

**10**

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

**THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2000-2001)**

**TENTH REPORT**



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

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

## CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

### REPORT

CHAPTER I    Introductory

CHAPTER II   Overall assessment of Demands for Grants  
of the Ministry of Urban Development

- (a) Plan outlay/expenditure
- (b) Non-Plan outlay/expenditure
- (c) Staff strength of the Ministry
- (d) Unspent balance/surrendered amount of
- (e) Analysis of the programmes/schemes/demands  
given in the Performance Budget (2000-2001).....

CHAPTER III   Demand-wise analysis of Demands for Grants  
(2000-2001)

- (a) Demand No.84 (Urban Development)
- (b) Demand No.85 (Public Works)
- (c) Maintenance of old bungalows in the  
DIZ Area
- (d) Addition/alteration in residential  
accommodation
- (e) Demand No.86 (Stationary and Printing)  
Directorate of Printing

#### CHAPTER IV Scheme-wise analysis of Demands for Grants (2000-2001)

- (a) Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT) Scheme.....
- (b) Mega City Scheme.....
- (c) Urban Mapping Scheme.....
- (d) Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP).....
- (e) Low Cost Sanitation Scheme for Liberation of Scavengers (LCS) Scheme.....
- (f) New Schemes started during 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.....
- (g) Subordinate/attached offices (L&DO).....
- (h) Autonomous/statutory bodies
  - (1) National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB).....
  - (2) Delhi Development Authority (DDA).....
- (i) Mass Rapid Transit System (MRTS).....

#### APPENDICES

- I. Statement of BE and RE for 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001.....
- II. Financial outlays Ninth Plan and actuals of Annual Plans 1997-98 to 1999-2000 and allocation 2000-2001.....
- III. Statement of Non Plan provision BE, RE and Actual Expenditure-1997-98 to 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001.....
- IV. Minutes of Tenth sitting of the Committee held on 29.3.2000.....
- V. Minutes of Sixteenth sitting of the Committee Held on 11.4.2000.....

### 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. Brahmaniah
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 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. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam

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

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

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

*Rajya Sabha*

- @31. Shri S. Agniraj
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. | Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | - | <i>Under Secretary</i>  |

---

@ Nominated w.e.f. 16.3.2000.

\*Ceased to be a member of the Committee w.e.f. 2<sup>nd</sup> April, 2000 consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha.

\$Died on 13.1.2000.

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AUWSP	-	Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme
BE	-	Budget Estimates
CPHEEO	-	Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organisation
CC	-	Commercial Complex
CMA	-	Central Magnet Area
CPWD	-	Central Public Works Department
DC	-	District Centre
DDA	-	Delhi Development Authority
DIZ Area	-	Delhi Imperial Zone Area
DMRC	-	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.
GIP	-	Government of India Press
GPRA	-	General Pool Residential Accommodation
GP NRA	-	General Pool Non-Residential (Office) Accommodation
GPO	-	General Post Office
HUDCO	-	Housing and Urban Development Corporation
IDSMT	-	Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns
I&B	-	Information and Broadcasting
LBZ	-	Lutyen's Bungalow Zone
LCS	-	Low Cost Sanitation for Liberation of Scavengers Scheme
LIG	-	Lower Income Group
L&DO	-	Land and Development Office
LPU	-	Letter Press Unit
LRT	-	Light Rail Transit
LSC	-	Local Shopping Centre

MH	-	Major Head
MIG	-	Middle Income Group
MP	-	Member of Parliament
MRT	-	Metro Rail Transit
MRTS	-	Mass Rapid Transit System
NA	-	Not Available
NCR	-	National Capital Region
NIUD	-	National Institute of Urban Development
NRSA	-	National Remote Sensing Agency
NSDP	-	National Slum Development Programme
OE	-	Office Expenses
OECD	-	Overseas Economic Corporation Fund (Japan)
PB	-	Planning Board
PLB	-	Photo Litho Unit
RE	-	Revised Estimate
SLSCs	-	State Level Sanctioning Committees
SMT	-	Small and Medium Towns
SFS	-	Self Financing Scheme
TA	-	Travelling Allowance
TCPO	-	Town and Country Planning Organisation
UD	-	Urban Development
UTs	-	Union territories

## 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 Tenth Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Development.

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 Development on 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2000.

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

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

6. They would also like to place on record their deep sense of 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.*



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

The erstwhile Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment was renamed as Ministry of Urban Development *w.e.f.* 9.4.1999. The Ministry was bifurcated into two Ministries namely, (i) Ministry of Urban Development and (ii) Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation *w.e.f.* 16.10.1999.

1.2 The Ministry of Urban Development deals with promotion of urban development, including urban water supply and sanitation, planning and coordination of urban transport system, local self Government, planning and development of National Capital Region, designing and construction of Central Government residential and non-residential buildings and connected works through Central Public Works Department, Directorate of Estates, Directorate of Printing, Controller of Stationery, Controller of Publications etc.

1.3 The overall Demands for Grants of the Ministry for 2000-2001 are Rs. 2189.93 crore (gross) both for plan and non-plan..

1.4 The detailed Demands for Grants 2000-2001 of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2000.

1.5 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination to only major issues concerning programmes relating to (i) Urban Development - IDSMT, Mega City Scheme, Contribution to NCR Planning Board, Urban Mapping Scheme, Urban Transport (MRTS); (ii) Water Supply and Sanitation - AUWSP and Low Cost Sanitation; (iii) Public Works - General Pool Residential and non-residential (office) Accommodation; (iv) Directorate of Printing; (v) Attached office like Directorate of Estates, Subordinate offices like Directorate of Estates, Land and Development Office (L&DO); and (vi) Statutory and autonomous bodies like National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB), Delhi Development Authority (DDA) in the context of budgetary allocation in Demands for Grants for the year 2000-2001.

## CHAPTER II

### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

#### **Demand numbers 84, 85 and 86.**

##### **(a) Plan Outlay/Expenditure**

The total plan and Non-Plan outlay of the Ministry, *i.e.* BE 1999-2000, RE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001 is given at Appendix-I. The 9<sup>th</sup> plan allocation and actual expenditure made since 1997-98 up to 1999-2000 (upto February 2000) is at Appendix-II.

As per the written replies furnished by the Government, BE 1999-2000 was Rs.2017.52 crore and RE 1999-2000 was Rs.1851.53 crore, resulting in a net reduction of Rs.165.74 crore (*i.e.* a reduction of 8.23%). When asked about the reasons for cut of Rs.165.74 crore at RE stage during 1999-2000, the Ministry in its reply has stated that in so far non-plan schemes are concerned, a cut of 10% was proposed by the Ministry of Finance on account of austerity measures. In the case of plan schemes, while there is a marginal step up in water supply on account of enhanced Pass Through Credit for External Assistance to HUDCO through OECF, there has been a reduction of funds for UD Schemes and GPRA. Reduction in GPRA has been on account of likely actual demand. The reduction in the Centrally sponsored UD Schemes has been very marginal. However, there has been noticeable reduction in the Central scheme of DMRC mainly in the OECF assistance provision.

In the Plan Scheme Outlay, the BE 1999-2000 was Rs.774.34 crore which was reduced to Rs.681.12 crore (*i.e.* a reduction of 12.04%) in 1999-2000. An expenditure of Rs. 441.42 crore has only been made during 1999-2000 upto February, 2000. Similarly, non-plan outlay in BE 1999-2000 was Rs.1243.18 crore which was reduced to Rs.1170.66 (*i.e.* a reduction of 5.83 %). An expenditure of Rs.895.76 crore was incurred during 1999-2000 (upto January, 2000) for non-plan outlay.

When asked further as to how far the physical performance of different programmes/schemes was affected by this reduction, the Ministry has replied that the effect on the achievement of the target will be marginal due to the reduction, since the reduction in schemes are not very substantial. Moreover, provision for BE 2000-2001 more than off-set the reduction in RE schemes in the last year.

When asked as to how the Ministry plan to utilise the additional Rs.338.40 crore (over RE 1999-2000) during 2000-2001 in view of the reduction of outlay at the RE stage 1999-2000 stage the Ministry have replied that the size of the plan is decided by the

Planning Commission based on the overall available resources. Accordingly, the Ministry at no point of time was provided with full allocation asked for. Therefore, the allocations to the Ministry's schemes are always scaled down keeping the limit proposed by the Planning Commission. Therefore, there should be no problem in utilising the additional provisions made in the BE.

2.2 During the course of oral evidence with the Secretary of the Ministry stated as under:

“...The total urban population in 1951 was about 17 per cent of India's total population. In 1991, this percentage has gone up to almost 26 per cent. In 2000-2001, we anticipate, on the basis of normal projections, that it should be in the neighbourhood of about 30 per cent of India's total population. We expect that in another 20 years, this figure will rise up to 41 per cent. When we compare the population of the developed part of the world, we find that anywhere from 45 per cent to 65 per cent is in urban area. This obviously means that there is a shift due to economic activity and better prospects of livelihood from rural areas to urban areas. In the rural areas of our country, there is a considerable unemployment and underemployment.

One third of urban population of India, that is 10 per cent of total India's population, is living in 23 metros. We have about 3800 urban local bodies. Urban centres in India are contributing 50 per cent of GDP and 90 per cent of growth revenue.

If we go the way we are going for and in 7, 10 and 15 years hence, we will not die of hunger but we may die of thirst. There will be no water. Water supply is becoming a very critical element not only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality.

In the Ninth Plan, the Task Force had arrived at a figure that about a sum of Rs.55,000 crore would be required for meeting the water supply requirements. We feel that this was a very small figure. Rakesh Mohan Committee was set up. This Committee had given solid reasons as to why it had arrived at a particular figure. You will be amazed that in the next ten years, they had estimated that urban infrastructure, which includes water supply, sewerage, storm water drainage, solid waste management, limited component of roads and transport would require 2,50,000 crore in a period of ten years. If I divide this figure by ten, I arrive at a

conclusion that a sum of Rs.25,000 crore which would be needed every year for urban infrastructure for a period of ten years regularly to be able to sustain our existing urban population. Now, this is a very formidable task and we have been spending lots of sleepless nights on this particular point.....At least a sum of Rs.12,000 crore or Rs.13,000 crore would be required every year.....In 1951 the allocation for my Department was 8 per cent of the total plan outlay. Today, it is about only 2.6 per cent. Let us not forget that there has been a tremendous inflation also. According to the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment, 18 functions have been identified for devolution to the urban local bodies. We have arrived at conclusions and we discussed them at length with the State Governments and with the funding agencies. Except for one or two States/Union territories elections to local bodies have been completed."

**2.3 The Committee are concerned to note that the BE for 1999-2000 has been reduced from Rs.2017.52 crore to Rs.1851.78 crore at the RE Stage resulting in a reduction of Rs.165.74 crore (*i.e.* a reduction of 8.23%). The Committee deduce that the non-satisfactory performance of plan schemes in the first three quarters of the financial year has compelled the Government to scale down the outlay at the RE stage by a sizeable amount adversely affecting the execution of several schemes aimed at urban development. They, therefore, are critical of the unsatisfactory performance of the Government in fully utilising the outlay and recommend that in future, the outlay meant for the Ministry be fully spent by stepping up the efficiency levels.**

**2.4 The Committee note that there is an increase of Rs.338.40 crore in the outlay of 2000-2001 as compared to RE 1999-2000. They are concerned to note that while the percentage of people living in the urban areas has gone up from 17 per cent in 1951 to 26 per cent in 1991 the allocation for the Ministry for plan schemes has decreased from 8 per cent in 1951 to about 2.6 per cent. They agree with the view expressed by the Secretary that at least a sum of Rs.12000 to Rs.13000 crore would be required to provide basic necessities in the urban areas of the country. They feel that Rs.2017.52 crore allocated for 2000-2001 will be very meagre to meet the future challenges. They therefore would like to strongly recommend that the Government should build a strong case before the Planning Commission so that the allocation for the Ministry of Urban Development is substantially stepped up.**

**2.5 The Committee are constrained to note that BE 1999-2000 for plan schemes was reduced from Rs.774.34 crore to Rs.680.87 crore at the RE stage (*i.e.* a**



BE	1998-99	723.29	1229.73	723.29	869.24
BE	1999-2000	774.34	1243.18	774.34	969.68
BE	2000-2001	900.43	1289.50	900.43	995.00

---

**Percentage increase in non-plan outlay during 2000-2001**

---

(1)	(2)
Demand No.84	6.10% (Revenue)
Demand No.85	6.13% (Revenue and Capital)
Demand No.86	6.77% (Revenue and Capital)

---

Total Demands of the Ministry as a whole 3.73%

---

2.9 When asked about the reasons for not containing the non-plan outlay to the barest minimum, in each of the three Demands of the Ministry during 2000-2001, the Government have stated that average 3.73% increase in non-plan expenditure is not significant in the case of the Ministry, particularly, in view of the larger salary & wages bill of the industrial/non-industrial employees in CPWD and printing presses. When asked further about the economies/measures the Ministry proposes to initiate to contain the continuous increase in the non-plan estimate to a reasonable level the Ministry has replied that the existing estimate is quite reasonable and there is hardly any scope for reducing the non-plan expenditure.

**The heads in which the Non-Plan outlay of the Ministry has increased in 2000-2001 as compared to that of 1999-2000, is as below:**

(Rs. in crore)

Head		B.E. 1999-2000	B.E. 2000-2001
1	Salaries	341.43	351.01
2	Wages	0.20	0.21
11	Domestic Travel Expenses	3.38	3.80
12	Foreign Travel Expenses	0.11	0.13
13	Office Expenses	15.41	18.55

14	Rent, Rates and Taxes	82.35	97.07
16	Publications	3.20	3.40
21	Supplies and Materials	54.17	57.15
27	Minor Works	355.82	379.61
28	Professional Services	0.21	0.21
31	Grants-in-aid	5.50	6.12
34	Stipend	0.57	0.65
42	Lump-sum Provision	0.14	0.16
43	Suspense	122.97	132.90
50	Other Charges	1.90	2.06
63	Inter-Accounts Transfer	1.06	1.41
	Total (Non-Plan)	1243.18	1289.50

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, the non plan outlay has always exceeded the plan outlay. Similarly, no plan outlay has been demanded for Demand No.86 (Stationery and Printing) during RE 1999-2000 and BE 2000-2001 and the entire estimate of Rs.154.17 crore and Rs.175.01 crore respectively, has been charged under the non-plan outlay.

**2.10 The Committee note the continuous increase in the non-plan outlay/expenditure of the Ministry since 1998-99. They do not agree with the view of the Ministry that the increase in the non-plan expenditure is not significant and there was hardly any scope for reducing the non-plan expenditure. They feel that there is considerable scope to reduce the non-plan expenditure viz. travel expenses, office expenses, minor works etc. which is increasing in recent years. They would like to impress upon the Ministry to initiate economies in the non-plan expenditure so that the said expenditure is kept to the barest minimum. The Committee observe that the non-plan outlay/expenditure of the Ministry has always exceeded the plan outlay/expenditure since 1998-99. They further observe that the entire Demand No.86 (i.e. for stationery and Printing) has been kept under non-plan head. In this regard they would like to recommend that the Government should find out ways and means so that the non-plan outlay does not exceed the plan-outlay.**

**(c) Staff Strength of the Ministry**

2.11 As per the Expenditure Budget 2000-2001, the following facts have been furnished by the Government:

- (a) The estimated strength of the Ministry of Urban Development as on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2000 would be increased to 33176 which was actually 33007 as on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 1999;
- (b) the strength is expected to be 33107 in March 2001.

2.12 When asked about the sectors in which the strength of the Ministry has increased, during 1998-99 vis-à-vis 1999-2000, the Ministry has replied that: the increase is thinly spread in a number of categories.. It may, however, be mentioned that the strength as on 1.3.2000 is estimated and the strength as on 1.3.99 were actual. The strength during 1998-99 (*i.e.* on 1.3.98) was 36757 which has come down to 33007 as on 1.3.99 (1999-2000).

When asked further about the steps to be initiated to reduce the proposed strength of the Ministry from 33176 during 2000 to 33107 by the year 2001 as given in the expenditure budget, the Government have replied that as per the instructions of Ministry of Finance, any post which remains vacant or held in abeyance for a period of one year or more is deemed to have been abolished. The Ministry has recently undertaken a review of all the vacant posts so that filling up of the posts will be strictly on consideration of merit.

As per the information given in the Annual Report (1999-2000), the total staff strength of the Ministry as on 31.12.1999 has been given as 34207 excluding the work charged unit of 18924 (for CPWD). When asked about the correct staff strength of Ministry of Urban Development as on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 1999 and on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2000 especially in the Secretariat of the Ministry, its attached and subordinate offices and in the public sector units under it, the Ministry has replied that a discrepancy has been noticed in the figures furnished by various offices under this Ministry. Therefore, the strength of the staff in the subordinate/attached offices of the Ministry is being compiled *de-now*. This information will be furnished separately.

**2.13 The Committee note that the Ministry as acknowledged in the written note does not maintain data regarding exact staff strength which is singularly surprising. They would therefore, like to know the staff strength in various offices of the Ministry. The Committee desire that the Ministry should make all out efforts to bolster efficiency and to cut down the non-plan expenditure.**

**(d) Unspent balance/surrendered amount of different Central Sector Schemes:**



2.14 When asked about the unspent/opening balances under different Central Sector Schemes of the Ministry as on 1<sup>st</sup> April during last three years, the Ministry has replied that the provision for the above schemes is made on year to year basis and the unspent balances are surrendered within the relevant financial year.

When asked further about the amount surrendered by the Ministry as on 1<sup>st</sup> April of last three years, the Ministry has replied that the provision in the Demands for Grants and capital expenditure is worked out on yearly basis and worked out demand-wise and revenue and capital heads. Sometimes, the entire schemes/programmes are spread over a number of major heads/sub-heads. Moreover, savings under the schemes are re-appropriated to meet the requirements and other schemes/programmes. Budget provisions surrendered will, therefore, not give precise idea about the utilisation of funds under each scheme/programme. The Controller General of Accounts compiles the re-appropriation accounts.

When asked on whether any thinking has been given to have the non-lapsable fund for the unspent balances of each of the schemes as is the existing practice with the different schemes of Ministry of Rural Development, the Government have replied that the non-lapsable funds are dedicated to the development of North-Eastern Region and Sikkim. So far as the Government Departments are concerned, there is no scope at present for keeping the unspent balances outside the Government accounts. Therefore, the budget allocation during the year are either to be utilised or surrendered to the Ministry of Finance.

**2.15 The Committee strongly recommend that the Government should make all out efforts to ensure that the outlay earmarked for the respective Central Sector schemes/programmes like IDSMT, AUWSP and Urban Mapping etc. in a particular year are used only for the specific programme/scheme for which the allocation is made and the chances of having unspent outlay are minimised. The Committee also urge that necessary steps should be taken by the Government to ensure that unspent outlay do not get accumulated with State Governments/implementing agencies. The next instalment under the specific scheme/programme should not be released to the defaulting States. The Committee recommend that strict guidelines in this regard should be framed and circulated to State Governments and the Committee apprised accordingly.**

**(c) Analysis of programmes/schemes/demands given in the Performance Budget (2000-2001)**

2.16 The Ministry of Urban Development has provided the information regarding budgetary allocation, of different programmes/schemes/demand-wise in the Performance Budget (2000-2001). However, the Ministry could not provide the information required on the total releases made under the different heads for respective programmes/schemes. Both Annual Report 1999-2000 and performance Budget 2000-2001 of the Ministry does not contain information on the release of funds State/Union-territory-wise.

Further the Performance Budget of the Ministry though contains information on allocation, and expenditure made since the commencement of the programme/schemes, it significantly misses information regarding planned and actuals for the last three years including the current financial year and physical targets. So much so, the Performance Budget 2000-2001 of the Ministry has failed to provide information regarding financial or physical performance of Delhi Development Authority, a premier autonomous body under the Ministry.

**2.17 The Committee find that the Performance Budget of the Ministry does not contain the information relating to the physical and financial achievement of the respective schemes in the States/UTs. They desire that the detailed information in this regard for the last three years including the current year should be given in the Performance Budget so as to have a comparative analysis of the performance of the Schemes/Programmes of the Ministry.**

### CHAPTER III

#### DEMAND-WISE ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2000-2001)

The Demands for Grants 2000-2001 of the Ministry has been presented to Parliament under the following Demand numbers:

Demand No.84 -	Urban Development
Demand No.85 -	Public Works
Demand No.86 -	Stationery and Printing

**(a) Demand No.84 (Urban Development)**

3.2 As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, in the Revenue Section the following observation is being made for the Secretariat-General Services (Major Head 2052).

Year	% increase over the previous year	
1996-97	(+)	1.37%
1997-98	(+)	3.32%
1998-99	(+)	29.77%
1999-2000	(+)	9.90%
2000-2001	(+)	22.70%

When asked about the reasons for the continuous hike in the outlay under said head since 1996-97, the Ministry has replied that MH 2052 covers expenditure on salaries and other expenditure of the Ministry viz. TA, OE, etc. The escalation during 1996-97 and 1997-98 is normal. During 1998-99, the abnormal increase could be attributed to payment of 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and introduction of new scheme of computerisation. During 1999-2000, provision for computerisation was increased from 0.50 crores to Rs.1.00 crore. The other increases were normal. During 2000-2001, there is substantial increase in salary provision which has gone up from Rs.8.63 crore in 1999-2000 (Actual expenditure upto February, 2000) to Rs.10.63 crore. Payment on account of salary is inevitable and there is hardly any scope to reduce the other expenditure

As per the Expenditure Budget, the estimated strength of the Ministry, as on 1.3.1999 was 33007 which has been estimated to increase to 33176 (*i.e.* an increase of 169 persons) as on 1.3.2000. Further, as per the written replies, for Demand number 84, the BE 1998-99 was Rs.928.63 crore against which the actual expenditure of Rs.842.21 crore was made. During 1999-2000 the expenditure (upto the end February 2000) is Rs.429.61 crore (provisional).

In the Revenue Section (Demand number 84), BE 1999-2000 was Rs.505.71 crore and BE 2000-2001 is Rs.665.68 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 31.63%).

When asked about how the Ministry propose to utilise the above mentioned enhanced outlay of Rs.665.68 crore during 2000-2001, the Ministry have replied that the enhanced outlay is mainly under the following heads:

(Rs. in crore)

	Major Head	B.E. 1999-2000	B.E. 2000-2001
Secretariat	2052	11.98	14.70
AUWSP, LCS etc.	2215	102.45	126.70
Urban Transport Planning, TCPO, Grants to NCRPB, DOAC etc.	2217	13.57	22.19
IDSMT, Mega city	3601	117.97	149.00
IDSMT	3602	0.24	0.40

Provision under MH 2052 is for Secretariat of the Ministry including salary and will be utilised fully. Provision under MH 2215 includes AUWSP Scheme and will be fully utilised towards the release of central share. The major increase under MH 2217 is towards the urban transport planning and its utilisation is linked to preparation of feasibility report by the State Governments. Provision under MH 3601 & 3602 relates to the release to State Governments and UT Governments under the scheme of IDSMT and Mega City. This will be fully utilised as per the scheme's guidelines.

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee the following observations on the Capital Section are made:

- (a) In BE 2000-2001, loans for water supply has been reduced by 60.7% over BE 1999-2000;
- (b) In BE 2000-2001, outlay for housing (General Pool Accommodation) has been reduced by 15.56% over BE 1999-2000;

- (c) In BE 2000-2001, the outlay for water supply and sanitation has been reduced by 11% over BE 1999-2000; and
- (d) Similarly the outlay for over all capital sector has been reduced by 8.82% in BE 2000-2001 over BE 1999-2000..

When asked about the reasons for reduction in the BE 2000-2001 in each of major heads of Capital Section mentioned above, the Ministry have replied that the provision for G.P.A. has been decreased due to lesser utilisation during 1999-2000.

When asked further as to how far the physical performance of different programmes/schemes would be affected by the decrease of outlay as mentioned above, the Ministry has replied that construction of GPRA is not expected to be adversely affected.

**3.3 The Committee consider that the hike in the major head 2052 (Secetariat- General service) by 22.7% in BE 2000-2001 is an unwarranted quantum jump over the hike of 9.9% in the previous year. The Committee also deplore the reduction in outlay for water supply in BE 2000-2001 by 60.7% over the outlay for BE 1999-2000. The Committee further deplore the reduction of outlay for housing (GPA) by 15.56% over the outlay for BE 1999-2000 as well as the reduction of outlay for water supply and sanitation by 11% over the outlay for BE 1999-2000. The Committee find that instead of initiating steps to contain expenditure on Secretariat-General service, the outlay earmarked for the critical components of urban development like water supply and housing has been reduced. The Committee view this seriously and urge upon the Government to take appropriate steps for restoration of the outlay.**

**(b) Demand Number 85 (Public Works)**

As per the detailed Demands for Grants 2000-2001 of the Ministry, the following observation about Public Works are being made:

Plan + non-plan heads	(Rs. in crore)
Actuals 1998-99	704.22
B.E. 1999-2000	810.91
R.E. 1999-2000	757.32
Expenditure (provisional) 1999-2000 upto February, 2000)	543.97

Expenditure as % of BE 1999-2000 67.08%

B.E. 2000-2001 859.85

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee the following observations about the Revenue section are made:

- (a) For the CPWD establishment, maintenance and repairs (*i.e.* the revenue section) the BE 2000-2001 has been increased to Rs.601.65 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 6.77%) from Rs.563.45 crore during BE 1999-2000.
- (b) During BE 1999-2000, the outlay for CPWD establishment, maintenance and repairs was reduced by 8.97% over BE 1998-99.

The details regarding BE and actuals for CPWD establishment, maintenance and repairs is as below:

(Rs. in crore)

	<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1998-99</u>		<u>1999-2000</u>		<u>B.E. 2000-2001</u>	
	BE	Actuals	BE	Actuals	BE	Actuals	Proposed	Allocated
Maintenance and Repairs	NA	344.41	NA	325.26	NA	278.96	416.00	NA
Establishment	NA	185.10	NA	213.01	NA	216.00	230.00	NA
Total:	465.10	329.51	619.00	538.27	563.45	494.96	646.00	601.65

When asked about how far the reduction in the Revenue Section affected the performance of CPWD during 1999-2000, the Ministry in their reply has stated that the reduction is mainly due to reduced provision under the head of 'Stock' from Rs.200 crore to Rs.112 crore in the year grant for 1999-2000. The reduction in 'Stock' is due to a change in policy of departmental supply of cement and steel to the contractor for major projects and due to closure of hot mix plants in Delhi. The overall performance was not affected by this reduction.

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, in the capital section of Public Works, the following observation are being made-

- (a) The total capital section of Public Works has been increased by 4.34% in BE 2000-2001 over BE 1999-2000 (*i.e.* from Rs.247.45 crore to Rs.258.20 crore);

- (b) The major increase for the Capital outlay is on Education, Sports, Art and Culture (*i.e.* an increase of 26.25%) and in the other Social Services (*i.e.* an increase of 15.27%); and
- (c) The major decrease is in the Capital Outlay on Shipping (*i.e.* a reduction of 16.38%), Capital outlay on Meteorology loans (*i.e.* a reduction of 5.66%) and capital outlay on other Scientific and Environment Research (*i.e.* a reduction of 4.76%);

The BE and Actuals for capital outlay of Demand No.85 since 1997-98 is as below:

(Rs. in crore)

<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1998-99</u>		<u>1999-2000</u>	
BE	Actuals	BE	Actuals	BE	Actuals
Capital Outlay	210.98 175.60	225.53 165.95		247.45 194.11	

When asked further as to how the Ministry proposes to utilise the enhanced capital outlay of 4.34% during 2000-2001, the Ministry has replied that the enhanced outlay is as per the requirement of funds for the construction of requirement of various Ministries. Sufficient schemes for construction are already available and hence the enhanced outlay can be utilised.

**3.5 The Committee are totally dissatisfied with the poor utilisation of the allocation during 1999-2000 where the utilisation fell short by 32.92% and now with the allocation of Rs.859.85 crore for 2000-2001, the Committee strongly direct the Government to properly plan the utilisation of money for various works so that the funds are fully utilised and absolutely satisfactory maintenance is provided.**

**(d) Maintenance of old bungalows in the DIZ Area**

3.6 When asked to state the expenditure being incurred by them on the maintenance of old bungalows/flats etc. allotted to V.I.P.s, the representative of the Ministry stated that the bungalows of MPs and Ministers are old bungalows which have practically outlived their life. They were not in a position to demolish and rebuild them as the LBZ regulations do not allow change in the coverage and land use etc. It was pointed out to the witness that though a huge sum was being spent on the maintenance of these bungalows every year, the bungalows were still in dilapidated condition and it would be better to build

new bungalows as per present day's requirement and style at a lesser cost. The Secretary, agreed that by replacing an old bungalow by a new one by maintaining the same area/height etc. the LBC regulations would not be violated and they would consider this suggestion.

**3.7 The Committee note that in spite of spending huge amount on annual maintenance of old bungalows which according to Government's own admission are old and have outlived their life, these are still in dilapidated condition. The Committee therefore, recommend that the Government should identify those bungalows which are in very poor and dilapidated condition in spite of incurring huge expenditure on their annual maintenance and should demolish them so that new bungalows could be constructed in their places without violating the provisions of LBZ.**

**3.8 The Committee recommend that a blueprint for demolition of old bungalows and construction of new ones in place of them in a time bound manner, may be evolved so that within a span of every 5 to 10 years around 100 old bungalows are demolished and new constructions are put in place for easing the tight position in allotment of bungalows to VIPs and others. The Government must also appropriately tie up with the Planning Commission and other agencies concerned for securing the necessary allocations.**

#### **Addition/alteration in residential accommodation**

**3.9** As per extant orders, allottees of general pool residential accommodation are entitled for certain addition/alteration after paying their contribution which varies from work to work. Up to recently this facility was available to all the allottees irrespective of the accommodation being controlled by any pool. This facility has now been restricted only to the allottees of general pool accommodation and others are being denied this facility

When asked about the reasons for denying this facility to other than general pool allottees, the Ministry in the written note has stated that in the case of accommodation constructed by CPWD, it is the responsibility of CPWD to maintain and repair such accommodation. CPWD has only been doing repair and maintenance of the departmental pool accommodation which were constructed by them. It has further been stated that there is a proposal that the facility of additions/alterations on payment of 10% may be extended to residential accommodation belonging to other pools. This proposal is under consideration of the Ministry.

**3.10 While noting the reply of the Government that the proposal to extend the facility of addition/alteration on payment of 10% of the cost of such addition/alteration in the houses belonging to other pools is under consideration of the Government, the Committee recommend that the final decision to restore this facility**



to allottees of all pools particularly where the quarters were constructed by CPWD and are maintained by them, is taken expeditiously so as to restore the said facility for the better maintenance of Government quarters. The question of provision of funds by the controllers of these pools, if any, should be sorted out by the Ministry by sitting across the table with concerned officers of those Departments.

**(e) Demand No.86 (Stationery and Printing)**

**Directorate of Printing**

3.11 The status of modernisation of all Government of India Presses (GIPs) in the country is as under:

Modernised Presses (Offset Technology)	Partially Modernised (Letter Press/Offset Technology)	Old Technology (Letter Press)
1	2	3
1. Govt. of India Press, Minto Road Photolitho Unit), New Delhi.	1. Govt. of India Press (Letter Press Unit), Faridabad	1. Govt. of India Press (Pub. Unit), Santragachi

1	2	3
2. Govt. of India Text Book Press, Chandigarh	2. Govt. of India Press, Nilokheri	2. Govt. of India Press (From Unit), Santragachi
3. Govt. of India Text Book Press, Mysore	3. Govt. of India Press, Nashik	3. Govt. of India Press, Gangtok
4. Govt. of India Text Book Press, Bhubaneshwar	4. Govt. of India Press, Coimbatore	4. Govt. of India Press (Letter Pres Unit), Minto Road
5. Govt. of India Press (Photolitho Unit), Faridabad	5. Govt. of India Press, Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi.	5. Govt. of India Press, Shimla
6. Govt. of India Patent Printing Press, Mumbai	6. Govt. of India Press, Aligarh	
7. Govt. of India Press, Wellington	7. Govt. of India Press, Temple Street, Calcutta	
8. Govt. of India Press, Koratty		
9. Govt. of India Press, Ring Road, Mayapuri		

When asked as to whether the Government have prepared any perspective plan with regard to modernisation of all the GIPs in the country, the Ministry has replied that no final plan can be drawn up for the purpose till Government decision for retention/restructuring of presses are known.

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, as on 1.4.99 the total unspent balance of Directorate of Printing was Rs.1 crore (plan) and Rs.4.57 crore (non-plan).

**3.12 The Committee note that the Government are yet to take a final decision regarding modernisation of all Government of India Presses (GIPs). They would therefore, like to urge the Government to take a final decision for modernisation of all GIPs at the earliest so that the entire unspent amount can be utilised during 2000-2001.**

## CHAPTER IV

### SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2000-2001)

The following are the Central Sector Programmes/Schemes of the Ministry:

- (i) IDSMT (ii) Mega City Scheme (iii) Urban Mapping Scheme (iv) AUWSP (v) LCS  
(vi) Other (New) Schemes.

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

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

(Rs. in lakh)

Category of Town and Population	Project Cost	Central Assistance (Grant)	State Share	HUDCO/ Financial Institution Loan/ Other Sources
A.(Less than 20,000)	100	48	32	20 (20%)
B.(2000 to 5000)	200	90	60	50 (25%)
C.(5000 to 100000)	350	150	100	100 (29%)
D.(1 to 3 lakh)	550	210	140	200 (36%)
E.(3 to 5 lakh)	750	270	180	300 (40%)

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

4.3 During 1999-2000, the Budget allocation (BE) for IDSMT was Rs.50 crore and RE was Rs.44.50 crore out of which till 15.03.2000, Rs.44.49 crore were released to the States/UTs. However, upto 31.12.1999, the release was Rs.17.94 crore (*i.e.* 40.31% out of

RE 1999-2000) for ongoing projects in 73 towns and 1 new town. The BE 2000-2001 for IDSMT are Rs.60 crore (*i.e.* an increase of Rs.10 crore over BE 1999-2000). As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, the total number of Small and Medium towns with population upto 5 lakh was 4565 out of which, till 15.03.2000, the IDSMT Scheme is in operation in 1005 towns only and 400 additional towns are targeted to be covered under IDSMT in the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.

Further it has been mentioned that 101 towns have been covered during the first three years of 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. The information year-wise is as under:-

Years	Towns covered
1997-98	16
1998-99	25
1999-2000	60
Total	101

**4.4 The Committee feel that IDSMT is in operation in only 1005 towns *i.e.* 22.02% of the total towns having population upto 5 lakh. The rest of the 3560 towns are yet to be covered under the scheme. It is further noted that the allocation during 2000-2001 has marginally been increased from Rs.44 crore during 1999-2000 to Rs.60 crore during 2000-2001. Keeping in view the large number of towns that are yet to be covered by the Scheme, the Committee find that the allocation being made is too low. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend that the allocation under the scheme should be enhanced so as to cover more and more towns. Besides, the Committee would also like to know the allocation required to cover all the remaining 3560 towns and the planning made on the part of the Government for the coverage.**

#### **Maintenance of assets/infrastructure created under IDSMT**

**4.5** As per the written note of the Government under IDSMT Scheme, the funds are released to the State Government/UTs. Therefore, the maintenance of assets/infrastructure created under the Scheme is the responsibility of the State Governments/Local Body.

**4.6 The Committee are unhappy to note the way the Government have washed their hands on the issue of maintenance of assets/infrastructure created under IDSMT by submitting that it is the responsibility of State Government or Local Bodies.**

**They take serious view of it and strongly recommend that the Government should analyse the position of maintenance of assets/infrastructure created under the scheme and consider providing an inbuilt mechanism for the purpose. Keeping in view the fact that the scheme is a centrally sponsored scheme. Necessary guidelines in this regard should be issued to State Governments and the Committee be apprised accordingly.**

#### **Monitoring of IDSMT**

4.7 As per the written note furnished by the Government, the monitoring of the scheme of IDSMT is done by the TCPO at the national level, State level Town and Country Planning Department/Department of Municipal Administration and by the District Collector at the district level.

Further it has been submitted in the written note that as per the revised guidelines (1995) the sanctioning/monitoring has been decentralised and the State level Sanctioning Committees (SLSCs) have been created comprising, among others, representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development, Planning Commission, TCPO and also from Financial Institutions/HUDCO under the Chairmanship of Secretary Urban Development/Municipal Affairs of the respective States/UTs. These Committees are also responsible, for periodically monitoring the progress of the various projects sanctioned and reviewing the implementation of the scheme. The Committees also ensure that the programmes taken up/implemented are in accordance with the guidelines laid down. Besides SLSCs, Regional Review Meetings are also convened by the Ministry of Urban Development.

**4.8 While noting the position of monitoring of IDSMT, the Committee would like to be apprised of the findings of the State Level Sanctioning Committees constituted to monitor the programme. Besides, it is recommended that the monitoring of IDSMT should further be strengthened by developing a good information system through the use of computers.**

#### **Review of IDSMT**

4.9 When asked about the review/evaluation of the IDSMT Scheme, the Government have replied that a Committee has been constituted for the review/evaluation of the scheme under the Chairmanship of JS(UD) and having representatives of State Governments, NIUA and TCPO.

Further it has been mentioned that the Review Committee was constituted on 12<sup>th</sup> August, 1999. It has met on two occasions namely 15.11.1999 and 31.01.2000. Draft

recommendations of the Committee are being finalised in consultation with members of the State Governments.

**4.10 The Committee note with concern the delay in the finalisation of the recommendations of the Review Committee. They would like to be apprised of the main recommendations of the review Committee when finalised and the action taken thereon.**

**The analysis regarding assessing the migration of population to cities/towns**

4.11 One of the goals of IDSMT was to facilitate arresting the migration of population to cities/towns. When asked whether the Government have ever done any analysis to study the above mentioned aspect, it has been stated by the Government that no specific study to analyse this fact has been attempted. However, by the development of small and medium towns, in the long run the pull factor of the metropolitan cities would get reduced. Further enhanced outlays under the scheme would help develop more small and medium towns which would in turn check migration.

**4.12 The Committee urge that the Government should make a review as to whether IDSMT was successful in arresting the migration of population to cities/towns.**

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

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

Central Share (Grant)	25%
State Share (Grant)	25%
Institutional Finance/Capital Market (Loan)	75%

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

The Ministry of Urban Development has the responsibility of broad policy formulation and monitoring of the Scheme. At the State/Mega City level, State Level Project sanctioning Committees and representatives of HUDCO monitor the Mega City Scheme.

4.14 During 1999-2000, the Ministry of Urban Development had proposed an allocation of Rs.100/- crore. The BE 1999-2000 (*i.e.* Central share) of Rs.86.47 crore was reduced to Rs.79.80 crore at the RE 1999-2000 stage. The BE 2000-2001 has been increased to Rs.91.00 crore (*i.e.* by Rs.21.20 crore over RE 1999-2000). Till 31.12.1999 out of 375 approved projects, 73 projects were completed and 193 projects were under progress and 109 projects were yet to be started. Till 31.12.1999, approved total project cost was Rs.3089.78 crore for which Rs.1906.43 crore was released (Central share of Rs.513.85 crore was released till 10.2.2000 + state share of Rs.576.98 crore + Institutional finance mobilised to the tune of Rs.815.60 crore). The expenditure reported upto December, 1999 was Rs.1200.47 crore. Thus, a sum of Rs.705.96 crore (*i.e.* Rs.1906.43 – 1200.47) was left as unspent amount with the implementing agencies.

**4.15 The Committee appreciate the cent percent release of Rs.79.80 crore in RE 1999-2000 (Central share) under the Mega City Scheme. They also appreciate the higher allocation of the scheme for 2000-2001 which has been increased to Rs.91 crore. They also note that out of 375 approved projects till 31.12.99, the work for 109 projects is yet to be started and out of the approved total project cost of Rs.3089.78 crore only 1906.43 crore has been released by the Centre, states and the financial institutions. The Committee, recommend, now that the allocation of central share has been hiked for 2000-2001, the Government should impress upon the respective State Governments to release their share in time so that the works for the remanining 109 approved projects may be started without delay.**

**4.16 The Committee are concerned to note that a sum of Rs.705.96 crore was left unspent with the implementing agencies till 31.12.1999, which reflects a very poor stage of implementation of various projects under the Mega City Scheme. The Committee recommend that the implementing agencies should be geared up to speed up the implementation of projects and to reduce the chances of having unspent balances towards the close of the year.**

**(c) Urban Mapping Scheme**

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

The BE 1999-2000 for the Scheme was Rs.3 crore out of which Rs.2.31 crore has been released by the Ministry so far. During 1998-99, the RE was Rs.1.40 crore out of which only Rs.0.60 crore had been released by the Ministry. As per the Performance Budget 2000-2001, till now Rs.10.99 crore has been released for the Scheme out of which an expenditure of Rs.6.57 crore (*i.e.* 68.88%) has been incurred. As per the written note of the Government, there are at present 4615 towns in the country. During the first phase (*i.e.* during the 8<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan) mapping of 25 towns has been taken up and completed. During the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, 25 more towns were approved to be covered by 2001-2002, out of which only mapping of 13 towns (*i.e.* physical achievement of 52 percent) has been assigned to the National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA).

**4.18 The Committee note that so far 68.88% percent of the released amount has been spent for the urban mapping Scheme. They also note that an amount of Rs.3.42 crore is reported to be lying with the NRSA as unspent. They further note that the work of mapping of 52 per cent of the targeted towns has been started. They would, therefore, like the Government to impress upon the executing agency *i.e.* NRSA to take up mapping of the rest of the 12 towns in 2000-2001. They also recommend that mapping of all the towns in India should be taken up on mission mode as information gleaned from maps are crucially required for development and other programmes.**

**(d) Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP)**

4.19 The Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme was launched in 1993-94 for the towns/cities having a population of less than 20,000 (as per 1991 census) in 25 States. The Scheme is funded on a 50:50 share basis between the Centre and the States. The project schemes under the AUWSP are scrutinised by the Central Public Health and Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO) and the funds are released to the State Governments. The Ministry of Urban Development monitors the financial and physical progress of AUWSP on quarterly basis.

4.20 The B.E. 1999-2000 the AUWSP was Rs.65.00 crore out of which Rs.53.65 crore (*i.e.* 82.54 percent) was released till 17.2.2000. The allocation for the programme for 2000-2001 has been increased to Rs.100.00 crore (*i.e.* an increase of 53.85 per cent over 1999-2000).

As per 1991 census, there were 2151 towns (having less than 20,000 population) and 23.4 million people were residing in these towns. As per 1996-97 cost estimates,



Rs.3394 crore were needed to provide water supply in these towns where as till 17.2.2000. The Central Government have released Rs.190.23 crore and State Governments have released Rs.147.23 crore (*i.e.* a total of Rs.337.69 crore). No specific physical target has been fixed for the programme but so far, 438 schemes at an estimated cost of Rs. 501.05 crore has been approved. Till date, Schemes in 95 towns (*i.e.* a coverage of 4.42 percent towns) are reported to have been completed/commissioned.

**4.21 The Committee appreciate that provision of potable water to all the towns having less than 20,000 population under the AUWSP is a task which has to be completed at all costs at the earliest. They feel the infinitesimal allocation of Rs.100 crore, though little higher than the allocation for the previous year, for the AUWSP for 2000-2001 is paltry compared to the gigantic task ahead. Taking note of the fact that out of 2151 towns, only 95 towns have so far been covered, the Committee are of the opinion that the Government's efforts in this regard appear to be an eye-wash exercise. Further the fact that the Government could spend only 82.54% of the funds allocated last year compounds the irony of the situations. The Committee deplore the Government for under utilisation of funds meant for AUWSP as well as for the paltry allocation for this monumental task.**

**4.22 The Committee however, are at a loss to know whether the Government at all have details about the availability of potable drinking water in towns having population above 20,000. The Committee strongly recommend that as a facet of the overall objective of providing potable drinking water to all, the towns with population above 20,000 should also be covered.**

**(v) Low Cost Sanitation Scheme for liberation of Scavengers scheme**

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

Category	Subsidy	Loan	Beneficiary Contribution
----------	---------	------	--------------------------

EWS	45%	50%	5%
LIG	25%	60%	15%
MIG/LIG	Nil	75%	25%

-----

The Scheme is being implemented with the following objectives:-

- Conversion of dry latrines into water borne low cost sanitary units;
- Construction of new units/on whole town approach where no facilities exist;
- Liberation of and Rehabilitation of Scavengers;
- Focus on towns below 5 lakh population as per 1991 census and there were 4615 such towns in the country.

The financial performance of the Scheme is as below:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure (released to HUDCO)
1997-98	27.80	26.80	26.80
1998-99	27.80	23.80	23.80
1999-2000	34.65	27.35	NIL

The information on allocation and release of funds (HUDCO share) under the Scheme since 1997-98 is as below:

(Rs. in crore)

	LOAN		SUBSIDY	
	Sanctioned	Released	Sanctioned	Released
1997-98	53.67	24.42	50.46	16.33
1998-99	67.87	48.81	36.62	11.30
1999-2000	38.77	50.16	23.62	60.37
(As on 29.2.2000)				

When asked about the reasons for the nil release of funds (Central share) for Low Cost Sanitation Scheme during 1999-2000 (till 21.2.2000) the Ministry in their reply has stated that the proposal for release of Rs.27.35 crore (Central share) to HUDCO is being processed.

As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, there were 72.1 lakh dry latrines in the urban areas (in 1998-99) needing conversion, out of which only 18.8 lakh dry units were sanctioned for the same. Similarly, against these 18.8 lakh units, only 9.3 lakh units have been completed and works for 3.7 lakh units are under progress. Thus works for the remaining 5.8 lakh dry units sanctioned are yet to be started.

When asked about the year by which the Government can convert the above mentioned 18.8 lakh units for which sanction has already been obtained, the Government in their reply have stated that physical and financial progress of the Scheme is reviewed through review meetings undertaken by the Ministry with the State Secretaries dealing with the subject. The urgency to successfully implement this Scheme by completing the work in progress is stressed upon in order to eradicate the de-humanising practice of manual scavenging in this country.

When asked further about the year by which the Ministry can convert all the 72.1 lakh dry latrines and how much funds would be required for the purpose, the Government in their reply have stated that the 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. 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 financial resources. The 9<sup>th</sup> Plan allocation for the LCS Scheme is Rs.200 crore. As per the written replies, an amount of Rs.120 crore has been allocated in the 9<sup>th</sup> Plan so far out of which the release was Rs.89.45 crore (*i.e.* 74.51 per cent).

**4.25 The Committee express their displeasure over the fact that no fund has been released under LCS scheme in 1999-2000. They are at a loss to point out that even after the lapse of 11 months, the proposal for the release of Rs.27.35 crore to HUDCO is still being processed and as such the conversion work of 5.8 lakh dry units is yet to be started. The Committee feel that the Government are yet to take the Scheme seriously, as only 75.41 per cent of the allocated funds has been released, since inception of the Scheme. They would therefore like to recommend that the**

**Government should take immediate steps to ensure better financial achievement under the Scheme.**

As per the Annual Report 1999-2000 of the Ministry, the Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993 is applicable in 6 States and Union territories. As per the written replies, the Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993 has become applicable to Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura, West Bengal and UTs with effect from 26.1.1997. The State Assemblies of Orissa, Punjab, Assam, Haryana, Bihar and Gujarat have also adopted the Act.

When asked as to how far in the remaining States/UTs the Low Cost Sanitation Scheme is being implemented without the enactment of the said Act, the Ministry have replied that the Centrally Sponsored Low Cost Sanitation Scheme (LCS) is a demand driven scheme. Project schemes are sanctioned by the Coordination Committee in this Ministry depending upon the Proposal(s) received from the State Government(s).

**4.27 The Committee note that the Employment of Manual Scavengers and constitution of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993, has so far been made applicable to the States of Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura and West Bengal since its enactment in June 1993. Subsequently, the States of Orissa, Punjab, Assam, Haryana, Bihar and Gujarat have also adopted it. As manual scavenging is one of the most detestable dehumanising practice of the decades that had gone by, the Committee strongly recommend that the rest of the States should be compelled to follow suit in adopting the Act through a tactics of harmonious admixture of pressure and persuasion which may include linking of the issue to release of Central funds to these States for various schemes for urban development.**

**(f) New Schemes started during the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan**

4.28 The following new (plan) schemes were supposed to be started by the Ministry during the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan :

- (i) Urban/Municipal Capacity Building in the context of 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment etc.;
- (ii) Setting up of NIUD;
- (iii) New Township Development including Shillong Satellite Township;
- (iv) New Township Scheme;
- (v) Development of Cultural Cities;

- (vi) Centrally sponsored programme for providing water supply in State Capitals excluding Mega Cities;
- (vii) Centrally Sponsored programme for providing sewerage, sewage treatment and drainage facilities in State capitals excluding Mega Cities;
- (viii) Special Scheme for Water Supply; and
- (ix) Special Scheme for Solid Waste Management and Sanitation.

The allocation for the following new Schemes has been made in the BE 2000-2001:-

S.No.	Name of the Scheme	Amount (BE 2000-2001) (in Rs. crore)
1.	New Township Scheme	0.50
2.	Development of Cultural Cities	0.50
3.	Special Scheme for Water Supply	1.00
4.	Special Scheme for Solid Waste Management and Sanitation	1.00
Total		3.00

**4.29 The Committee are distressed to note that all the new Schemes expected to be started during the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan (1997-2002) could not commence as no fund has been released as of today by the Ministry for any of the schemes. They further note that in the BE 2000-2001 an amount to the tune of Rs.3.00 crore for the 4 new Schemes (viz. New Township Scheme, Development of Cultural cities, Special Schemes for water supply, and Solid Waste Management and Sanitation) has been allocated. The Committee hope that the Government will give due importance to the new Schemes and urgently commence the operation of these Scheme at least during 2000-2001.**

**(g) Sub-ordinate/Attached Office**

*Land and Development Office (L&D0)*

4.30 The Land and Development Office is a Subordinate Office of the Ministry of Urban Development and is responsible for administration of about 50,000 leases of Central Government in Delhi. (3300 leases are perpetual leases of Nazul Land and the remaining 47,200 are rehabilitation leases). It also looks after conversion of leasehold residential properties upto 500 sq.mtrs plot area into freehold apart from allotment of land to various Government/Semi-Government Departments and social, cultural, charitable, educational and religious institutions.

Under Lease Administration, the Land and Development office is dealing with the following types of cases in respect of the leased properties under lease terms:-

1. Grant of Sale Permission
2. Grant of Mortgage Permission
3. Grant of Gift Permission
4. Substitution
5. Mutation
6. Inspection of Leased properties
7. Encroachments on Govt. Land

The Following statement shows B.E, R.E. and Actual in respect of Land and Development Office during the period 1997-98 to 2000-2001:-

(Rs. in crore)

1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001		
BE	RE	Actual	BE	RE	Actual	BE	RE	Actual	BE	RE	Actual
1.76	2.13	1.64	2.16	3.90	3.59	2.49	2.27	1.95	2.75	-	-

As per the 24<sup>th</sup> Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (12<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha), the Secretary of the then Department during the course of oral evidence had admitted that there is rampant corruption prevalent in L&D office and that they are now computerising the land records. He had also hoped that the position will be better after the computerisation of L & D Office.

4.31 When asked about the progress of computerisation of L&D Office (as on 15.3.2000) the Ministry have replied that a detailed project report has been prepared by National Informatics Centre for computerisation of activities of L&DO. As per this project report, the total expenditure involved for computerisation would be Rs. 282 lakh. The Ministry of Urban Development has so far provided Rs. 80 lakh (Rs.40 lakh during 1998-99 and Rs. 40 lakh during 1999-2000) for computerisation of L&DO. The project of computerisation includes on line processing of applications, mapping, storage of historical data of properties, etc. In the first phase, processing of conversion application through computer has commenced. Other activities such as substitution, mutation, grant of mortgage permission, etc. shall be computerised in the next phase.

On another query about the number of cases of corruption has been detected in the L&D Office by the Ministry of Urban Development during 1998-99 and 1999-2000, the Ministry has replied that vigilance administration L&DO has been strengthened. Year-wise statement indicating the vigilance cases initiated/disciplinary action taken in L&DO during the last three years in as under:-

Year	No. chargesheeted	No. Penalty imposed
1997-98	NIL	NIL
1998-99	12	3
1999-2000	5	2

When asked as to how many application for getting the premises freehold have been received so far, the number of cases finalised and pending, the Ministry has replied that as on 31.1.2000, 21,337 applications for conversion from leasehold to freehold have been received. Out of these, about 17,500 applications have since been processed/disposed of. The pending applications, by and large, relate to the period from 1.12.99 onwards.

Asked further about the time by which when all the pending applications for getting the premises from leasehold to freehold are likely to be disposed and whether the Ministry had thought of fixing some stipulated time frame for disposing of the applications for getting premises freehold the Ministry in their reply have stated that L&DO's Citizens' Charter for Lessees provide that all applications for conversion of residential leased properties into freehold will be disposed of within a period of three months from the date of receipt, if the information and other papers submitted by the lessee are in order.

With a view to giving incentives to the lessees to get their residential leased properties converted into freehold, the Government modified conversion scheme on 28.6.1999. In accordance with modified conversion scheme, as a special concession, it was decided to charge conversion free on the basis of land rates of 1987. This concession was available for a period of 6 months, *i.e.* upto 27.12.1999. Subsequently, this concession was extended upto 15.1.2000 and thereafter upto 31.3.2000. In these circumstances, a large number of conversion applications have been received in December, 1999 & January, 2000.

It has been submitted by the Government in their written note that because of abnormal rush of conversion applications in December, 1999/January, 2000 and acute shortage of man-power in Land & Development Office, it may not be possible to adhere to the normal prescribed time frame of 3 months for processing/disposal of these applications. Keeping these factors in view, all efforts would be made to clear all pending applications by the end of July, 2000.

**4.32 The Committee note that as on 31.1.2000, 21337 application have been received by the L&D office for conversion from leasehold to freehold property, out of which 17500 applications have since been processed/disposed off. The Committee hope, L&DO would be able to dispose of the remaining applications within the stipulated time of three months from the date of receipt. While appreciating the steps taken by the Government to computerise L&D Office, the Committee would like that the Government should take necessary steps to check the rampant corruption prevalent in that office.**

**(h) Autonomous statutory Bodies**

*(1) National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB)*

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

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



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

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

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

4.34 For the 9<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan Rs.400.00 crore was proposed for the NCRPB against which Rs.200.00 crore had been allocated. The following statement shows unspent balance, RE and BE in respect of NCR Planning Board as budgetary support provided by the Ministry of Urban Development:-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-2001
Unspent Balance on 1 <sup>st</sup> April	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
BE	45	45	45	50
RE	42	45	42	-
Actuals	42	45	42	-

The NCRPB has approved 'Functional Plans' in the Transportation, Telecommunication, Power and Industry areas.

As on date (15.3.2000), the Board has extended financial assistance to the participating States for implementing 135 projects for land acquisition and development, for residential and industrial facilities and infrastructure including water supply, sewerage, drainage, transport etc. These projects altogether have an estimated cost of Rs.3217.75 crore (excluding CMA's) against which, the Board has, however, sanctioned an amount of Rs.1426.95 crore as loan assistance and released a loan of Rs.814.78 crore.

(Rs. in crore)

States	No.of Schemes	Estimated Cost	Loan Sanctioned	Loan Released
Uttar Pradesh	52	1106.51	593.89	284.55
Rajasthan	45	375.53	196.68	134.25
Haryana	34	1735.71	612.38	371.98
Sub-total	131	3217.75	1402.95	790.78
CMAs	4	-	24.00	24.00
Total	135	3217.75	1426.95	814.78

As per the written reply the efforts by the NCRPB have helped the creation of the following infrastructure by 1999-2000 in the region:

Nature of Projects	States			
	Haryana	Rajasthan	Uttar Pradesh	Total
Residential Areas (Plots/Flats)	26,000	24,000	64,000	1,14,000
Commercial Areas (Shops/Offices)	3,000	4,700	6,700	17,000
Industrial Areas (Plots/Sheds)	2,000	1,000	6,000	10,100

**4.35 The Committee note that Rs. 814.78 crore has been released as loan against the sanctioned amount of Rs. 1426.95 crore for the 135 projects reportedly started in the NCR. The Committee note that the participating states are yet to release their share and the released amount by NCRPB is only 44.35 % of the estimated cost of Rs. 3217.75 crore. The Committee would like to that the NCRPB should impress upon the participating states to release their share for the overall development of NCR without further delay.**

(2) *Delhi Development Authority (DDA)*

4.36 The Delhi Development Authority has the statutory jurisdiction for overall development and land use in the National Capital Territory of Delhi.

As per the Annual Report 1999-2000 of the Ministry, the Physical achievement for construction of residential buildings is as below:-

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

	<b>SFS</b>	<b>MIG</b>	<b>LIG</b>	<b>Janata</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Houses completed upto 31.3.99	49253	60424	74838	77753	262268
2. Houses in progress as on 1.4.99	4236	2642	774	10716	18368
3. Houses targetted to be taken up during December 1999	8832	1946	2014	5852	7266
4. New houses taken up/ started upto December 1999	622	184	608	5852	7266
5. New houses to be taken up during January to March, 2000	8210	1762	1406	Nil	11378
6. Houses targeted to be completed during 1998-99	592	1006	552	3824	5974
7. Houses completed upto December 1999	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
8. Houses likely to be completed between Jan. to March, 2000	552	1006	552	3824	5974

The physical achievement for the development of commercial centres by the DDA is as below:-

	<b>D.C.</b>	<b>C.C.</b>	<b>L.S.C.</b>	<b>C.S.C.</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Commerical Complexes completed upto 31.3.99	6	24	116	420	566
2. Commercial Complexes in progress as on 1.4.99	1	3	8	7+6JM	19+6 JM
3. New Complexes targeted to be taken up during 1999-2000	Nil	9	15	11+6JM	35+6JM
4. Commerical schemes taken upto December 1999	Nil	2	1	1+2JM	4+2JM
5. Commercial schemes likely to be taken up during January to March 2000	Nil	7	14	10+4JM	31+4JM
6. Commercial schemes targetted to be completed during 1999-2000	1	3	8	7+6JM	19+6JM
7. Commercial schemes completed upto December 1999	Nil	1	1	2+4JM	4+4JM
8. Commercial schemes likely to be completed during January to March, 2000	1	2	7	5+2JM	15+2JM

When asked about the number of houses whose construction has been completed but allocation could not be made and reasons for not allocating the premises, the Ministry have replied that DDA has completed 16133 houses upto the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 1999. Electricity is not available in 10625 houses while water is not available in 5508 houses. The area-wise and category-wise detail is given in the following tables.

**Details of Houses not allocated due to absence of electricity**

Sl.No.	Location	SFS	MIG	LIG	Janata	Total
1.	Dwaraka	1167	1694	2560	272	5693
2.	Rohini Phase III	-	946	2654	-	3600
3.	Narela	-	-	-	792	792
4.	Shalimar Bagh, Plot A, Blk D. Phase I	200	-	-	-	200
5.	748, Janata Houses at Shivaji Enclave	-	-	-	340	340

**Details of Houses not allocated due to absence of Water Supply**

Sl.No.	Location	SFS	MIG	LIG	Janata	Total
1.	Narela	140	1984	1652	1732	5508

However, as and when the information with regard to availability of the flats are being given by the Engineering Department to Housing Department, soon after the same are put for draw for allotment to the wait-listed registrants.

During the course of oral evidence the representative of the Ministry stated as under: "Water and electricity are not within our control. Delhi Jal Board supplies water and Delhi Vidyut Board supplies electricity. Water is a big problem. Unless our problem with Haryana is solved, there is going to be a water riot, as the Secretary has pointed out....When these projects were started, two authorities were supplying water and power. They were taken into confidence. But, now there is some problem and they are not able to supply water. Therefore, what we are doing now is that we are tapping ground water and supplying it. Where ground water is not potable, nothing could be done."

**4.38 The Committee are appalled over the state of affairs in DDA when the Government informed them that out of 16,133 houses constructed upto the end of the third quarter of 1999, 65.8% houses did not have electricity and 34.14% did not have water connection thus leaving houses with no takers. DDA being a premier agency should have constructed the houses only after reassuring themselves about the provision of basic facilities like electricity and water. Having sunk huge Government funds in the constructions which have no takers, the DDA have mindlessly caused enormous losses to the Government. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend to the Government, to identify those responsible for this terrible loss, for initiating punitive action with a view to deterring DDA from indulging in further loss making misadventures.**

**(i) Mass Rapid Transit System (MRTS)**

4.39 The Union Cabinet approved the investment proposals for Delhi MRTS in September, 1996. As per this decision, the project is to be implemented through a joint venture company viz. Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. With equity participation of 50% each by the Government of India and Government of NCT of Delhi. Both the Governments are required to release Rs.1036 crore each towards equity of the company by March, 2005. OFCF (now JBIC - Japanese Bank for International Cooperation) is providing loan assistance for the project to the extent of 56% of the total cost of the project. The balance cost of the project is to be met by the Government of India and Government of NCT of Delhi. The loan agreement for first tranche amounting to about Rs.470 crore was signed in February, 1997. Separate loan agreements are required to be signed for each subsequent tranche of loan.

4.40 The following are some of the milestones achieved towards implementation of the project:-

- (i) General Consultants consisting of a consortium of PCI, JARTS and TONICHI of Japan, PBI of USA and RITES of India were appointed in September, 1998 by Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. to render technical services for implementation of the project. The total cost of consultancy will be Rs.208 crore.
- (ii) Out of about 168.5 ha. of private land required for the project, 60 ha. has already been taken over. The process for taking over of the balance land is also on.

- (iii) The Government of NCT of Delhi is taking necessary steps for rehabilitation of project affected persons.
- (iv) The construction of Shahdara-Tis Hazari section of the Shahdara-Nangloi rail corridor, which was taken up in October, 1998 is in full swing and a substantial progress has been achieved. As far as the progress of the project as a whole is concerned, 7.2% physical progress was achieved as on 31.1.2000.

**4.41 While noting the achievement made under MRTS, the Committee would like to be apprised of the scheduled date of completion of the Nangloi Rail Project. The Committee would also like to be informed about the target of taking over the balance land required for MRTS.**

**4.42 The Committee further like to be informed of the information in respect of number of affected persons who have to be rehabilitated in the process of taking over land for MRTS and the planning on the part of the Government in this regard. The policy/guidelines should be so framed that rehabilitation is effected first and the project work commenced thereafter.**

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

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

**APPENDIX I**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Statement showing BE and RE for the year 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 indicating % hike**

(Gross)

(Rs. in crore)

	BE 1999-2000		RE 1999-2000		BE 2000-2001		Percentage variation over Excess (+)		BE 1999-2000 Saving (-)	
	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Demand No.84										
Revenue	227.49	278.22	226.59	273.50	370.47	295.21	62.68%	6.10%	-	-
Capital	437.14	99.60	373.41	66.54	414.56	74.83	-	-	5.17%	24.89%
Total	664.63	377.82	600.00	340.04	785.03	370.04	27.54%	-	-	2.06%
Demand No.85										
Revenue	9.00	554.45	8.76	554.95	9.00	592.65	-	6.89%	-	-
Capital	100.46	147.00	72.11	122.00	106.40	151.80	5.91%	3.27%		
Total	109.46	701.45	80.87	676.45	115.40	744.45	5.43%	6.13%	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Demand No.86										
Revenue	-	159.91	-	152.42	-	173.26	-	8.35%	-	-
Capital	0.25	4.00	0.25	1.75	-	1.75	-	-	100%	56.
Total	0.25	163.91	0.25	154.17	-	175.01	-	6.77%	100%	-
Grand Total (D.No.84+85 +86)	774.34	1243.18	681.02	1170.66	900.43	1289.50	16.84%	3.73%	-	-
Grand Total (Plan + Non Plan)	2017.52		1851.78		2189.93		4.58%			

## APPENDIX II

## MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

### Financial Outlays: Ninth Plan (1997-2002) and Annual Plan 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-2000 & 2000-2001

(Rs. in crore)

[illegible]



[illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<b>B.</b>	<b>Externally Assisted Projects</b>									
1.	*Pass through Assistance to DMRC from O.E.C.F.	2900.00	362.22	50.00	20.00	63.50	23.00	80.00	52.00	1.00
<b>C.</b>	<b>New Schemes</b>									
a.	Urban/Municipal capacity Building to the context of 74 <sup>th</sup> Amendment etc.	35.00	5.00	-	-	0.50	-	0.01	-	-
b.	PM's New Initiatives for North-Eastern States	-	-	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
c.	Setting up of NIUD	-	-	-	0.50	0.50	-	0.01	-	-
d.	New Township Development including Shillong Satellite Township	100.00	-	1.00	-	0.50	-	0.01	-	-
e.	New Township Scheme									0.50
f.	Development of Cultural Cities									0.50
	Total	2451.00	1686.00	273.00	241.83	363.50	324.91	355.60	255.99	404.62
	*EAP	2900	362.22	60.00	20.00	63.50	23.00	80.00	52.00	1.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Water Supply and Sanitation:</b>									
6.	Training in PHE* Research* Monitoring & MIS* Urban Water Disposal*	32.50	6.00	2.00	0.89	2.00	1.01	2.00	1.00	2.00
7.	Low Cost Sanitation for liberation of Scavengers	300.00	200.00	28.00	26.80	28.00	28.00	34.65	-	30.00
8.	Equity to Urban Development & UWS Financing Corp./HUDCO	80.00	90.00	8.00	8.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	20.00
9.	Extension of AUWSP to small towns	3596.00	370.00	28.00	27.95	45.00	40.00	65.00	51.83	87.90
10.	Support to Water Supply scheme of major cities facing acute water shortage	100.00	86.00	4.50	-	4.50	-	4.50	4.50	60.00
11.	Pilot project on Solid Waste Management near airports in few selected cities in the country	36.00	20.00	0.50	-	1.00	-	1.00	-	5.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12.	“Pass through credit for External assistance to HUDCO from O.E.C.F.	45.00	64.00	64.00	33.47	0.50	2.50	10.00	9.40	3.93
	Total	4144.50	772.00	71.00	63.44	98.50	82.81	125.15	75.33	204.90
	*EAP	44.50	64.00	64.00	33.47	0.50	2.50	10.00	9.40	3.93
	<b>New Schemes</b>									
a.	Centrally sponsored programme for providing water supply in State Capitals excluding Mega Cities	434.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b.	Centrally sponsored programme for providing sewerage, sewage treatment & drainage facilities in State capitals excluding Mega Cities	944.00	28.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c.	Centrally sponsored programme for solid waste management in State capitals excluding Mega Cities	86.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
d.	Special Scheme for Water Supply	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00
e.	Special Scheme for Solid Waste Management and Sanitation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00
	Total	1464.00	28.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.00
iv.	General Pool Accommodation	500.00	327.00	45.00	63.63	70.00	72.32	80.00	36.89	75.00
	Total	500.00	327.00	45.00	63.63	70.00	72.32	80.00	36.89	75.00
<b>V.</b>	<b>Public Works</b>									
13.	CPWD Training Institute R&D Cell	40.00	15.00	2.50	1.73	2.50	2.12	3.00	1.95	3.00
14.	General Pool Accommodation (Non—Residential)	200.00	100.00	20.00	15.18	20.00	9.85	20.00	7.10	20.00
15.	North-Eastern Zone	15.00	18.00	3.00	2.56	3.50	3.01	4.00	2.76	4.00
16.	System Development through Computerisation	10.00	5.00	-	-	1.00	0.85	2.00	-	2.00
17.	Equity Support to NBCC	20.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	285.00	138.00	25.00	19.47	27.00	15.83	29.00	11.81	29.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
VI.	Stationery and Printing									
18.	M.E.T.P.	6.00	3.00	0.50	0.21	1.00	-	0.25	-	-
	Total	6.00	3.00	0.50	0.21	1.00	-	0.25	-	-
	Grand Total	8850.00	2925.00	529.00	442.25	624.00	521.37	680.00	441.42	800.50*
	EAP	2945.00	426.22	114.00	53.47	64.00	25.50	90.00	61.40	4.93

\* Including a provision of Rs.80.05 crore for the Project/Scheme for North East & Sikkim.

**APPENDIX III****MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT****Statement of Non-Plan provision (BE, RE & Actual Expenditure) during the 9<sup>th</sup> Plan period**

(Rs. in crore)

Demand No.	1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
84-UD										
Gross	254.55	292.56	302.33	319.42	343.15	323.32	377.82	340.04	256.52	370.04
Recoveries	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04
Net	254.51	292.52	302.33	319.38	343.11	323.32	377.78	340.00	256.52	370.00
85-Public Works										
Gross	573.05	625.93	631.45	731.45	697.45	639.64	701.45	676.45	532.16	744.45
Recoveries	229.45	229.45	241.26	289.45	239.45	228.93	201.45	201.45	166.25	219.45
Net	343.60	396.48	390.19	442.00	458.00	410.71	500.00	475.00	365.91	525.00

Demand No.	1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
86- Stationery and Printing										
Gross	147.42	164.84	116.05	178.86	178.14	141.27	163.91	154.17	107.08	175.01
Recoveries	68.42	68.42	46.36	71.00	71.00	68.27	72.01	72.01	63.65	75.01
Net	79.00	96.42	69.69	107.86	107.14	73.00	91.90	82.16	43.43	100.00
Grand Total										
Gross	975.02	1083.33	1049.83	1229.73	1218.74	1104.23	1243.18	1170.66	895.76	1289.50
Recoveries	297.91	297.91	287.62	360.49	310.49	297.20	273.50	273.50	229.30	294.50
Net	677.11	785.42	762.21	869.24	908.25	807.03	969.68	897.16	665.86	995.00





## APPENDIX IV

### MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1755 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri P.R. Kyndiah – In the *Chair*

#### *MEMBERS*

##### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri A. Brahmaniah
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
6. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
7. Prof. Kailasho Devi
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Vijay Goel
10. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
11. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
12. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
13. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
14. Shri Ramachandra Paswan
15. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
17. Shri Maheshwar Singh
18. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
19. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

*Rajya Sabha*

20. Shri S. Agni Raj
21. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
22. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
23. Shri N.R. Dasari
24. Shri Onward L. Nongdu
25. Shri N. Rajendran
26. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
27. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman - *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - *Under Secretary*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development**

1. Shri Ashok Pahwa - Secretary
2. Shri G.C. Bhandari - Additional Secretary & FA
3. Shri S. Banerjee - Joint Secretary (UD)
4. Shri B.S. Duggal - Director General of Works, CPWD
5. Shrimati Sarita J.Das - Member Secretary, NCR Planning Board
6. Shri P.K. Ghosh - Vice-Chairman, DDA
7. Shri A. Chakrabarti - OSD (Tech), MRTS
8. Shri E. Sreedharan - CMD, DMRC
9. Shri S.D. Mesh Ram - Chief Planner, TCPO

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 representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development to the sitting. He also drew the attention of the witnesses to the provision of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the said Ministry.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

**APPENDIX V**  
**MINUTES OF THE SIXTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE**  
**HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2000**

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs. in Room No.'62', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete – *Chairman*

*MEMBERS*

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri A. Brahmaniah
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. Shrimati Ranee Narah
11. Shri Ramachandra Paswan
12. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
13. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
14. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

*Rajya Sabha*

15. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
16. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
17. Shri N.R. Dasari

18. Shri C. Apok Jamir
19. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
20. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
21. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
22. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman - *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the Draft Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Development.

3. The Committee adopted the Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Urban Development 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*

(See para 3 of the minutes of the sitting held on 11.4.2000)

Sl.	Page	Para	Line	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	7	2.4	8	<i>For “21 per cent” read “26 per cent”</i>
2.	8	2.5	3	<i>After “gear up” insert “and streamline”</i>
3.	13	2.13	6	<i>After “strength” Add “which is singularly surprising”</i>
4.	13	2.13	2	<i>(i) Omit “to downsize there manpower” from bottom</i>
				<i>(ii) For “curtail” read “cut down”</i>
5.	15	2.15	-	<i>For the existing para read the following: “The Committee strongly recommend that the Government should make all out efforts to ensure that the outlay earmarked for the respective central sector schemes/programmes like IDSMT, AUWSP and Urban Mapping etc. in a particular year are used only for the specific programme/scheme for which the allocation is made and the chances of having unspent outlay are minimised. The Committee also urge that necessary steps should be taken by the Government to ensure that unspent</i>

1	2	3	4	5
				outlay do not get accumulated with State Governments/implementing Agencies. The next instalment under the specific scheme/programme should not be released to the defaulting States. The Committee recommend that strict guidelines in this regard should be framed and circulated to State Governments and the Committee apprised accordingly.”
6.	20	3.3	4	<i>For “loans” read “outlay”</i>
7.	20	3.3	3 from bottom	<i>For “loans” read “outlay”</i>
8.	20	3.3	1 and 2 from bottom	<i>For lines 1 and 2 from bottom read the following:</i> “1999-2000. The Committee find that instead of initiating steps to contain expenditure on Secretariat-General service, the outlay earmarked for the critical components of urban development like water supply and housing has been reduced. The Committee view this seriously and urge upon the Government to take appropriate steps for restoration of the outlay.”
9.	24	3.7	3	<i>Add at the end:</i> “The Committee recommend that a blueprint for demolition of old bungalows and construction of new ones in place of them in a time bound manner, may be evolved so that within a span of every 5 to 10

1	2	3	4	5
				years around 100 old bungalows are demolished and new constructions are put in place for easing the tight position in allotment of bungalows to VIPs and others. The Government must also appropriately tie up with the Planning Commission and other agencies concerned for securing the necessary allocations.”
10.	32	4.10	-	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>“The Committee note with concern the delay in the finalisation of the recommendations of the Review Committee. They would like to be apprised of the main recommendations of the Review Committee when finalised and the action taken thereon.”</p>
11.	34	4.16	-	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>“The Committee are concerned to note that a sum of Rs.705.96 crore was left unspent with the implementing agencies till 31.12.1999, which reflects a very poor stage of implementation of various projects under the Mega City scheme. The Committee recommend that the implementing agencies should be geared up to speed up the implementation of projects and to reduce the chances of having unspent balances towards the close of the year.”</p>



1	2	3	4	5
12.	37	4.22	3 from bottom	<i>For “desire” read “strongly recommend”</i>
13.	40	4.25	10 from bottom	<i>For “are concerned to note” read “express their displeasure”</i>
14.	41.	4.27	-	<i>For the existing para read the following: “The Committee note that the Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993, has so far been made applicable to the States of Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura, West Bengal since its enactment in June 1993. Subsequently, the States of Orissa, Punjab, Assam, Haryana, Bihar and Gujarat have also adopted it. As manual scavenging is one of the most detestable dehumanising practice of the decades that had gone by, the Committee strongly recommend that the rest of the States should be compelled to follow suit in adopting the Act through a tactics of harmonious admixture of pressure and persuasion which may include linking of the issue to release of Central funds to these States for various schemes for urban development.”</i>

1	2	3	4	5
15.	52	4.38	12 and 13	<i>For</i> “constrained to issue a direction” <i>read</i> “ strongly recommend”
16.	54	4.42	-	<i>Add</i> at the end: “The policy/guidelines should be so framed that rehabilitation is effected first and the project work commenced thereafter.”