

6

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

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

SIXTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

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. Brajmanaiiah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
10. Prof. Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Vijay Goel
13. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
14. Shri R.L. Jalappa
15. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
16. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
17. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
18. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
19. Shrimati Raneer 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. 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. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
32. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
33. Shri N.R. Dasari
34. Shri C. Apok Jamir
35. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
36. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
- *37. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
38. Dr. Mohan Babu
39. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
40. Shri N. Rajendran
41. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
42. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
43. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

*Died on 13.1.2000.

INTRODUCTION

1. the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Sixth Report on Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Twelfth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Urban Development of the then Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment.

2. The Twenty-fourth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 5th October, 1999.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 7th March, 2000.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 24th Report of the Committee (Twelfth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix III.

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2000

25 Phalgun, 1921 (Saka)

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twenty-fourth Report on Demands for Grants for the year (1999-2000) of the then Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999.

2. Action Taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 30 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

(i) Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15, 3.7, 3.10, 3.11, 3.15, 3.22, 3.23, 3.26, 3.30, 3.31, 3.35, 3.37, 3.38, 4.8, 4.14, 4.15, 5.3, 5.4, 5.7 and 6.6

(ii) Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:

Para Nos. 2.10, 2.13, 4.7 and 4.9

(iii) Recommendations in respect of which Reply of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:

Para No. 6.4

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

Para No. 3.5 and 3.6

3. The Committee require that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.

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

A. Full utilisation of funds for Plan Schemes**Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)****5. The Committee had recommended as under:**

"The Committee are concerned to note that the meagre outlay allocated for the different schemes of the Department of Urban Development (Plan) i.e. Rs. 723.29 crore during 1998-99 has been reduced to Rs. 664.65 crore at the RE stage. They feel that the reduction of outlay at RE stage for the planned schemes affects the overall implementation of the different schemes and had adverse effect on the planning. In the absence of uncertainty about outlays, no proper planning can be made for different projects. They, therefore, strongly recommend that whatever allocation is made for the planned schemes during a particular year should not be reduced at RE stage in any circumstances.

It is further noted that the reduced outlay at RE stage could not be utilised fully during 1997-98 and 1998-99 under the respective schemes of the Department. The Committee feel that not only inadequate allocation is made for the different schemes of the Department but whatever allocation is made could not be utilised fully. It is, therefore strongly recommended that the Government should ensure 100% utilisation of the allocated money."

6. The Government in their Action Taken reply have stated:

"The Ministry shares the concern of the Committee in regard to reduction of allocation at the RE stage as also non-utilisation of even the reduced allocation during 1997-98 and 1998-99 on the Plan schemes of this Ministry.

In regard to reduction of allocation at the RE stage, it is stated that the R.E. allocation is determined by the Ministry of Finance during the course of the relevant financial year taking into account the pace of expenditure under each scheme and also the other relevant factors like past balance with the State Governments, release of their share etc.

The relevant figures of B.E., R.E. and Actuals during 1997-98 and 1998-99 on an overall basis in respect of the two Departments are given below:—

Name of the Department	B.E. 1997-98	R.E. 1997-98	Actuals 1997-98	B.E. 1998-99	R.E. 1998-99	Actuals 1998-99	% Utilisation w.r.t. R.E. 1997-98 1998-99
(a) Budgetary Support	415.00	396.04	388.78	560.00	514.26	491.24	98.17 95.52
Urban Development							
Deptt. of UEPA	235.00	238.23	236.22	328.00	287.00	284.99	99.16 99.30
(b) EAP	114.00	114.00	53.47	64.00	63.50	25.25	46.90 39.76

It will thus be seen that the bulk of the saving is in EAP utilisation. In the case of EAP, utilisation, among other factors, depends on the remittance by the foreign agency. In this connection, it would also be relevant to state that generally provisions are made on higher revenue side so that inflow of foreign assistance is not hampered on account of inadequate budget provision."

7. The Committee note that RE allocation is determined by the Ministry of Finance during the course of the relevant financial year taking into account the pace of expenditure under each scheme. While stressing the need for absolutely no cut at RE stage for plan schemes, the Committee urge the Government to take certain corrective steps to increase the pace of expenditure during the course of a particular year to get the full amount of the allocated outlay under the respective schemes.

B. Revised guidelines for IDSMT Scheme

Recommendation (Para Nos. 3.5 & 3.6)

8. The Committee had recommended as below:

"The Committee find that not only the allocation under IDSMT Scheme was meagre, but the progress of expenditure in States/UTs and of the projects was not very encouraging. They feel that in view of the very low allocation, the scheme has failed to make any impact on the infrastructure of the covered towns. They, therefore, would like to urge that there is a need to give

a fresh thinking to the scheme as also admitted by the Special Secretary of the Ministry during his evidence. Besides recommending for higher outlay for the scheme, they would also like that Government should consider to distribute funds to the selected key towns rather than spreading the resources so thinly."

(Rec. Para 3.5)

9. It is further noted that for improving the infrastructure of the town/cities, an integrated approach, in planning process is required. They therefore, recommend that to achieve the objective, the Government should review and restructure the scheme."

(Rec. Para 3.6)

10. The Government in their Action Taken reply have stated:

"The Ministry agrees with the view of the Committee. It is a fact that the allocations under IDSMT are approximately Rs. 25-30 lakh per town per annum. Further, with 3300 towns still to be covered, the Ministry, if it were to continue to allocate the meagre resources it receives in the manner as it is doing so today, would take not less than 140 years to cover all eligible towns.

The suggested way could be reducing the number of towns under this scheme and thereby increasing allocations. However, this would require a change in the present guidelines as also a review of the scheme. The Ministry is undertaking a complete review, conscious that this issue needs to be addressed immediately. The matter shall be pursued with the Planning Commission consequent to the internal review of the Ministry being completed."

(ATR for Para 3.5)

11. "The Ministry endorses the view of the Committee, with the allocations being low the concept of integrated development itself is incorrect. Integrated development means development, which covers every aspect of urban infrastructure, which is required for a small or medium town. This would include projects such as roads, water supply, sanitation, solid waste management, parks, commercial complexes etc. The total amount required, if one were to cover all such infrastructure would run into crores. Not only that, if one were to prioritise certain infrastructure as essential requirement of a town, namely that of water supply, sanitation, solid waste management and roads one would find that even this would run into a few crores. In the light of this the present allocation of 25-30 lakhs is definitely inadequate. Accordingly, the Ministry is in the process of reviewing the whole scheme so as to

make it more relevant as also more effective. The results of our review shall also be sent to the Planning Commission for further action."

(ATR for Para 36)

12. The Committee note the steps taken by the Government to review DSMT and would like to be apprised of the final decision taken in this regard.

C. Centrally Sponsored Scheme for the cities having population between 5 to 40 Lakhs.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.7)

13. The following is the recommendation of the Committee:

"While examining the Demands for Grants 1997-98 of the Department the Committee had observed that at present there was no scheme to cover the cities having population between 5 lakh and 40 lakh and strongly recommended to consider to provide some scheme for such cities. The Government in their action taken replies to the said recommendation had stated that they had taken up the matter with the Planning Commission who ruled that it was not possible to introduce/formulate a new scheme in view of the severe budgetary constraints. The Committee in their 14th Report regarding action taken on their earlier report, while noting that inspite of recommending repeatedly by the Committee no action has been initiated so far. The Committee feel that it is not justified to ignore some cities on population criterion and hence reiterate their earlier recommendation."

14. The Ministry in their Action Taken reply stated:

"The Ministry of Urban Development is in full agreement with the views of the Committee. The Ministry itself has repeatedly addressed the Planning Commission on the issue, as such towns (those having a population between 5-40 lakhs) are 43 but house 22% of the urban population. Therefore, there is a strong case for a separate scheme to cover these towns which could act as counter magnets to Mega cities and halt migration. In this regard, the Ministry has addressed Planning Commission at the level of Additional Secretary *vide* D.O. letter dated 12.4.99 and subsequently reminded for expediting the case *vide* D.O. No. H-1411/44/98-UD.-III (M) dated 14th July, 99. The Ministry is extremely hopeful that the issue shall be re-examined by the Planning Commission despite paucity of funds."

15. The Committee note the efforts made by the Government to cover the cities between 5-40 lakhs of population by the centrally sponsored schemes. They hope that the decision in this regard would be taken at the earliest and the Committee apprised accordingly.

D. Data regarding vacant land

Recommendation (Para No. 3.10)

16. The Committee recommended as below:

"The Committee note that one of the functions of L&DO is to maintain records of Central Government land. They feel that huge Government land is not being properly used which could be a big resource. They would like to be informed about the data in respect of the Government land not being used at present."

17. The Ministry in their Action Taken reply have stated:

"The exact data of vacant land is not available now. Keeping in view the difficulties in conducting the survey and collecting the data in this regard, it is proposed to collect this information through Information Technology techniques like aerial survey, digitalisation, computerised drafting and map storage facilities. A proposal for this has been prepared by the NIC and as per their estimates, an amount of Rs. 1.82 crore is required for Base Map Data Applications. However, so far only an amount of Rs. 2 lakh has been received for the purpose (during 1998-99), which has been utilised for collecting map data of one colony having about 1000 properties and entering the same into the system and preparation of software for linking the map data with the alpha numeric data. Further progress of the project would depend upon the availability of funds. Simultaneously, survey of vacant lands and collection of data thereof with the existing manpower is in progress. It is expected to be completed by 31st December, 1999."

18. The Committee note that the survey of vacant lands and collection of data thereof was in progress and was expected to be completed by the 31st December, 1999. The Committee hope that the said survey might have been completed by now. They would like to be apprised of the report of the survey.

E. Municipal & Planning Committee in States

Recommendation (Para No. 3.37)

19. The Committee had recommended as under:

"The Committee note that in many States Municipal and Planning Committee have not been constituted. They would like to know the status of these Committees States/UT-wise."

20. The Ministry in their Action Taken reply have given the State-wise position of constitution of District and Metropolitan Planning Committee. The statement may be seen at Annexure I.

21. From the information furnished by the Government, it is observed by the Committee that out of 25 States and 7 Union territories, District Planning Committee have since been constituted in 6 States and 2 Union territories and are under consideration in 14 States and 1 Union territory. Further Municipal Planning Committee have not been constituted in any State/Union territory so far. However, in 8 States these Committees are under consideration. The Committee feel that the Government should persuade the remaining State Governments/Union territory administrations to constitute these Committees at the earliest. The Committee hope that the necessary information in this regard might have been received from Government of Meghalaya. They would like to be apprised of the same.

F. Under utilisation of funds allocated for General Pool Accommodation

Recommendation (Para No. 5.7)

22. The Committee had recommended as under:

"As the Government must be incurring substantial expenditure on rent for hiring General Pool Accommodation (Non-residential) the Committee feel that by releasing adequate funds for the construction of such accommodation, not only the rent liability could be reduced but assets would also be created. They would like that the Government should examine the possibility of raising funds for the purpose from the FIs/markets."

23. The Ministry in their Action Taken reply have stated:

"During the year 1998-99, an allocation of Rs. 40 crore (Rs. 20 crore under Plan and Rs. 20 Crore under Non-Plan) was made at BE stage for the construction of General Pool Accommodation (Non-Residential). The actual expenditure was, however, of the order of Rs. 17.36 (Rs. 9.85 crore under Plan and Rs. 7.51 crore under Non-Plan). Thus, sufficient funds were available for construction of G.P. Accommodation (Non-residential).

During the current year, an amount of Rs. 40 crore has been allocated at the BE stage (Rs. 20 crore for Plan and Rs. 20 crore under Non-Plan). The actual expenditure incurred upto Sept., 1999 is Rs. 6.12 crore (Rs. 2.39 crore under Plan and Rs. 3.73 crore under Non-Plan). Again, even during the current year, the allocated amount is not expected to be utilised fully. Thus, raising of funds from the FIs/markets would not be called for.

24. The Committee note that during 1998-99 and 1999-2000, sum of Rs. 40 crore was allocated each year for the construction of General Pool accommodation (non-residential). However, out of the allocated sum, only an amount of Rs. 17.36 crore could actually be spent in 1998-99 and in the year 1999-2000, only a small amount of Rs. 6.12 crore could be sent upto September, 1999. The underutilisation of allocated amount shows that either the estimates were not realistic or the progress of work was not being monitored properly. To ensure proper utilisation of scarce resources, the Government should make attempt to prepare more realistic estimates and should also keep a close watch on the progress of projects.

G. Full utilisation of allocated funds

Recommendation (Para No. 6.4)

25. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee find that during 1997-98 only half of the allocated money could actually be utilised. Further, during 1999-2000, the budgetary allocation is just half of the Budget Estimates 1997-98. They would like to know the reasons for huge underspending under this account.”

26. The Government in their Action Taken reply have stated:

The reasons for underspending can be attributed to the following reasons:

- (a) strict inventory control in purchase of spare parts, etc. resulted in savings;
- (b) delay in receipt of estimates for site preparation for installation of machineries, etc. from the CPWD;
- (c) delay in site preparation by the CPWD which upset the action for procurement of machinery and equipments as installation/housing of machinery and equipments was not possible for want of proper site; and
- (d) non-materialisation of purchase of machinery and equipments in time for the above reasons.

27. The Committee find that the Government themselves are responsible for getting the lesser allocation during 1999-2000 as the allocated funds could not be utilised fully. They also note that the delay in site preparation by CPWD is the major reason for the underspending. The Committee take serious note of the lapse on the part of CPWD and would like that the Government should take stringent action to make CPWD more efficient to achieve the results and 100% utilisation of funds.

CHAPTER II
RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED
BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)

The Committee are also concerned to note that the meagre outlay allocated for the different schemes of the Department of Urban Development (Plan) i.e. Rs. 723.29 crore during 1998-99 has been reduced to Rs. 664.65 crore at the RE stage. They feel that the reduction of outlay at RE stage for the planned schemes affects the overall implementation of the different schemes and had adverse effect on the planning. In the absence of uncertainty about outlays, no proper planning can be made for different projects. They, therefore strongly recommend that whatever allocation is made for the planned schemes during a particular year should not be reduced at RE stage in any circumstances.

It is further noted that the reduced outlay at RE stage could not be utilised fully during 1997-98 and 1998-99 under the respective schemes of the Department. The Committee feel that not only inadequate allocation is made for the different schemes of the Department but whatever allocation is made could not be utilised fully. It is therefore strongly recommended that Government should ensure 100% utilization of the allocated money.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry shares the concern of the Committee in regard to reduction of allocation at the RE stage as also non-utilisation of even the reduced allocations during 1997-98 and 1998-99 on the plan schemes of this Ministry.

In regard to reduction of allocation at the RE stage, it is stated that the RE allocation is determined by the Ministry of Finance during the course of the relevant financial year taking into account the pace of expenditure under each scheme and also the other relevant factors like past balance with the State Governments release of their share etc.

The relevant figures of B.E., R.E. and Actuals during 1997-98 and 1998-99 on an overall basis in respect of the two Departments are given below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Name of the Department	B.E. 1997-98	R.E. 1997-98	Actuals 1997-98	B.E. 1998-99	R.E. 1998-99	Actuals 1998-99	Percentage utilisation w.r.t. R.E.	
							1997-98	1998-99
(a) Budgetary Support								
Urban Development	415.00	396.04	388.76	560.00	514.26	491.24	98.17	95.52
Deptt. of UEPA	235.00	238.23	236.22	328.00	287.00	284.99	99.16	99.30
(b) EAP	114.00	114.00	53.47	64.00	63.30	25.25	46.90	39.76

It will thus be seen that the bulk of the saving is in EAP utilisation. In the case of EAP utilisation, among other factors, depends on the remittance by the foreign agency. In this connection, it would also be relevant to state that generally provisions are made on higher Revenue side so that inflow of foreign assistance is not hampered on account of inadequate budget provision.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

It is further observed by the Committee that the outlay at RE stage under Non-Plan during 1998-99 of Rs. 908.25 crore is higher as compared to the plan outlay of Rs. 664.25 crore. It is further observed that whereas Plan head was reduced at RE stage by about Rs. 59 crore the Non-Plan exceeded the BE about Rs. 39 crore. Similarly during 1999-2000, Non-Plan outlay exceeds plan outlay. They would like to be informed of the reasons due to which Non-Plan head during 1998-99 was increased to that extent. While the Ministry have been complaining of scarcity of funds for planned schemes the increase in the non-plan expenditure can hardly be justified. They would therefore urge the Government to take immediate steps to identify the areas of non-plan expenditure where expenditure could be kept to the budgeted limit and also to bring it down as far as possible. They will like to be informed of the action taken by the Government in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Comparative position of BE & RE 1998-99 and BE 1999-2000 both Plan and Non-Plan under three Demands of the Department of Urban Development is as under:—

BE 1998-99		RE 1998-99		BE 1999-2000	
Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan
723.29	869.24	664.45	908.25	774.34	969.68

Thus there has been reduction of about Rs. 59.00 crore on Plan side during 1998-99 at the RE stage with reference to BE as against an increase of about Rs. 39 crore on the Non-Plan side.

The main reason for step-up in the Non-Plan R.E. over B.E. during 1998-99 has been that the provision for Maintenance and Repairs which included sizeable salary component of work charged staff was increased (BE of Rs. 312.76 crores to RE of Rs. 342.81 crores). This included a sum of Rs. 10 crores additionally made available by the Ministry of Finance for the Maintenance and Repairs of MP's houses. The other areas of increase are Rents, Rates & Taxes (BE Rs. 76.12 crore, RE 81.00 crore) and Salary to Staff (BE Rs. 333 crore and Rs. 335 crore).

Decrease on the Plan side reflected the trend of expenditure and also the need to abide by the other procedural and conditionalities relating to release of funds. The observations of the Committee as contained in Para 2.14 of this Report have been forwarded to Ministry of Finance. In so far as the Deptt. of UD is concerned, the Non-plan provision includes a sizeable amount of payment of salaries and wages to staff and workers in the Government of India Presses as also the work charged Establishment of CPWD. CPWD is responsible for maintenance of Central Government properties both residential and non-residential which is a non-plan item of work.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)

From the data made available to the Committee, they note that percentage of urban population has increased from 23% in 1980-81 to 33% in 2000-2001. Similarly, the estimated contribution to National Income has increased from 47% in 1980-81 to 60% in 2000-2001. They, therefore, strongly recommend that Planning Commission should review the position of allocation of funds and earmark substantial funds for the Urban Development specifically the priority sectors. They would like that the Government should pursue with the Planning Commission for the enhancement of allocation. They also recommend that Annual Allocation should commensurate with the total allocation made during 9th Plan and there should not be any further cut for any schemes of the Department.

Reply of the Government

It has been always the earnest endeavour of the Ministry to seek maximum allocation of funds from the Planning Commission. Nevertheless, the major constraint in this regard has been the overall availability of Plan funds with the Commission and the comparative prioritisation with other sectors of development. The observation of the Hon'ble Committee have been forwarded to the Planning Commission and it is hoped that the requirement of the Ministry will receive greater attention in the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)

The Committee feel that no sufficient home work appears to have been done either by the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment or Planning Commission before chalking out any investment plan particularly the financial capability of the State Governments to contribute their share. They therefore, recommend that as observed in their earlier reports the Government in consultation with the State Governments should make proper study before launching any new scheme.

Reply of the Government

The observation of the Committee has been respectfully noted and a copy of the Hon'ble Committee's recommendation has been forwarded to Planning Commission as well. At the same time, it may be mentioned that since Planning Commission has shown inability to taking up of any major new schemes by this Ministry, scope of launching of any major new scheme is not foreseen.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.7)

While examining the Demands for Grants 1997-98 of the Department the Committee had observed that at present there was no scheme to cover the cities having population between 5 lakh and 40 lakh and strongly recommended to consider to provide some schemes for such cities. The Government in their action taken replies to the said recommendation had stated that they had taken up the matter with the Planning Commission who ruled that it was not possible to introduce/formulate a new scheme in view of the severe budgetary constraints. The Committee in their 14th Report regarding action taken on their earlier report, while noting that inspite of recommending repeatedly by the Committee no action has been initiated so far. The Committee feel that it is not justified to ignore some cities on population criterion and hence reiterate their earlier recommendation.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry of Urban Development is in full agreement with the views of the Committee. The Ministry itself has repeatedly addressed the Planning Commission on the issue, as such towns (those having a population between 5-40 lacs) are 43 but house 22% of the urban population. Therefore, there is a strong case for a separate scheme, to cover these towns which could act as counter magnets to Mega cities and halt migration. In this regard, the Ministry has addressed Planning Commission at the level of Additional Secretary *vide* D.O. letter dated 12.4.99 and subsequently remined for expediting the case *vide* D.O. No. H-14011/44/98-UD. III (M) dated 14th July, 99. The Ministry is extremely hopeful that the issue shall be re-examined by the Planning Commission despite paucity of funds.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 15 of the Chapter I of the Report).

Recommendation (Para No. 3.10)

The Committee note that one of the functions of L & DO is to maintain records of Central Government land. They feel that huge Government land is not being properly used which could be a big resource. They would like to be informed about the data in respect of the Government land not being used at present.

Reply of the Government

The exact data of vacant land is not available now. Keeping in view the difficulties in conducting the survey and collecting the data in this regard, it is proposed to collect this information through Information Technology techniques like aerial survey, digitalisation, computerised drafting and map storage facilities. A proposal for this has been prepared by the NIC and as per their estimates, an amount of Rs. 1.82 lakhs is required for Base Map Data Applications. However, so far only an amount of Rs. 2 lakhs has been received for the purpose (during 1998-99), which has been utilised for collecting map data of one colony having about 1000 properties and entering the same into the system and preparation of software for linking the map data with the alpha numeric data. Further progress of the project would depend upon the availability of funds. Simultaneously, survey of vacant lands and collection of data thereof with the existing manpower is in progress. It is expected to be completed by 31st December, 1999.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 18 of the Chapter I of the Report.)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.11)

While appreciating the steps taken by the Government to computerise the land records maintained by L & D Office, they would like that the exercise should be completed expeditiously and more transparency should be maintained. The copies of records should be made available to the public concerned when they desire, after fulfilling the required formalities.

Reply of the Government

NIC prepared a detailed project report for computerisation of L & DO with estimated cost of Rs. 2.83 crores. It is proposed to complete the project on a phased manner. The first Phase is estimated to cost Rs. 88.40 lakhs. However, during 1998-99, an amount of Rs. 40 lakhs was received, The utilisation details of which are given in the Annexure - I. The Action Plan for the year 1999-2000 together with the financial requirement is given at Annexure-II. It is expected that on completion of the project the functioning of L&DO would be more transparent.

The copies of the record sought by legitimate applicants are provided to them, after fulfilling the required formalities.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-LD
Dated 29.9.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)

The Committee note that not only the allocation under the scheme was inadequate but whatever was allocated during a particular year is reduced at RE stage. While urging for higher outlay for the schemes, they strongly recommend that the outlay should not be reduced at any cost at Re stage.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry agrees with the views of the Committee. Under Mega City Scheme urban infrastructure projects with cost recovery methods are to be taken up. Projects of basic infrastructure namely roads, water supply, sanitation, sewerage and solid waste management in Mega Cities are highly capital intensive. Central Government on the other hand allocates approximately Rs. 15-17 crore a year. The States release a similar share as a matching grant and 50% is needed through Institutional sources. However, the allocations from both Centre and States are very meagre and Institutional Finance too costly an option. Thus projects suffer, specially those which are non-remunerative in nature. While the Ministry has repeatedly taken up the matter with Planning Commission for enhanced allocation, however, the question of reduction in outlays is also a matter of concern and being addressed. We have written to the Planning Commission *vide* our letter No. H-11016/4/99-UDIII (M) dated 14th July, 1999.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.9.99)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.22)

While noting that only half of the proposed allocation has been made during 9th Plan for NCRPB and little funds could be received through Bonds, the Committee feel that serious attention has not been paid to the scheme. While appreciating the laudable objectives of deflecting Delhi's population of 20 lakh to DMA town etc. by 2001, they find that even after the lapse of about 14 years since the Board was constituted, the scheme appears to be on papers only. While viewing the position of Delhi which is bursting at the seams, the Committee strongly recommend that the city could not afford to delay the implementation of the scheme. While recommending that Planning Commission should be pursued to enhance the proposed allocation during the 9th Plan, they would like that serious attention should be paid to the implementation of the projects. To achieve the objectives, Committee feel that there is a need for co-ordination amongst the various sectors/Ministries and States involved in the process and Government should take necessary action in this regard.

Reply of the the Government

The approved IX Plan of the Board had proposed an allocation of Rs. 800 crore as budgetary support through the Ministry of Urban Development. However, this was reduced to Rs. 400 crore when the Ministry of Urban Development had formulated its consolidated IX Plan and submitted to the Planning Commission. Thereafter when the allocation for IX Plan was finally decided by the Planning Commission, this got further reduced to Rs. 200 crore.

In the meantime the Planning Commission had sanctioned an IEBR of Rs. 3120 crore, which the Board has been utilising to mobilise funds from the capital market through taxable and tax free bonds. The amount raised through these bonds along with the budgetary support from the Ministry of Urban Development are being utilised to meet the funds requirement of the Board for financing joint sector projects with the States. Further, in order to avoid delay in the implementation of the projects, all States and central Ministries have been advised to provide separate 'NCR Sub Component Plan' within their respective Five Year Plans and make requisite financial allocations. This is being coordinated through the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.9.99]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.23)

The Committee note that on the one hand the objective of the NCR is to deflect the population, on the other hand, FSI has been increased in Delhi. They feel that if the space in Delhi is increased, the investors would tend to invest in Delhi rather than in DMA town of NCR. The Committee would like to know the rationale for increasing the FSI in Delhi particularly in view of the fact that it goes against the objectives of NCR.

Reply of the Government

- (i) MPD-2001 approved by the Government of India and notified on 1.8.90 had suggested two pronged strategy to accommodate the increase in population/projected population during the plan period i.e. 1981-2001. One of the strategy was to redensify the existing residential area and the other was to develop new areas as part of urban extension.

It is within this framework of strategy, of re-densification of existing residential areas, that the FSI in Delhi is considered to be increased on the basis of the recommendations of Malhotra Committee set up by the Ministry of Urban Development:—

- (ii) The investment in the housing sector due to increase in FSI of the existing plots in Delhi and in general will not attract the investors who would otherwise be investing in DMA towns of NCR.
- (iii) The increase in FSI on the existing plot has also facilitated the optimum utilisation of available and as a resource in the urban area.
- (iv) The major immigrants are the poor and landless workers coming to Delhi for economic opportunities. This group is not benefiting from the relaxed FSI thus this factor is not going to attract further population as such.

In view of the above the rationale for increasing the FSI in Delhi is to solve the problems of a small plot and of housing shortage to some extent in the city and is within the framework of MPD-2001.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M.No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.9.99]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.26)

While noting that the financial assistance by the Central Government is given to States to meet partly the cost of studies being undertaken by them, they would urge the Central Government to impress upon the State Governments that while sanctioning plans for new colonies in their States they should ensure that enough land/resources are kept apart to meet the requirement of road rail transport that may be required to be developed in future.

Reply of the Government

The State Governments/UTs have been requested that while sanctioning plans for new colonies in their States they should ensure that enough land/resources are kept apart to meet the requirement of road rail transport that may be required to be developed in future.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 30.11.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.30)

The Committee note that the Government have allocated only 25% of the proposed allocation under MRTS during 9th Plan. They take serious view of it and would like that the Department should take up the matter with the Planning Commission again for allocating adequate funds as the cut in allocation would lead to delay in the implementation and also cost escalation of the project.

Reply of the Government

The matter regarding adequate funds for equity of Delhi MRTS Project was taken up with the Planning Commission. However, it has not been possible for the Planning Commission to make additional allocation of funds for the project. The matter will again be pursued with the Planning Commission for increase in allocation.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
Dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.31)

The Committee also note that as per pres^t reports, there appears to be a lack of coordination between various agencies of the Government in giving clearance to the matters pertaining to the concerned agencies. The same reports have also gone to state that a day's delay cost a loss of Rs. 1.39 crore to the exchequer. In view of the importance of the scheme for the people of NCR and also in view of the reported loss, the Committee would urge upon the Government

to issue suitable instructions to all the agencies concerned not to delay the project for one reason or the other. They would like to be informed of the action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Proper liaison is being maintained between the concerned departments of the Government and other agencies to ensure the commissioning of the project by the target date of March, 2005.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.35)

The Committee take serious note of the poor condition of urban mapping in the country. It is alarming to note that majority of the towns of the country don't have even the base maps, not to talk of the updated maps. They feel that since the maps are the important documents for the planning purpose, serious attention should be paid to the urban mapping. Majority of the land related court cases are due to the absence of correct and updated maps. It is recommended that sufficient funds should be provided under the scheme. Not only that, they would also like that Government should think of launching a 100 per cent centrally sponsored scheme for the urban maps as is being done at present under the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

Reply of the Government

It is clarified that the Urban Mapping Scheme is a Central Sector Scheme being 100% funded by the Central Government thus for the present perhaps no new scheme needs to be launched. However, looking to the fact that as of now only 25 towns have been covered under the scheme and with the country having a total of more than 4615 towns, it would take a large number of years before all towns would be covered. The allocations under the scheme have generally been about a crore and at this rate for the scheme to make an impact is difficult. The Ministry, therefore, endorses the views of the Committee completely and has accordingly taken up the matter with the Planning Commission *vide* its letter No. H-11016/4/99-UDII (M) dated 14th July, 1999.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.37)

The Committee note that in many States Municipal and Planning Committees have not been constituted. They would like to know the status of these Committees States/UT-wise.

Reply of the Government

The State-wise position of Constitution of District and Metropolitan Planning Committee is in the Annexure.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 21 of the Chapter I of the Report.)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.38)

While appreciating the initiatives taken by 10th Central Finance Commission by making *ad-hoc* grant of Rs. 1000 crore to the States for the capacity building of Urban Local Bodies, they would like that the funds should expeditiously be made available to the respective local bodies in all the States/UTs to ensure the implementation of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes. They also recommend that the said grant as when released, should be closely monitored to ensure its proper utilisation by the local bodies.

Reply of the Government

The grant-in-aid to States on the recommendations of Central Finance Commission is released by the Finance Commission Division of the Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance for undertaking development projects. This grant is being released to States since 1996-97. The release of grant-in-aid is regulated under the provisions stipulated in the "Revised Guidelines for utilisation of the grant from the Central Government to the state Government for Local Bodies on the recommendation of the Tenth Finance Commission" which were framed by Ministry of Finance in consultation with the Planning Commission, Ministry of Rural Development and this Ministry. For expeditious release of funds to the local bodies, this guideline, *inter-alia* provides that under no circumstances should the released grants be diverted to other purpose or held back by the State Government.

However with the implementation of these guidelines, it has been observed that some of its provisions are coming in the way of effective utilisation of the Central Grants by local bodies. Accordingly, Finance Ministry has been requested to consider the revision of the guidelines for effective utilisation of grants released on the recommendation of the Central Finance Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.8)

While appreciating the budgetary constraints, the Committee feel that more funds are required for the scheme as water is a fundamental necessity for human beings and is in the priority sector of the Government. They regret to note that allocation during Ninth Plan for the most priority programme, AUWSP is around 10% of the proposed money. They would like to know the rationale for such a low allocation for the programme. Besides recommending for higher outlay, they would also like that it should be ensured that the scarce resources made available to the different States/UTs are utilised fully for the purpose.

Reply of the Government

This Ministry shares the views of the Hon'ble Committee and feels that more funds are required for the water supply sector since water is a fundamental necessity for human beings. In order to get a higher allocation for the water supply sector, this Ministry had requested the Planning Commission vide D.O. letter dated 3rd September, 1998 written by the Special Secretary to the Adviser (WS & HUD), Planning Commission urging the Planning Commission to make a higher allocation for the water supply sector. Against the proposal of Rs. 5608.50 crore for water supply and sanitation sector for the 9th Plan, an allocation of Rs. 800 crore has been made in view of limited budgetary resources. Rs. 370 crore have been allocated for the Centrally Sponsored Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP) meant for towns having population less than 20,000 as per 1991 census. The State Governments are advised from time to time during various meetings, which are held to review the water supply and sanitation schemes, to ensure that the scarce resources which are made available for water supply sector are optimally utilised. In order to stress upon

further on the valuable advice of the Hon'ble Committee, the States/UTs are being once again advised to ensure optimal utilisation of the scarce resources.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.14)

The Committee observe that out of a total of 3643 towns which were to be covered under the scheme, only 1167 towns could be covered till 1998-99. As regards financial achievement under the scheme, out of an amount of Rs. 504.07 crore which was sanctioned as loan, only Rs. 175.39 crore was released. It is needless to emphasize on the importance of the scheme as on its success depends the liberation of 1,21,591 persons, who due to reasons beyond their control have to carry night soil on their head. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to tackle this problem on war footing and in consultation with the Planning Commission, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and State Governments should evolve ways and means to complete the work as early as possible.

Reply of the Government

This Ministry shares the views of the Hon'ble Committee and believes that the dehumanising practice of carrying night soil should be abolished in the country as early as possible. In order to eliminate the practice of carrying night soil, the Centrally sponsored scheme of Urban Low Cost Sanitation (LCS) for liberation of scavengers is being operated through this Ministry. Under the scheme existing dry latrines are being converted into low cost pour flush latrines and the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment is looking after the rehabilitation of liberated scavengers.

There were 4 lakhs scavengers and 72.1 lakhs dry latrines in urban areas as per the estimate of the Committee constituted by the Planning Commission in 1988-89. The 8th Plan envisaged conversion of dry latrines into Low Cost Pour Flush Twin Pit Latrines and thereby liberating all these scavengers during this period. However, this could not be achieved due to resource constraint during the 8th Five Year Plan and some other reasons mentioned below. To convert all the dry latrines into pour flush toilets, the Working Group for the formulation of Ninth Five Year Plan on Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Sector has estimated that an investment of Rs. 6057 crore would be required. The physical targets, which could be achieved would depend on the availability of the financial resources. The 9th Plan allocation for the

LCS scheme is Rs. 200.00 crore. Details of the funds allocated/released under the scheme during the 9th Plan are as under:—

(Rs. in crores)			
Year	Budget Allocation	Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure
1997-98	27.80	26.80	26.80
1998-99	27.80	23.80	23.80
1999-2000	34.65	—	—
(As on 31.5.99)			

The scheme has been taken up on a whole town basis and is being operated through the HUDCO.

As on 31.5.99, 821 schemes have been sanctioned (country-wise) at a project cost of Rs. 126158.72 lakhs involving loan amount of Rs. 57195.32 lakhs and a subsidy of Rs. 44428.47 lakhs. The number of conversion/construction, which would be carried out with the completion of these schemes, is 3609062. The community toilets which would be constructed are 3463. A total number of 1212 towns have been covered and 122417 scavengers would be liberated. The loan amount released as on 31.5.99 is Rs. 21808.98 lakhs and subsidy released is Rs. 18360.61 lakhs. The units completed (conversion/construction) are 8,45,196 and units in progress (conversion/construction) are 2,40,600. The total number of scavengers liberated till 31.5.99 are 28137 and 165 towns have been declared scavenger-free.

The slow progress of the scheme is attributed to the following:—

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

The State Governments have been requested from time to time to take necessary steps to eliminate the practice of manual scavenging and to adopt The Employment of Manual Scavengers

& Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993. The Act has become applicable to Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura, West Bengal and UTs with effect from 26.1.97. The State Assemblies of Orissa, Punjab, Assam, Haryana, Bihar and Gujarat have also adopted the Act.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)

The Committee also note that while rehabilitation of scavengers was one of the objectives of the scheme, the rehabilitation is being done by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. They would like that coordination should be maintained with the said Ministry to ensure that the scavengers liberated under the scheme are rehabilitated properly. To ensure better coordination, it is recommended that a joint working group of the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment and Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment should be constituted.

Reply of the Government

The valuable suggestion of the Hon'ble Committee has merit as coordination between this Ministry and the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment will go a long way in effective implementation of the Centrally sponsored Low Cost Sanitation scheme for Liberation and Rehabilitation of Scavengers. In line with the suggestion given by the Hon'ble Committee, a Coordination Committee has been set up under the Chairmanship of the Joint Secretary (dealing with the subject) in this Ministry to include new towns under the Low Cost Sanitation Scheme. In the Coordination Committee meetings, a representative from the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment is also being invited, as suggested by the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.3)

The Committee find that the objective to meet the 100% satisfaction level in various stations where Central Government Servants are posted could not be achieved due to uncertainty of the availability of funds. The Committee recommend that the Planning Commission should be requested to ensure to release actual allocation in Annual Plans commensurating with the allocation made during Ninth Plan so that proper planning in this field can be made.

Reply of the Government

The yearly allocation of funds for the GPRA during the 8th and 9th plan periods are given below:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	8th Plan	Allocation	9th Plan	Allocation
1st year	1992-93	19.00	1997-98	61.35
2nd year	1993-94	29.00	1998-99	70.00
3rd year	1994-95	49.00	1999-2000	80.00
4th year	1995-96	39.00	2000-01	*
5th year	1996-97	41.90	2000-02	*

* Allocation yet to be made.

From the above, it can be seen that there is continuous increase in the allocation of funds over the years since the beginning of 8th Plan. the Ministry is taking up the matter regarding more allocation of funds with the Planning Commission.

(Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development))

Recommendation (Para No. 5.4)

The Committee also note that though the allocation was increased to Rs. 76.76 crore at RE level, the expenditure was reported to be Rs. 51.78 crore. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons due to which the amount allocated under the Head during 1998-99, could not be utilised by the Government. They would also like to impress upon the Government that whatever allocations are made under any head, efforts should be to make full and proper utilization of the allocated amount.

Reply of the Government

The position of the allocation of funds during the 1998-99 is given below:—

	Year	Amount in crores
B.E.	1998-99	70.00
R.E.	1998-99	76.76
Final B.E.	1998-99	70.55

Against the final budget estimate of Rs. 70.55 Crore for the year 1998-99, the expenditure during the year was Rs. 72.00 Crore. The expenditure of Rs. 51.78 Crore was upto January 1999.

The observation of the Committee regarding the utilisation of funds has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.7)

As the Government must be incurring substantial expenditure on rent for hiring General Pool Accommodation (Non-Residential) the Committee feel that by releasing adequate funds for construction of such accommodation, not only the rent liability could be reduced but assets would also be created. They would like that the Government should examine the possibility of raising funds for the purpose from the Fis/markets.

Reply of the Government

During the year 1998-99, an allocation of Rs. 40 crore (Rs. 20 crore under Plan and Rs. 20 crore under Non-Plan) was made at BE stage for the construction of General Pool Accommodation (Non-Residential). The actual expenditure was, however, of the order of Rs. 17.36 (Rs. 9.85 crore under Plan and Rs. 7.51 crore under Non-Plan). Thus, sufficient funds were available for construction of G.P. Accommodation (Non-Residential).

During the current year, an amount of Rs. 40 crore has been allocated at the BE stage (Rs. 20 crore for Plan and Rs. 20 crore under Non-Plan). The actual expenditure incurred upto Sept., 1999 is Rs. 6.12 crore (Rs. 2.39 crore under Plan and Rs. 3.73 crore under Non-Plan). Again, even during the current year, the allocated amount is not expected to be utilised fully. Thus, raising of funds from the fis/markets would not be called for.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99—Bt. dated 30.11.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 24 of Chapter I of the Report.)

Recommendation (Para No. 6.6)

The Committee recommend that decision in respect of the modernisation/closure of the 5 Government of India Presses should be taken without further delay. They also recommend that while taking any decision about GIP, Gangtok, the Government must consider the cost of getting the Government stationery printed from private persons and also the job opportunities being provided by the Press to the local people.

Reply of the Government

The question of modernisation/closure/restructuring, etc. of Government of India Presses/Units has been receiving utmost priority in this Ministry. A decision has to be taken after consulting various Ministries/Departments and with the approval of the Cabinet. Every effort is being made for taking an early decision in the matter.

2. Insofar as Government of India Press, Gangtok is concerned, this Press is not included in the list of the Government of India Presses/Units which have been slated for closure/modernisation, etc.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99—Bt. dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.10)

The Committee observe that the over-all position of allocation of outlay for the Department of Urban Development has not been indicated separately either in the Performance Budget 1999-2000 or in the Annual Report 1999-2000. The requisite information was not supplied even at the instance of the Committee. In the absence of the separate data for the Department it is not possible to find out the comparative position of outlay in different years. The Committee disapprove this attitude of the Government and urge that the separate allocation for the Department of Urban Development should be indicated in all the Budget papers till the two Departments of the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment are formally merged into one Department.

Reply of the Government

Performance Budget 1999-2000 has been divided into two separate parts i.e. Part-A: Department of Urban Development, and Part-B: Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. Financial provision in respect of Deptt. of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation has been given in Chapter-3 (p. 63-64) of Part-B and that of the other Department in Chapter 3 of Part-A at pages 42-45.

In reply to question 1 of the list of points for discussion on 1st April, 1999 relating to Examination of the Demands for Grants 1999-2000, it has been explained that Budget of this Ministry is divided into four Demands i.e. Demand No. 83 — Urban Development, Demand No. 84—Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation etc. Demand-wise Plan and Non-Plan figures of BE 1998-99, RE 1998-99 and BE 1999-2000 have been furnished in reply to this question apart from giving the 8th Plan budget provisions and Actuals and 9th Plan Allocations sought and yearly allocations 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 alongwith Actuals 1997-98 and 1998-99. There also the overall provision has been shown separately for the Deptt. of Urban Development and Deptt. of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation during the 9th Plan period. The Demand-wise figures of RE 1998-99 and BE 1999-2000 have been given in Chapter II of Annual Report as well.

The two departments have since been merged into one Ministry *i.e.* Urban Development. However, so long as separate Demand for Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation continues, the provision will be shown separately.

Every endeavour will be made to comply with the requirement of the Committee in regard to furnishing all facts and figures.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)

It is also noted that for the different schemes of the Department the allocated outlay is far less than the proposed outlay for the 9th Plan. The priority areas like water supply and sanitation and Delhi Metro Rail Corporation have been sanctioned outlay far lesser than the proposed outlay. Further for new schemes, out of proposed outlay for Rs. 1464 crore, only Rs. 28 crore has been agreed to. The Committee feel that substantial funds should be earmarked for the priority areas. For Delhi MRTS, they feel that the reduced outlay would badly affect the project. It is felt that unless adequate funds are allocated for the schemes it carry no meaning for planning for the new schemes.

Reply of the Government

It is a fact that as against the allocation of Rs. 4144.50 crore sought for the ongoing Schemes of Water Supply and Sanitation Sector, the actual allocation agreed to by the Planning Commission for the 9th Plan is Rs. 772 crore. The major shortfall has been under the Scheme of Extension of AUWSP to Small towns wherein the allocation sought was Rs. 3596 crore as against the agreed figure of Rs. 370 crore. It was proposed to extend the scope of the scheme to cover the towns with upto one lakh population.

The existing scheme covers towns having a population of less than 20,000 as per the 1991 census. The allocation agreed to is for the Scheme as it is.

For the new schemes, an outlay of Rs. 1464 crore was proposed but only a token provision of Rs. 28 crore has been kept. Generally, Planning Commission is not in favour of taking up any new scheme. So far as DMRC is concerned, DBS sought was Rs. 956 crore against which allocation made is Rs. 625 crore (Equity Rs. 425 crore and for land acquisition Rs. 200 crore). Generally the understanding is that the scheme will not be allowed to suffer for want of allocation. No doubt the EAP of Rs. 2900 crore was proposed against which the allocation agreed to was much lower at Rs. 362.22 crore. Generally, the EAP is related to release of funds by the overseas agencies and again the figure of allocation agreed to shown would not stand in the way of larger inflow of External assistance. Nevertheless a copy of the Committee's observations has been forwarded to Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.7)

The Committee find that keeping in view the ground reality the data with regard to the demand and availability of water and sanitation as made available to the Committee does not appear to be realistic. They urge that Central Government should procure realistic data in respect of demand and availability of potable water in different cities, on priority basis.

Reply of the Government

The State Governments and their implementing agencies incharge of urban water supply and sanitation sector have been urged in the past from time to time to send necessary data relating to water supply, sanitation and solid waste management to this Ministry. The Central Public Health & Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO), the technical wing of this Ministry has circulated on 7.8.98 separate formats for water supply, sanitation and solid waste management to the State implementing agencies, incharge of urban water supply and sanitation sector to collect, compile and furnish the information to this Ministry in respect of the towns appearing in the 1991 census report. However, the observations of the Hon'ble Committee have been noted. The CPHEEO has been asked to take up this matter with the State implementing agencies, incharge of urban water supply and sanitation sector and to speed up the task of collection of data relating to water supply, sanitation and solid waste management in a more elaborate manner so that the projections made thereafter on the basis of data available are more realistic keeping in view the observations of the Hon'ble Committee.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Recommendation (Para No 4.9)

While considering water as the most priority sector, the Committee feel that it is not justified to ignore the cities/towns on the population criterion. They, therefore, urge that the Planning Commission should consider the proposal of the Department to cover the towns having population more than 20,000 without further delay and funds should be made available to them for the scheme.

Reply of the Government

This Ministry shares the views of the Hon'ble Committee and feels that it is not justified to ignore the cities/towns on population criteria for the purpose of including the same in the Centrally sponsored Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP). The Planning Commission has been requested from time to time to extend the scope of the AUWSP to the towns having population upto one lakh as per 1991 census. A proposal was sent to the Planning Commission by this Ministry on 26th September, 1996 followed by a D.O. letter No. G-20017/6/96-Bt. dated 24th January, 1997 from the then MOS (UD). Another letter was sent by MOS (UD) on 10th July, 1998 to the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission in this regard. However, the Planning Commission has stated that for various financial reasons it would be more practical to emphasise implementation of the AUWS Programme in towns having population upto 20,000 as per 1991 census instead of enlarging the scope of the scheme.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt. dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para No. 6.4)

The Committee find that during 1997-98 only half of the allocated money could actually be utilized. Further, during 1999-2000, the budgetary allocation is just half of the Budget Estimates 1997-98. They would like to know the reasons for huge underspending under this account.

Reply of the Government

The reasons for underspending can attributed to the following reasons:

- (a) strict inventory control in purchase of spare parts, etc. resulted in savings;
- (b) delay in receipt of estimates for site preparation for installation of machineries, etc. from the CPWD;
- (c) delay in site preparation by the CPWD which upset the action for procurement of machinery and equipments as installation/housing of machinery and equipments was not possible for want of proper site; and
- (d) non-materialisation of purchase of machinery and equipments in time for the above reasons.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99 (Deptt. of Urban Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 27 of the Chapter I of the Report.)

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Para No. 3.5)

The Committee find that not only the allocation under IDSMT Scheme was meagre, but the progress of expenditure in States/UTs and of the projects was not very encouraging. They feel that in view of the very low allocation, the scheme has failed to make any impact on the infrastructure of the covered towns. They, therefore, would like to urge that there is a need to give a fresh thinking to the scheme as also admitted by the Special Secretary of the Ministry during his evidence. Besides recommending for higher outlay for the scheme, they would also like that Government should consider to distribute funds to the selected key towns rather than spreading the resources so thinly.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry agrees with the view of the Committee. It is a fact that the allocations under IDSMT are approximately Rs. 25-30 lakhs per town per annum. Further, with 3300 towns still to be covered, the Ministry, if it were to continue to allocate the meagre resources it receives in the manner as it is doing so today, would take not less than 140 years to cover all eligible towns.

The suggested way could be reducing the number of towns under this scheme and thereby increasing allocations. However, this would require a change in the present guidelines as also a review of the scheme. The Ministry is undertaking a complete review, conscious that this issue needs to be addressed immediately. The matter shall be pursued with the Planning Commission consequent to the internal review of the Ministry being completed.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt.
dated 29.09.99]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 12 of the Chapter I of the Report.)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.6)

It is further noted that for improving the infrastructure of the towns/cities, an integrated approach, in planning process is required. They therefore, recommend that to achieve the objective, the Government should review and restructure the scheme.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry endorses the view of the Committee. With the allocations being low the concept of integrated development itself is incorrect. Integrated development means development, which covers every aspect of urban infrastructure, which is required for a small or medium town. This would include projects such as roads, water supply, sanitation, solid waste management, parks, commercial complexes etc. The total amount required, if one were to cover all such infrastructure would run into crores. Not only that, if one were to prioritise certain infrastructure as essential requirement of a town, namely that of water supply, sanitation, solid waste management and roads one would find that even this would run into a few crores. In the light of this the present allocation of 25-30 lakhs is definitely inadequate. Accordingly, the Ministry is in the process of reviewing the whole scheme so as to make it more relevant as also more effective. The results of our review shall also be sent to the Planning Commission for further action.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. H-11013/4/99-Bt
dated 29.09.99]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 12 of the Chapter I of the Report.)

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2000
25 Phalgun, 1921 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I

POSITION OF DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE AND METRO PLANNING COMMITTEE

Sl. No.	State/ UT	DPC constituted or not, if not reasons thereof (Ref. Art. 243ZD)	MPC constituted or not, if not reasons thereof (Ref. Art 243ZE)
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	The matter is under consideration of the State Govt.	
2.	Assam	DPCs will be constituted after the Panchayat Election.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
3.	Bihar	DPCs will be constituted after elections of Municipalities in the State, which are presently held up due to Court case.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
4.	Goa	In view of the non-constitution of Zilla Panchayats in the State, so far, it appears it will take some more time to make DPC functional.	
5.	Gujarat	The State Govt. has informed that constitution of DPCs and MPC is under active consideration of State Government.	
6.	Haryana	DPCs are being constituted.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
7.	Himachal Pradesh	DPCs are being constituted by the Panchayati Raj Deptt. of State.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
8.	Karnataka	DPCs have been constituted in 18 Distts. out of 20 Distts.	^ Bangalore Metropolitan Committee Bill is being prepared & action will be taken to constitute Bangalore Metropolitan Committee after the finalisation of the Bill.

1	2	3	4
9.	Kerala	Constituted.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
10.	Madhya Pradesh	DPC have been constituted.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
11.	Maharashtra	A Bill for constitution of DPCs has already been passed by the State Legislature.	A draft Bill to constitute MPC is pending with State Cabinet for its approval.
12.	Manipur	Provision has been made in the State Municipal Act. DPC yet to be constituted.	
13.	Orissa	The Orissa District Planning Act, 1998 providing for constitution of DPCs has already enacted by the State Govt. in Oct. 1998.	No Metropolitan city.
14.	Punjab	The matter is under consideration with the Planning Department of the State Government.	
15.	Rajasthan	DPC has been constituted by Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Deptt. of the State Government.	No Metropolitan City has been declared.
16.	Sikkim	The Sikkim Urban and Regional Planning Bill, 1998 has been passed by the State Assembly recently. The Bill provides for involvement of people's elected representatives in the Planning Committees.	
17.	Tamil-Nadu	State Govt. is taking action to constitute DPC/MPC.	
18.	Tripura	Constituted.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
19.	U.P.	The U.P. D.P.C. Ordinance, 1999 has been promulgated by the State Govt. on 19.5.99	Not constituted.
20.	West Bengal	DPCs have been constituted.	Rules for Constitution of MPC are being finalised.

1	2	3	4
21.	Arunachal Pradesh	No Municipality exists.	
22.	J&K	74th CAA is not applicable to J&K. State Govt. is processing their own amendment to the Constitution of J&K. At present no proposal of having DPC/ MPC in ULBs.	
23.	Meghalaya	Information is awaited from the State Government.	
24.	Mizoram	The State Government informed that the draft Municipal Act is under consideration with the State Government.	
25.	Nagaland	No urban local body exists	
UNION TERRITORY			
1.	NCT of Delhi	Government of Delhi had sought exemption from constitution of DPC & MPC in Delhi. This matter is being examined by Ministry of Home Affairs who is nodal authority for affairs of UTs. This Ministry has already given its comments to MHA that mandatory provisions of 74th Amendment Act., should be applied to UTs.	
2.	Pondicherry	DPC will be constituted after elections of Municipalities, which are presently held up due to Court case.	No Metropolitan Area in the UT.
3.	A&N	Constituted.	No Metropolitan Area exists.
4.	Chandigarh	Chandigarh Administration has requested Ministry of Home Affairs to exempt Chandigarh from the requirement of constitution of DPCs.	
5.	Daman & Diu	DPCs constituted	No Metropolitan Area exists.
6.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	There is no Urban Local Body.	
7.	Lakshadweep		

APPENDIX II

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 7 MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs. in Committee Room
'D' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete -- *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Prof. Kailasho Devi
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Vijay Goel
10. Shri R.L. Jalappa
11. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
12. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shrimati Ranee Narah
15. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
16. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
17. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
18. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
19. Shri Maheshwar Singh
20. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
21. Shri D. Venugopal
22. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

23. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
24. Shri Kamendu Bhattacharjee
25. Shri C. Apok Jamir
26. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
27. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
28. Shri Onward L. Nongdu
29. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
30. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
31. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murtly | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee

Consideration of draft Action Taken Reports

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| 4. | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| 5. | *** | *** | *** | *** |

6. The Committee then considered Memorandum No. 8 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-Fourth Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Urban Development of the then Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the draft action taken Report.

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| 7. | *** | *** | *** | ** |
|----|-----|-----|-----|----|

8. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the draft action taken Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/Departments and to present the same to Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

***Evidence proceedings not related to this subject have been kept separately.

APPENDIX III

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 24TH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (12TH LOK SABHA)

I. Total number of Recommendations	30
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government Para Nos. 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15, 3.7, 3.10, 3.11, 3.15, 3.22, 3.23, 3.26, 3.30, 3.31, 3.35, 3.37, 3.38, 4.8, 4.14, 4.15, 5.3, 5.4, 5.7 and 6.6	23
Percentage to the total recommendations	(76.67%)
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies Para Nos. 2.10, 2.13, 4.7 and 4.9	4
Percentage to total recommendations	(13.33%)
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee Para Nos. 6.4	1
Percentage to total recommendations	(3.33%)
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited Para Nos. 3.5 and 3.6	2
Percentage to total recommendations	(6.67%)