	245
Bhopal	194,755	5	74,045	61,940	32,860	15,375	5,255	4,790	485

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Greater Bombay	2,663,015	205	1,886,150	538,090	170,745	46,260	12,345	9,185	35
Pune	491,165	10	299,895	105,670	48,385	24,280	7,000	5,920	5
Nagpur	299,720	—	96,285	106,190	54,530	23,795	9,620	9,300	—
Ludhiana	165,840	10	61,010	45,490	27,880	17,225	6,845	6,585	795
Jaipur	266,435	680	98,965	72,580	38,815	25,960	11,945	17,370	195
Madras	1,090,695	—	445,250	343,435	163,275	81,595	26,345	20,600	120
Coimbatore	232,190	—	78,580	82,270	41,015	16,625	7,165	6,510	25
Madurai	199,530	—	97,420	62,955	24,195	8,810	3,495	2,645	10
Lucknow	295,770	80	104,635	93,950	45,740	25,665	10,655	12,435	2,610
Kanpur	358,925	580	152,830	121,925	40,505	21,210	8,070	12,435	1,370
Varanasi	132,880	295	30,545	37,025	21,325	16,065	9,120	16,620	1,885
Calcutta	2,150,290	4,865	1,185,565	522,980	225,440	105,325	36,805	67,540	1,770
Delhi	1,689,166	105	766,596	456,325	262,271	122,691	40,882	47,481	2,815
	Total	6950							

APPENDIX XV

STATE-WISE DETAILS OF DWELLING UNITS SANCTIONED BY HUDCO FOR EWS/LIG

Sl. No.	State/UT	1998-99		1999-2000 (as on 28.3.2000)	
		EWS	LIG	EWS	LIG
	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	33063	—	33884	432
2.	Assam	19912	6338	—	—
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—
4.	Mizoram	—	—	—	—
5.	Nagaland	—	—	—	—
6.	Meghalaya	—	—	—	—
7.	Tripura	—	—	1175	525
8.	Manipur	—	—	—	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Bihar	45	338	—	—
10.	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—
11.	Punjab	—	—	—	—
12.	Haryana	—	2046	—	664
13.	Himachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—
14.	Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	—	—
15.	Delhi	—	—	—	—
16.	Gujarat	13976	—	17255	—
17.	Daman & Diu	—	—	—	—
18.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	—	—	—
19.	Karnataka	133708	—	55900	—
20.	Goa	—	—	—	—

	2	3	4	5	6
1. Kerala		62710	4858	59125	5600
2. Lakshadweep		—	—	—	—
3. Madhya Pradesh		50000	—	—	—
4. Maharashtra		3966	14747	—	343
5. Orissa		12000	—	—	100000
6. Rajasthan		—	—	—	—
7. Tamil Nadu		18142	—	1504	3096
8. Pondicherry		—	—	—	—
9. A&N Islands		—	—	—	—
30. Uttar Pradesh		44550	—	—	—
31. West Bengal		10000	—	150000	—
32. Sikkim		—	—	—	—
Total		402072	28327	318843	110660

APPENDIX XVI

STATE-WISE DETAILS OF DWELLING UNITS COMPLETED/IN PROGRESS BY HUDCO FOR EWS/LIG

Sl. No.	State/UT	1998-99				1999-2000 (as on 29.2.2000)			
		EWS Units completed	In progress	LIG Units completed	In progress	EWS Units completed	In progress	LIG Units completed	In progress
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Andhra Pradesh	—	—	—	—	4161	12674	—	—
2.	Assam	—	—	—	—	—	926	—	265
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4.	Mizoram	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5.	Nagaland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.	Meghalaya	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.	Tripura	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	Manipur	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9.	Bihar	—	45	—	—	45	—	—	—
10.	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.	Punjab	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12.	Haryana	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2710
13.	Himachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.	Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15.	Delhi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16.	Gujarat	—	—	—	—	—	6332	—	—
17.	Daman & Diu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
18.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19.	Karnataka	1451	389	—	—	31792	6171	—	—

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0. Goa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1. Kerala	—	26485	—	—	—	2645	73080	4858	—
2. Lakshadweep	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Madhya Pradesh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Maharashtra	—	—	—	—	—	—	1535	—	5667
5. Orissa	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	—	—
6. Rajasthan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7. Tamil Nadu	—	—	—	—	—	9120	5896	3000	—
8. Pondicherry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. A&N Islands	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
0. Uttar Pradesh	—	—	—	—	—	4300	4500	—	—
1. West Bengal	10000	—	—	—	—	10000	—	—	—
2. Sikkim	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total		11451	26919	—	—	62063	111162	7858	8642

APPENDIX XVII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE 11TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD
ON THURSDAY, THE 30TH MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1310 hrs. in Committee Room "E" Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri P.R. Kyndiah — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Padmanava Behera
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Ambanti Brahmanaiah
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
7. Shri Swami Chinmayanand
8. Prof. Kailasho Devi
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
11. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
12. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
13. Shrimati Ranee Narah
14. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
15. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
16. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
17. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
18. Shri Maheshwar Singh
19. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

20. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
21. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
22. Shri N.R. Dasari
23. Shri C. Apok Jamir
24. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
25. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
26. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
27. Shri Solipeta Ramchandra Reddy

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1. Shri S.S. Chattopadhyay | — | Secretary |
| 2. Shri G.C. Bhandari | — | AS and FA |
| 3. Shri J.P. Murthy | — | Joint Secretary |
| 4. Shri V. Suresh | — | CMD-Housing and Urban
Development Corporation |

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri P.R. Kyndiah to act as Chairman for the sitting under rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation to the sitting and drew their attention to the provision of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

4. The Committee then took the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation on Demands for Grants (2000-2001).

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings of the sitting was kept.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 5th April, 2000.

APPENDIX XVIII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE 15TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HI
ON TUESDAY, THE 11TH APRIL, 2000

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1230 hrs. in Comm
Room '62' Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri A. Brahmanaiyah
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
7. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
8. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
9. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
10. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
11. Prof. (Smt.) A.K. Premajam
12. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

13. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
14. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
15. Shri N.R. Dasari
16. Shri C. Apok Jamir
17. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
18. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
19. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
20. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy — *Assistant Director*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation.

3. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation with certain modifications as indicated in Annexure.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the report after getting it factually verified from the Ministry concerned and present the same to the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(SEE PARA 3 OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH SITTING
OF THE COMMITTEE DATED 11.4.2000)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	7	1.17	1	<p><i>for</i></p> <p>'observe with regret that'</p> <p><i>read</i></p> <p>'do not agree with the view of the Government that'</p>
2.			5 and 6	<p><i>for</i></p> <p>'of certain problems relating to bank finance.'</p> <p><i>read</i></p> <p>'the negative role and the non-cooperative attitude of bankers.'</p>
3.			last line	<p><i>after 'future'</i></p> <p><i>insert</i></p> <p>'The Committee also recommend that to monitor the situation and to arrest this trend, frequent review meetings should be held preferably at Minister's level.'</p>
4.	14	2.18	3	<p><i>before 'role' insert 'negative'</i></p>

1	2	3	4	5
5.			last line	<p><i>after 'by States' insert</i></p> <p>'The Ministry should take up with the Ministry of Finance with regard to the negative and non-cooperative attitude of banks. The Committee also feel that the huge unspent balances with States under SJSRY could be due to the reason that USEP funds are not utilised by all ULBs. They desire that at least 50% of USEP funds should be spent by the ULBs on the urban wage employment programme under SJSRY.'</p>
6.	24	2.38	3 lines from bottom	<p><i>for the existing 3 lines from bottom</i></p> <p><i>read</i></p> <p>'The Committee note that the Government have not specified any deadline for the review Committee to complete their task. The Committee urge that the review of the guidelines of the Yojana be completed within a stipulated time frame by the Committee without further delay.'</p>
7.	28.	2.49	last line	<p><i>for 'direct' read 'desire'</i></p>
8.	29	2.49	last line	<p><i>Add at the end</i></p> <p>'They feel that the guidelines for implementation of NSDP should be changed. They, further desire that the guidelines be modified to provide for an active role for the wards committees in implementing the NSDP.'</p>

1	2	3	4	5
9.	34	2.60	last two lines	<i>for the existing last two lines read</i> ‘The Committee desire that before the task is entrusted to NGOs etc., the modalities thereof may be worked out and adequate publicity is given so that public awareness is created amongst the users as well as service providers.’
10.	35	2.61	last line	<i>Add at the end</i> ‘They desire that the concept of ‘Night Shelter’ should be redefined to include the shelterless families of footpath dwellers instead of catering to individual footpath dwellers with a view to preventing disintegration of the families of footpath dwellers and broadbasing the provision of service.’
11.	40	3.9	last line	<i>Add at the end</i> ‘The Committee further recommend that with a view to providing EWS/LIG houses only to the needy, the Government should persuade the authorities responsible for allotting these houses to develop objective parameters for identifying the genuine beneficiaries for the purpose of allotment.’