

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

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF URBAN EMPLOYMENT
AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1998-99

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
March, 2000/Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	5
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	21
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	23
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited	25

APPENDICES

I.	Minutes of the 3rd Sitting of the Committee held on 24.2.2000	26
II.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 4.6.1997 addressed to Ministry of Finance	28
III.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 24.7.1997 addressed to Cabinet Secretary	30
IV.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 23.9.1997 addressed to Member-Secretary, Planning Commission	33
V.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 8.9.1997 addressed to Member-Secretary, Planning Commission	35
VI.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 27.10.1997 addressed to Member-Secretary, Planning Commission	37
VII.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 15.12.1997 addressed to Ministry of Finance	38
VIII.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 6.1.1998 addressed to Ministry of Finance	40

IX.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 12.2.1998 addressed to Advisor (HUD), Planning Commission	42
X.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 16.3.1998 addressed to Director (HUD), Planning Commission	44
XI.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 19.3.1998 addressed to Special Secretary, Planning Commission	46
XII.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 20.3.1998 addressed to Ministry of Finance	48
XIII.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 22.4.1998 addressed to Special Secretary, Planning Commission	49
XIV.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 5.5.1998 addressed to Director (HUD), Planning Commission	51
XV.	Copy of Ministry's letter dated 10.7.1998 addressed to Director (HUD), Planning Commission	53
XVI.	Copy of terms of reference of the Committee constituted on 12.6.1998	54
XVII.	Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 3rd Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha)	56

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

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

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

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - *Under Secretary*
3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy *Assistant Director*

*Nominated we.f. 24.1.2000.

'*Died on 13.1.2000.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Second Report on 'Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Twelfth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1998-99) of the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation of the then Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment.

2. The Third Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 13th July, 1998. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 21st January, 1999.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 24th February, 2000.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 3rd Report of the Committee (Twelfth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix XVII.

NEW DELHI;
3 March, 2000
13 Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1999-2000) deals with action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Third Report on Demands for Grants (1998-99) of the Ministry of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation (erstwhile Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation of Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 13th July, 1998.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 18 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos. 1.8, 1.9, 1.22, 1.23, 2.12, 2.24, 2.42, 2.43, 3.7, 3.14, 3.15, 4.13, 4.17 and 4.18

- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue:

Para Nos. 2.40 and 2.41

- (iii) Recommendations/observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:

Para Nos. 4.11 and 4.12

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

NIL

3. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of the recommendations.

Streamlining the Implementation of National Slum Development Programme

Recommendation (Para Nos. 4.11 and 4.12)

4. The Committee in their earlier recommendation noted as under:

"The Committee note that the Government in August, 1996 has launched yet another scheme known as National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) which aims to provide additionality to the normal Central assistance given to States/UTs for slum development. The programme aims to provide adequate and satisfactory water supply, sanitation, primary education, health care etc. to the urban poor living in slums. It also aims to develop community participation through NGOs, CBOs and other private institutions. The funds for the programme are allocated by the Department of Expenditure (Ministry of Finance) and Ministry of Home Affairs to the States/ UTs respectively. However, the monitoring of the progress of implementation etc. of NSDP has been entrusted to the Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation in the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment.

While the guidelines (original) have been issued by the Planning Commission, the same have been revised by the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation, in December, 1997. The Committee fail to understand the rationale behind such an arrangement made in respect of this programme and wonder as to what extent the monitoring by this Ministry will be effective when funds for the programme are being made available from the Demands of other Departments/Ministries...

... The Committee, therefore, desire that steps be taken urgently to streamline the system of funds allocation, etc. and to evolve a coordinated approach for the successful implementation of the NSDP...."

5. The Government in their reply stated:

"Agreed with the views of the Standing Committee. Since, mid 1997, this Ministry is attempting to rationalise the arrangements made in respect of this programme. In this regard correspondence had been exchanged with the Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and also the Cabinet Secretariat Prior to issue of revised guidelines, this Ministry was in a very anomalous situation. Apportionment of funds was done by the Planning Commission whereas the releases were done by the Department of Expenditure directly. No input was sought from 'this Department, even a copy of the release orders issued by the Department of Expenditure were not marked to this Department for information. To make the system more workable and to enhance the scope of this programme, the guidelines were revised by this Ministry in consultation with the Planning Commission. The MIS proforma was designed and circulated to all States/ UTs to report the physical as well financial progress to this Ministry. Necessary inputs were provided to States and UT to implement the programme in an effective manner. The monitoring can be made effective if funds too are released by this Ministry."

6. The Committee while noting the agreement of the Government with their recommendation find that Government have themselves admitted certain lacunae in the present system and have felt that the monitoring can be made effective, if funds too are released by this Ministry'. In view of this admission by the Government themselves, the Committee recommend that either the release of funds under NSDP should also be entrusted to the Ministry of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation or its monitoring may also be done by the Department of Expenditure which releases the funds.

B. Study on the Economic Capacity of Slum Dwellers.

Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)

7. The Committee in their earlier recommendation observed as follows:

"It is felt that while planning any programme for slum development, it is presumed that the dwellers are very poor having no or very little economic capacity to contribute for the development of their own area. With a view to discourage growth of slums and to involve the slum dwellers in the development, the Government should not only increase the outlay for programmes like IDSMT etc., but should also conduct

a study of the economic capacity of the slum dwellers. To begin with such a study could be conducted by the Government on sample basis of any slum of NCT of Delhi. The Committee will like to be informed of the report of such study.”

8. The Government in their reply stated as follows:

"Under the Chairmanship of the additional Secretary (UD), Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment a new Committee has been set up to examine various technologies available for rehabilitation of Jhuggi Jhompri Dwellers from NDMC area."

9. In response to their recommendations that a study of the economic capacity of the slum dwellers should be conducted, the Government have stated that they have since appointed a Committee to examine various technologies available for rehabilitation of Jhuggi jhompri Dwellers in the NDMC area. The terms of reference of this Committee nowhere indicate that the said Committee is required or would be conducting a study of the economic capacity of the slum dwellers even of a JJ Colony of NDMC area. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendations and Urge upon the Government to appreciate the spirit of their recommendations by conducting a study of the economic capacity of the slum dwellers not only of NDMC area but also of areas where programmes like IDSMT are being implemented.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 1.8)

The Committee note that during the year 1997-98, the Ministry has launched a new Yojana viz., Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) encompassing the earlier schemes of NRY, UBSP and PMI UPEP from 1.12.1997. A cursory glance of the budgetary provisions for 1998-99 reveals that as compared to Rs. 259.41 crore in 1997-98 the allocation made for 1998-99 stands at Rs. 337.21 crore, registering an increase of 29.99% over BE 1997-98. However, there is no increase in the provision for plan expenditure on the Revenue side which has remained stagnant at Rs. 218 crore, while in the capital section, plan side the allocation at Rs. 110 crore for 1998-99 shows an increase of 214% over BE figure of Rs. 35 crore in 1997-98.

Reply of the Government

The B.E. allocation for 1997-98 and 1998-99 (Plan) under the Schemes of NRY etc. is as under:

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	B.E 1997-98			B.E. 1998-99		
		Rev.	Cap.	Tot.	Rev.	Cap.	Tot.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
REVENUE							
1.	Nehru Rozgar Yojana	80	—	80			
2.	Urban Basic Services for the Poor	20	—	20			
3.	PMI UPEP	88	—	88			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4.	Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana	—	—	—	188.50		188.50
5.	Others	30	—	30	29.50	—	29.50
	Total Revenue	218	—	218	218.00	—	218.00
	CAPITAL						
6.	Equity to HUDCO for Housing	—	35	35	—	110	110.00
	Total Capital	—	35	35	—	110	110.00
	Grand Total	218	35	253	218.00	110	328.00

2. It will thus be seen that allocation for the new Scheme of Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana during 1998-99 was Rs. 188.50 crores as against Rs. 188.00 crores for the previous three schemes during 1997-98. It is a fact that there has been no increase in the Plan provision during 1998-99 *vis-a-vis* 1997-98 on the Revenue side.

The only appreciable increase is in Equity to HUDCO *i.e.* from Rs. 35.00 crores during 1997-98 to Rs. 110.00 crores during 1998-99 on the capital side. The enhanced equity support to HUDCO has been provided keeping in view the emphasis of the Government on increasing housing stock in a big way. The National Agenda for Governance envisages construction of 20 lakh additional houses every year for the benefit of the poor and the deprived. Out of this, 7 lakh houses will be in urban areas and 13 lakh in rural areas. HUDCO was expected to meet one third of the additional target. Hence, the increase in allocation of equity support to HUDCO.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of
Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 1.9)

The allocation envisages for the earlier major schemes of NRY, UBSP, PMI UPEP in the Revenue Section was Rs.187.20 crores in 1997-98 as against the allocation of Rs. 186.70 crores for the newly launched Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) in BE 1998-99 showing a decrease of Rs. 50 lakhs over the BE 1997-98. The Committee, therefore, desired that allocation for SJSRY should at least have been kept at the level of 1997-98, if not more, since the new Yojana encompasses the earlier three schemes of NRY, UBSP and PMI UPEP.

Reply of the Government

Rs. 188 crore were provided by the Planning Commission in 1997-98 and this Department had sent a proposal for Rs. 400 crores for 1998-99 to the Planning Commission. However, Planning Commission had provided Rs. 188.50 crores which include Rs. 80 lakh for Salaries and Rs. 1 crore for making payment of earlier dues to DAVP & HUDCO towards launching of PMI UPEP scheme in November, 1995. The net amount available for SJSRY thus fell short by about Rs. 50 lakhs.

The Planning Commission will be addressed, again to at least maintain allocations at old levels and to increase allocations.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 1.22)

The Committee observe that while on one hand there has been no increase in the allocation for the major scheme of SJSRY in BE 1998-99, on the other, the non-plan expenditure at Rs. 9.21 crore in 1998-99 registered an increase of 43.68% over Rs. 6.41 crore in BE 1997-98. A new proviso of Rs. 250 lakh has been made towards giving assistance to HUDCO to compensate it for interest loss on account of loans to Jabalpur earthquake victims. It is proposed to assist HUDCO for the purpose initially for three years and recommend its continuation till the differential of interest loss to HUDCO on account of loan is compensated.

The Committee, however, regret to note that the allocation for office expenses (on non-plan side) register an increase of over 714% from Rs. 14 lakh in BE 1997-98 to Rs. 114 lakh in BE 1998-99. According to the Ministry, the increase was to meet the expenses for giving wide publicity to the programme of PMI UPEP launched in August, 1994 though the scheme itself now stands discontinued *w.e.f.* 30.11.1997 and has become part of the newly launched SJSRY.

Reply of the Government

The areas of variation between BE 1997-98 BE 1998-99 (Non-Plan) can be summarised as under:

Item	BE 1997-98	BE 1998-99	Variation
Secretariat	0.32	0.53	0.21
Interest subsidy for Areas affected by Natural Calamities	—	2.50	2.50
Contribution to UNCHS	0.35	0.35	NIL
N.B.O. (Estt.)	0.64	0.73	0.09
Grants-in-Aid to CGEWHO	0.10	0.10	NIL
Financing Housing Schemes for Central Govt. Employees through Housing Agencies	5.00	5.00	NIL
Total	6.41	9.21	2.80

As may be seen from above, the variation is due to the grant of interest subsidy to HUDCO in respect of the areas affected by natural calamities. Apart from it, the normal increase in salary/establishment accounts for remaining Rs. 0.30 crores.

In so far as the increase in the allocation for Office Expenses from Rs. 14 lakhs to Rs. 114 lakhs is concerned, it may be stated that these figures are on the Plan side. The additional allocation of Rs. 100 lakhs in 1998-99 was for making payment of earlier dues of DAVP and HUDCO towards launching of that PMI UPEP Scheme in November, 1995. The scheme of SJSRY has been started *w.e.f.* 1.12.97. Evidently, merger of the PMIUPEP Scheme was not contemplated at that time.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 1.23)

They further note that the manpower requirements of the Department till now are being made on a tentative basis due to which there is a wide gap between the estimated and actual strength of establishment as on 1.3.1997. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the manpower requirements of the Department, be assessed in a more pragmatic manner assessing the actual workload by carrying out SIU/Internal work study at the earliest. They also desire that office expenses on account of publicity for various programmes of the Department be kept to the bare minimum to reduce non-plan expenses in future.

Reply of the Government

Upto 1996-97, there was one common Demand for both. the Departments, namely, Urban Development and Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. It was for the first time during 1996-97 that the budget provision under Demand No. 82, Urban Development and Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation were tentatively segregated into (A) Department of Urban Development (B) Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. However, one common schedule of Estimated Strength of Establishment and provision, therefore, for both the Departments was retained. During 1997-98, separate Demand No. 83 was introduced for the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The staff strength shown notionally pertains to NBO and does not cover the entire Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The discrepancy in figures is basically attributed to transition of the relative figures from the earlier composite Demand to the new Demand relating to the Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation.

The position brought out under Demand No. 84 during the year 1998-99 relating to Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation represents the correct picture wherein the actual strength of the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation including NBO in schedule relating to Estimated strength of Establishment and provisions therefor as on 1.3.97 has been shown as 142 alongwith the estimated strength as on 1.3.98 and 1.3.99 as 145 and 140 respectively.

In the light of the position explained above, entrusting of the work and study of the Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation to Staff Inspection of the Internal Work Study Unit may not be necessary.

In regarding to the observations of the Committee relating to Office Expenses on account of Publicity for various programmes of the Department of Under Non-Plan, it is stated that there is no provision as such under Non-Plan during 1998-99. The Hon'ble Committee is evidently referring to the provisions made in Plan in respect of which the position has been explained under Para 1.22.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

The Committee note that the number of persons living below poverty line at 763.37 lakh for 1993-94 constitute 32.36% of total number of persons in urban areas. The revised poverty line for people in urban areas to be categorised as BPL families at 1996-97 prices is Rs. 353.44 per capita per month. They further

note that the funds allocated Rs. 653.35 crore by the Government for urban poverty alleviation programmes were 24.21% of the amount proposed (Rs. 2699 crore) in respect of the 8th Five Year Plan which fell to just 9.87% (Rs. 581 crore) for the first two years of Ninth Plan (yet to be finalised) proposals (Rs. 5889.45 crore). The contention of the Ministry that the level of allocation by the Planning Commission remained at the previous plan levels is untenable. It becomes all the more obvious

When viewed in the context of percentage of GDP which is in the region of 0.08% during 1995-96 and 1996-97. The Committee recommend that the allocations for urban poverty alleviation programmes (UPA) should be increased keeping in view the increasing level of urban poverty and is to provide a better quality of life to the urban poor. They would like to be apprised of the steps taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

For the 8th Five year Plan, the proposed outlay for the UPA Programme, viz. NRY, UBSP and PMI UPEP was Rs.1850 crore (NRY – 1500, UBSP – 100, PMI UPEP – 250) against which actual allocation was Rs.585 crore which was 31.5% of the proposed outlay. For the 9th Five Year Plan, the proposed outlay for the above UPA Programme (merged as SJSRY since December, 1997) was Rs. 4869 crores against which actual allocation for first two years was Rs.376.5 crores which is 7.73% of the proposed outlay. For the year 1998-99, the Planning Commission agreed only marginal increase in the allocation i.e. from Rs.188 crore during 1997-98 to Rs.188.5 crores during 1998-99. One reason for the nominal increase is that the State Governments were having substantial unspent balances from previous releases. After reviewing the progress of SJSRY during 1998-99, this Ministry would take up with the Planning Commission the question of increasing allocation for the scheme. The Ministry agrees with the Hon'ble Standing Committee and appreciated its support for the higher allocations for UPA schemes. The matter will be vigorously pursued with the Planning Commission as in the past.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No.2.24)

It is observed that the Committee 1996-97 in their 2nd and 12th Report (Eleventh Lok Sabha) has recommended that sustainability and viability aspect (including the roles of Banks in micro enterprises assisted under SUME) of SUME of NRY be examined, pending which the scheme should be held in abeyance. Further, the Committee find it disconcerting to note that on the one hand these three schemes have now been discontinued as pointed out by the Committee (1996-97) as they have suffered from certain contradictions, had overlapping features and resulted in unequal benefits extended to intended persons under the schemes, while on the other, the Government's claim that their progress was satisfactory is not comprehensible. The Committee feel that had these lacunae been removed at the time of launching of these schemes, they would not have to be discontinued now. The Committee also feel that the Ministry could have expedited the reports of the evaluatory studies commissioned earlier, before these UPA schemes were discontinued. They therefore, desire that the Government should be more vigilant before they launch new schemes with similar features, in future.

Reply of the Government

The observation of the Committee have been respectfully noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.42)

Further, the shelter upgradation component of SHASHU under NRY has now been made part of the National Slum Development Programme. The Yojana had inherited the unspent balances of the earlier schemes of NRY, UBSP & PMI UPEF in addition to the allocation made in RE 1997-98. They, therefore, desire that as the Yojana is of recent origin, the Ministry should closely monitor the progress of implementation by States while allocating the funds.

Reply of the Government

For monitoring the progress of implementation of the Yojana at the national level, a High Level Monitoring Committee (HLMC) has been set up under the Chairmanship of Secretary (UEPA). Apart from monitoring by the Committee, review meetings are also convened by the Department with the concerned Secretaries/nodal officers from the States at suitable intervals. As directed by the Committee, close monitoring will be done.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.43)

The Committee while noting that the new scheme of SJSRY has retained many other features of earlier schemes of NRY, PMI UPEP & UBSP, caution the Government with regards to the role of banks, the sustainability and viability of self-employment ventures under USEP etc. and to avoid the pitfalls of the earlier schemes while implementing SJSRY. The Committee feel that proper planning is a necessary prerequisite for successful implementation of projects under the Yojana in both the self-employment and wage-employment special schemes. They desired that the Ministry should keep in mind the views of this Committee as contained in their earlier Reports. They also desired that to have a close monitoring, a system of concurrent evaluation of the progress of implementation of the 'Yojana should be got done from an independent agency. They desire to be apprised of the steps taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The comparison of features in the following table, of Self Employment Component of Scheme of Urban Micro Enterprises (SUME) of Nehru Rozgar Yojana (NRY) with that USEP of SJSRY would reveal that self employment ventures envisaged under the new scheme would be more viable and sustainable:

	SUME of NRY	USEP of SJSRY
Subsidy	Rs. 5000/- (SCs/STs/Women) Rs. 4000/- (General)	Rs. 7500/- (for all)
Loan	Rs. 15000/- (SCs/STs/Women) Rs. 12000/- (General)	Rs. 37500/-
Margin Money		Rs. 5000/-
Project cost	Rs. 20000/- (SCs/STs/Women)	Rs. 50000/-

It would be seen that self employment ventures under Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP) of the SJSRY would be more viable and sustainable and income generating. In such a situation, the repaying capacity of the beneficiaries will be more and Banks will come forward willingly to finance such ventures. Besides, High Level Monitoring Committee (HLMC) set up in the Ministry under the Chairmanship of the Secretary (UD) will also take care of bottlenecks in smooth flow of banks' finance.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.7)

The Committee are of the considered view that Government should take some concrete measures to boost housing activity by way of extending certain tax benefits or providing other similar concessions so that Government objective of shelter for all as visualised is attained in the minimum possible time frame and cost estimates.

Reply of the Government

The Government has since formulated National Housing and Habitat Policy, which has been laid in Parliament. The basic objectives of the policy are:-

1. to create surpluses in housing stock either on rental or ownership basis.

2. providing quality & cost effective housing and shelter options to the citizen specially the vulnerable groups and the poor.
3. ensuring that housing, alongwith supporting services is treated as a priority and at par with infrastructure sector.
4. ensuring that all dwelling units have easy accessibility to basic sanitation facilities and water.
5. removing legal, financial and administrative barriers for facilitating access to, land finance and technology.
6. forging strong partnership between private, public and cooperative sectors to enhance the capacity of the construction industry to participate in every sphere of housing and habitat.

The objectives of the policy would be carried out through appropriate initiatives at all levels of Government. The policy clearly describes the role of Central Government, State Governments, local authorities, housing finance institutions, housing boards, development authorities, corporate and private sector and cooperatives, Research and Development Institution and others.

The National Agenda for Governance accords priority to Housing for All with emphasis on the housing needs of the poor. The Agenda envisages construction of 20 lakh additional houses every year for the benefit of the poor and the deprived. Out of these 20 lakh additional houses, 7 lakh houses will be constructed in urban areas and the remaining 13 lakh will be in rural areas. It is expected that HUDCO will meet 1/3rd of the additional target.

So far as fiscal concessions for housing are concerned, the policy states that incentives are to be provided to encourage the investment by financial institutions, HFIS, mutual funds, companies, trust, foreign institutional investors in rental housing. The HFIs would develop innovative instrument to mobilise domestic saving in the country to meet their need for finance. The policy also envisages that fiscal concessions would be required to mobilise resources at low cost for funding housing for the weaker sections and also to encourage different activities like affordable housing rental housing for low income groups, energy efficient housing, disaster resistant construction etc. The private sector would be persuaded to invest a part of their pro housing needs of the poor. The Government has already accorded a number of tax concessions to attract investment in the housing sector. HUDCO has also been permitted to issue tax-free and taxable bonds in the past for mobilisation of resources from the market at lower interest rates to make the financial assistance to the vulnerable sections viable and sustainable.

Following concession have been given in the 1998-99 budget:-

- * Urban land held as stock in trade has been exempted from Wealth Tax from 5 years to 7 years.
 - * Properties rented out for more than 3 months are exempted from Wealth Tax.
 - * The limit of 20% as deduction for repairs and collection charges out of rental income has been raised to 25%.
- Deduction for interest on borrowed capital in case of self occupied properties has been raised from the level of Rs. 15,000/- to Rs. 30,000/-.
- * Carry forward of losses from house property against future income under the same head is to be allowed for 8 years.
 - * Deduction for rents paid for residential accommodation for self occupation is to be allowed.
 - * Tax holiday for approved housing projects - 100% deduction from profits for first five years and 30% deduction is allowed for subsequent five years HFIs can transfer 40% of their profits to special reserve.
 - * This Ministry has been raising the matter regarding tax relief under Section 10 (23G) of the Income Tax

Act to be granted for Housing Finance Companies in order to raise low cost resources for financing EWS Housing. This has not yet been approved by Ministry of Finance. This is being pursued.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.14)

The Committee while appreciating the special emphasis being laid on Housing for Weaker Section etc. in the 9th Plan desire that HUDCO and the nodal Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment should ensure that adequate provisions for meeting the basic civic amenities like electricity, water, sewerage and

provision for health care etc. have been made in the plans for construction of houses of EWS/LIG categories.

To achieve this objective the HUDCO should examine making the provision for basic amenities and facilities for health care etc., a condition precedent for sanctioning of loans to State Governments. HUDCO while releasing loans should also ensure that good quality building material is used in the houses being constructed with its help. For this purpose HUDCO should consider on the spot checking through some independent agency. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps taken by the Government in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The National Housing & Habitat Policy stipulates that it will be ensured that all dwelling units have easy accessibility to basic sanitation facilities and water. The policy also envisages that State Government would prepare long term programmes to tackle problems in housing and basic services.

As a premier techno financing institution in the field of human settlements, HUDCO has been working towards the betterment of living condition of people with prime focus on the low income and economically weaker sections. While on one hand HUDCO promotes environmentally appropriate settlements through intense and optimum use of land, proper development of infrastructure facilities like roads sewerage, horticulture, water and electricity supply, health care centre, community centre etc. and sensitive planning on the other it encourages simple, inexpensive and aesthetically pleasing housing design which make use of locally available building materials and indigenous construction techniques, thereby reducing costs and bringing housing within the affordability of the people. HUDCO has been asked to keep in view the above suggestion of the Hon. Committee with regard to on the spot checking through some independent agency, while sanctioning housing projects in future and also to ensure that good quality construction material is used in housing project financed by it. The State Governments have also been advised to issue necessary instructions to the State Housing Agencies to comply with the recommendations of the Committee.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of
Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)

The Committee feel that to ensure use of better quality of building material in the houses being constructed for persons belonging to EWS/ LIG categories, the draw of lots for specific houses should be held in advance so that the beneficiary was aware that a particular unit was to be allotted to him. The Committee hope that if adopted, this system will not only expedite construction process but will also act as a deterrent on the constructing agency in using inferior quality of building material.

Reply of the Government

Housing being a State subject, it is primarily the responsibility of State housing agencies to ensure that contractors do not use inferior or substandard building material with a view to earn profits. The recommendation of the Committee regarding draw of lots for specific houses has therefore been communicated to State Governments for appropriate action.

In this connection it may be stated that efforts are being made in various R & D institutions in the country to develop cost effective, energy efficient, environment friendly building materials to ensure durable construction. The dissemination, of information about the large scale use of these materials is being done through Building Centres and the State PWDs are increasingly been advised to adopt these innovative technologies and building material with a view to reduce the construction cost and promote construction of safer and more durable houses. The State Governments have been requested to issue appropriate instructions of the State housing agencies for implementation of the recommendations of the Hon. Committee.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.13)

While the Committee appreciate the concern of the Government towards the problem of development of slums in the country, at the same time they recommend that funds for this programme should not be allocated by reducing outlays for other schemes of urban development. They also observe that the slums put extra burden on the already inadequate infrastructure available in the particular city. They, therefore, recommend that instead of taking up development of slums in isolation, the Government should make a coordinated effort to develop/strengthen the available infrastructure of the city. They will also like to draw the attention of the Government to their recommendation made by them in their First Report on Demands for Grants (1998-99) of the Department of Urban Development in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Agreed with the views of the Committee.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.17)

The Study Group II of the Committee (1997-98) had observed during their study visit to Mumbai that to improve the living conditions in the slums private sector/builders were being involved in the slum development in a big way by providing tenements with all civic amenities to the people of that slum in a portion of the slum land and by developing the remaining part of the land and selling it at market rates. The cost of building the tenements for the slum dweller is thus allowed to be recovered from the sale of flats in the other portion of the slum so. developed by the private builders.

The Committee understand that such an arrangement has been tried in any other part of the country. It is observed that in Delhi, the JJ clusters are being developed in a slightly different form. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to explore the possibility of development of slums in other cities/towns on the above pattern under the National Slum Development Programme. They may be apprised of the steps taken in that direction.

Reply of the Government

The Hon'ble Minister for Urban Affairs and Employment has constituted a task force to finalise a location specific and on site Slum Improvement Project under the Chairmanship of Shri J.P. Murthy, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment, with a view to concretise the action plan, recommending the specific slum/ jj cluster of the size of about 1000-1500 families, for in situ development and simultaneously sharing the land either at the same site or neighborhood which should be capitalised for

resources mobilisation to cross subsidise for the proposed slum development pilot project. The results of this study, as well as the Mumbai experience will be transmitted to the States for their guidance.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)

It is felt that while planning any programme for slum development, it is presumed that the dwellers are very poor having no or very little economic capacity to contribute for the development of their own area. With a view to discourage growth of slums and to involve the slum dwellers in the development, the Government should not only increase the outlay for programmes like IDSMT etc., but should also conduct a study of the economic capacity of the slum dwellers. To begin with such a study could be conducted by the Government on sample basis of any slum of NCT of Delhi. The Committee will like to be informed of the report of such study.

Reply of the Government

Under the Chairmanship of the Additional Secretary (UD), Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment a new Committee has been set up to examine various technologies available for rehabilitation of Jhuggi Jhompri Dwellers from NDMC area. The terms of the Committee are at Appendix XVI.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation)
OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 9 of Chapter 1 of the Report)

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.40 and 2.41)

The Committee note that the Government launched the Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) - a Yojana encompassing many of the features of the earlier UPA schemes of NRY, UBSP and PMI UPEP effective from 1.12.1997. This Yojana is funded in the ratio of 75:25 between the Center and States while the earlier schemes were on a 60:40 basis. The Yojana has a self employment & wage employment based special schemes akin to the SUME & SUWE sub- schemes of NRY with an exception of a new sub-component viz. the scheme of Development of Women and Child in Urban Area on similar lines as that of DWCRA scheme in rural areas. An allocation of Rs. 186.70 crore has been made in BE for the year 1998-99 for the Yojana. The unit cost ceiling in USEP under SJSRY has been enhanced to Rs. 50,000/- from that of Rs. 20,000/- in SUME of NRY with the provision for group/joint ventures.

It appears to the Committee that the Ministry had not conducted any survey with regard to the utility of the Yojana, obtaining the feedback of the intended beneficiaries' etc. before the Yojana was launched for implementation. They, recommend that in future the Ministry should conduct such a survey before any new scheme is launched for implementation. The Committee, therefore, desire that a certain portion of funds under the USEP and UWEP special schemes of SJSRY should be earmarked for women beneficiaries as is done in the rural poverty alleviation programmes being implemented by the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken in the matter.

The Urban Self Employment Programme (USEP) of Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) is meant for the urban poor living below the poverty line as defined from time to time. Within this broad look of urban poor, the women, the SC/ST will be given special attention. The guidelines provide that the percentage of women beneficiaries under these programmes shall not be less than 30%. Apart from this, an exclusive sub-scheme titled Development of Women and Children in Urban Areas (DWCUA) under this programme has also been launched. This scheme is distinguished by the special incentive extended to urban poor women who decide to set up self employment ventures in a group as opposed to individual effort. Groups of urban poor women shall take up an economic activity suited to their skill, training, aptitude and local conditions. Thus, the main programme of USEP which gives 30% coverage to women beneficiaries, along with an exclusive sub-scheme of DWCUA meant for women, adequately takes care of this segment of society. Also not less than 30% of USEP funds are earmarked for DWCUA.

The Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP) of SJSRY provides wage employment to the urban poor beneficiaries by utilising their labour for construction of socially and economically useful public assets such as low cost water supply, pour flush community toilets, community baths, drainage related earth works and other community facilities etc. in the jurisdiction of urban local body. Generally we may not find less than 30% women working under wage employment. Therefore, the Committee may consider whether reservation or earmarking of funds, as desired, may be proposed.

The Urban Wage Employment Programme (UWEP) of SJSRY provides wage employment to the urban poor beneficiaries by utilising their labour for construction of socially and economically useful public assets such as low cost water supply, pour flush community toilets, community baths, drainage related earth works and other community facilities etc. in the jurisdiction of urban local body. Generally we may not find less than 30% women working under wage employment. Therefore, the Committee may consider whether reservation or earmarking of funds, as desired, may be proposed.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para Nos. 4.11 and 4.12)

The Committee note that the Government in August 1996 has launched yet another scheme known as National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) which aims to provide additionality to the normal central assistance given to States/UTs for slum development. The programme aims to provide adequate and satisfactory water supply, sanitation, primary education, health care etc. to the urban poor living in slums. It also aims to develop community participation through NGOs, CBOs and other private institutions. The funds for the programme are allocated by the Department of Expenditure (Ministry of Finance) and Ministry of Home Affairs to the States/UTs respectively. However, the monitoring of the progress of implementation etc. of NSDP has been entrusted to the Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation in the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment.

While the guidelines (original have been issued by the Planning Commission, the same have been revised by Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation in December, 1997. The Committee fail to understand the rationals behind such an arrangement made in respect of this programme and wonder as to what extent the monitoring by this Ministry will be effective when funds for the programme are being made available from the Demands of other Departments/ Ministries. This is further accentuated when viewed in the context of this Ministry's negligible role in the estimation of/maintaining data base in respect of the slum population in the country.

The slum population as per estimates of TCPO for 1991 stands at 462.608 lakh which is likely to rise to 618.258 by the year 2001. The Committee, therefore, desire that steps be taken urgently to streamline the system of fund allocation, etc. and to evolve a coordinated approach for successful implementation of the NSDP. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps taken in this regard as also the progress made as a result thereof.

Reply of the Government

Agreed with the views of the Standing Committee. Since, mid 1997, this Ministry is attempting to rationalise the arrangement made in respect of this programme. In this regard correspondence had been exchanged with the Planning Commission, M/o Finance and also the Cabinet Sectt. Copies of the correspondence are Appendix II to XV. Prior to issue of revised guidelines, this Ministry was in a very anomalous situation. Apportionment of funds was done by the Planning Commission whereas the releases were done by the Department of Expenditure directly. No input was sought from this Department, even a copy of the release orders issued by the Department of Expenditure were not marked to this Department for information. To make the system more workable and to enhance the scope of this programme, the guidelines were revised by this Ministry in consultation with the Planning Commission. The MIS proforma was designed and circulated to all States/UTs to report the Physical as well financial progress to this Ministry. Necessary inputs were provided to States and UTs to implement the programme in an effective manner. The monitoring can be made effective if funds too are released by this Ministry.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation) OM No. H-11013/1/98-Bt dated 21.01.1999]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 6 of Chapter I of the Report)

CHAPTER V

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

- NIL -

NEW DELHI;
3 March, 2000
13 Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX 1

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT(1999-2000)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE 3RD SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 24TH FEBRUARY, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Committee Room 'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete - *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
3. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
4. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
5. Shrimati Hema Garmang
6. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
7. Shri R.L. Jalappa
8. Shri P.R Kyndiah
9. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
10. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
11. Shri Chandresh Patel
12. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
13. Prof. (Smt.) A.K Premajam
14. Shri D. Venugopal

Rajya Sabha

15. Shri Kamendu Bhattacharjee
16. Shri N.R Dasari
17. Shri C. Apok Jamir
18. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
19. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
20. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
21. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
22. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - *Under Secretary*
3. Shri P.VL.N. Murthy - *Assistant Director*

2. Consideration of Draft Action Taken Reports

3. The Committee then considered Memorandum No. 2 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Third Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1998-99) of the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation of the then Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the draft action taken Report.

4. XXX XXX XXX
5. XXX XXX XXX

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

7. *The Committee then adjourned.*

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

APPENDIX II

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 4.6.1997 ADDRESSED TO MINISTRY OF FINANCE

D.O.No.K-11019/29/96-UPA (A&C)/V5/I

KIRAN AGGARWAL

SECRETARY

Tel: 301 7444 Fax: 301 0991

Date. 4.6.97

Dear

As you know a National Slum Development programme was launched in August 1996 to provide an additionality to the normal Central assistance to the States/UTs for slum development. An allocation of Rs. 250 crores was made to the States/UTs for 1996-97 and additional central assistance allocated for 1997-98 is Rs. 330 crores.

2. The guidelines circulated by the Planning Commission for implementation of NSDP, indicate that at the national level, the programme will be monitored by the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment (Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation). Accordingly, we have developed a Management Information System (MIS) to monitor the quantitative and qualitative performance of NSDP. A copy of the standard format designed for Quarterly Review of the Programme is enclosed.

3. We have requested the Chief Secretaries of all the States/UTs to send the report on the achievements for the year 1996-97 as also Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) for the 1st quarter of 1997-98 in the prescribed proforma to this Ministry in the first week of July 1997 and thereafter a QPR for each quarter in the first week of the month following.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,
(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

To

1. Shri C. Ramachandran,
Secretary (Exp.),
Ministry of Finance,
North Block,
New Delhi.
2. Ms. Krishna Singh,
Adviser (HUD&WS),
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhawan,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX III
COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 24.7.1997
ADDRESSED TO CABINET SECRETARY

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444
AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN,
NEW DELHI-110011

Date 24th July, 1997

Dear Shri Subramanian,

You are aware that the National Slum Development Programme was inaugurated and launched by the Prime Minister in August 1996 at Kanpur in U.P. This programme was initially approved by the Planning Commission as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme and was launched as such in Kanpur.

2. The Department of Expenditure subsequently took up this issue with the Planning Commission and it was decided that this programme should be treated as special Central assistance to States and not as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The Planning Commission modified its earlier approval and accordingly Rs. 250 crores reserved for this programme for the year 1996-97 were, thereupon, released to the States/ Union Territories in four quarterly instalments directly by the Department of Expenditure.

3. The releases by the Department of Expenditure to the States/ UTs were made on the basis of an apportionment of funds made to States/UTs by the Planning Commission on the basis of slum population as per the 1991 Census. Guidelines for the implementation of this scheme have also been issued by the Planning Commission.

4. The Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation has been designated as the nodal department for this scheme and is expected to monitor and oversee this programme at the Central level. This Department has already devised and forwarded a detailed MIS reporting format to the states for this purpose.

5. It is in this connection that I am writing to draw your attention to the anomalous situation that has resulted. Apportionment of funds, as mentioned before is being done by the Planning Commission whereas the release is being done by the Department of Expenditure directly. No input is being sought from this Department under the existing arrangement for either exercise. It is curious that even a copy of the quarterly release orders issued by the Department of Expenditure in favour of the States is not marked to this department for information. This Department had to obtain copies from the Department of Expenditure informally last year.

6. This Department has also received a number of references from States about non-receipt of the release orders by them. Many States are not even aware of the allocations made to them under this programme. States are demanding that the normal practice of release of funds through nodal Departments in Government be adopted in this case because that practice ensures that the concerned nodal departments in the States are kept in the picture. At present, the release orders of the Department of Expenditure are addressed to the Finance and Planning Departments at the State level, neither of whom are the nodal departments for the implementation of this programme. In a number of cases these funds allocation orders were not brought to the notice of the State nodal departments and, therefore, funds could not be made available in the States for the activities envisaged under the scheme.

7. Release of funds through the Department of UEPA will ensure that this Department will be able to follow up and monitor achievements of the States under this programme much better than is possible under the

existing arrangement. *Inter se* changes in allocations between States could also be made, from time to time, based on the performance of States, expenditure etc., so as to ensure optimum utilisation of allocated resources.

8. I have already written to Member Secretary, Planning Commission and Secretary (Expenditure) in this regard (copy enclosed). I would request you to kindly consider convening a meeting in which a decision can be taken to amend the existing system and to introduce a more workable and effective arrangement.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Encl: As above.

Shri T.S.R. Subramanian,
Cabinet Secretary,
Cabinet Secretariat,
Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi.

APPENDIX IV

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 23.9.1997 ADDRESSED TO TO MEMBER-SECRETARY, PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011

Date 23rd September, 1997

Dear Dr. Jalan,

The National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) was launched in August, 1996 to provide an additionality to the normal central assistance to the State/UTs for slum development. An amount of Rs. 330 crores has been allocated for the year 1997-98.

2. The guidelines to implement NSDP were prepared and circulated by Planning Commission to **all** State Governments/UT Administrations. Recently, it has been discovered that in some of the States, guidelines and other correspondence addressed to the States by Planning Commission have not percolated to the nodal agencies. In some States, till date, in spite of six release orders having been issued by the Department of Expenditure in the Government of India, so far not a single paise has been released by the State Government to the Slum Development Departments. Copies of letters from seven such States are enclosed for information.

3. This issue had been taken up both with the Department of Expenditure and the Planning Commission. The Department of Expenditure has now intimated us that as the guidelines have been issued by the Planning Commission, we may take up the matter with you.

4. It is, therefore, requested that you may kindly look into the matter and evolve a workable system so that the NSDP can be implemented in the same spirit in which it was conceived and funds can be put to the use for which they were intended.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Dr. Bimal Jalan,
Member Secretary,
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhawan,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX V

**COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 8.9.1997 ADDRESSED TO
TO MEMBER-SECRETARY, PLANNING COMMISSION**

**KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444**

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011**

Date 8th September, 1997

Dear Dr. Jalan,

I am enclosing herewith a copy of references received today from Administrator, Union Territory of Lakshadweep and Commissioner & Secretary, Urban Development Department, Government of Bihar about the progress of work under NSDP. I am bringing these instances to your attention, as the guidelines for the NSDP have been issued by the Planning Commission. One Government has provided housing facilities on the pattern of Indira Awaas Yojana in rural areas and the other has utilised the funds for payment of land acquisition charges. You may like to examine whether this is in line with the objective of the programme and if not, suitable modifications of the guidelines may be issued.

You are aware that the Cabinet has recently approved the revised scheme for poverty alleviation under which the SHASHU component of our programme is now to be dovetailed with the NSDP. According to the Cabinet decision, it has, *inter-alia*, been decided that this amount will not be used to provide 100 per cent subsidy for housing and that the State Government will ensure that there is a loan component linked with the subsidy amount. Keeping the above in mind, you may like to issue fresh guidelines under the NSDP.

With regards,
Encl: As above.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Dr. Bimal Jalan,
Member Secretary,
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhawan,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX VI

**COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 27.10.1997 ADDRESSED TO
TO MEMBER-SECRETARY, PLANNING COMMISSION**

**KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444**

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011**

Date 27th October, 1997

Dear Dr. Jalan,

This has reference to the discussions in your room held on 30.9.97 and my letter dated 23rd October, 1997. I enclose herewith the draft guidelines for the National Slum Development Programme as prepared by this Department. You will note that the SHASHU component has been incorporated in the guidelines. The detailed formats pertaining to the utilisation certificates to be submitted by the State Governments and the formats for monitoring and evaluating the scheme, will be sent shortly.

If we have your consent for the enclosed guidelines in principle, this Department, will thereafter send them to Department of Expenditure for their concurrence also, in response to their reference D.O. No. 33(2) PFI/96 dated 8.9.97.

As far as the year 1997-98 is concerned, the slum population figures, as arrived at by the Planning Commission may be taken as the basis for release of funds.

With regards,

Encl: As above.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Dr. Bimal Jalan,
Member Secretary,
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhawan,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX VII

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 15.12.1997 ADDRESSED TO MINISTRY OF FINANCE

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011
Date 15th December, 1997

Dear Shri Ramachandran,

Please refer to your DO Letter No. 33(2)PFI/96 dt.8/9/97 regarding the issue of the National Slum Development Programme which is being implemented as special Central assistance to States. Rs.250 crores were released to the States under this programme in 1996-97 and Rs.330 crores have been earmarked for this purpose in 1997-98.

You may recall that the Deptt. Of UEPA had been made the nodal Department for this programme. However, the apportionment of funds was being done by the Planning Commission and the release of funds was being done by the Department of Expenditure directly. Consequently, this department was finding itself terribly handicapped in implementation. States were also complaining about non release of funds by Finance and Planning Departments at the State level to the implementing departments.

These, as well as other problems, were brought out by us and raised with your department as also with the Planning Commission from time to time. A meeting was held with Dr. Bimal Jalan and, as decided therein, a set of revised guidelines was formulated and sent to the Planning Commission for vetting before issue by this Department. It was agreed that for proper monitoring and control, the role of the Department of UEPA needed to be strengthened. Hence, guidelines should be issued by us and care should be taken to ensure convergence between these guidelines and the other poverty alleviation initiatives.

Proposed guidelines were accordingly drafted and sent to the Planning Commission in October 1997. A meeting was held on the 2nd of December 1997 when certain modifications proposed by the Planning Commission were incorporated after deliberation. A copy of the letter from the Planning Commission agreeing to the new guidelines is attached herewith. These new guidelines have been issued to all States and UTs on the 11th of December 1997 for their information and necessary action.

You will notice, that under the heading 'Release of Funds' of the new guidelines, as agreed by the Planning Commission, it has been provided that the Planning Commission shall indicate the provision under this 'Central Assistance for Slum Development' at the beginning of each financial year. However, releases to States shall be made by the Department of Expenditure ONLY after the Department of UEPA reviews expenditure, physical progress made on the ground and other performance criteria, as may be felt necessary, AND THEREAFTER makes recommendations to the Department of Expenditure regarding *inter se* release of funds between States. This may kindly be noted and future releases governed on this basis. The Department of UEPA has already started the process of review of States performance and shall be reverting to the Department of Expenditure very soon in this connection.

I am hopeful that the progress and performance of schemes under this Programme will now show an improvement.

I would, therefore, request you to kindly ensure that future releases under this 'Central Assistance' follow the pattern approved by the Planning Commission as elucidated above and as detailed in the copy of the attached guidelines.

With regards,
Encl: As above.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Mr. C. Ramachandran
Secretary, Department of Expenditure
Ministry of Finance, North Block, New Delhi.

APPENDIX VIII

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 6.1.1998 ADDRESSED TO MINISTRY OF FINANCE

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011

D.O. No. K-11019/29/96-UPA
(A&C)/V.5/I-DD (M)

Dated 6th January, 1998

Dear

Kindly refer to my letter of even number dated 15th December, 1997 enclosing therewith new guidelines for the National Slum Development Programme (NSDP), providing special Central assistance for slum development.

As stated earlier, under the heading 'Release of Funds' in the new guidelines, as agreed by the Planning Commission, it has been provided that the Planning Commission shall indicate the provision under the head 'Central Assistance for Slum Development' at the beginning of each financial year. However, releases to State shall be made by the Department of Expenditure only after the Department of UEPA reviews expenditure, physical progress made on the ground and other performance criteria, as may be felt necessary, and thereafter makes recommendations to the Department of Expenditure, regarding *inter se* release of funds between States. The Department of UEPA has already started the process of review of States' performances and shall be reverting to the Department of Expenditure very soon in this connection.

I would, therefore, request you to kindly ensure that future releases under this Central Assistance follow the pattern approved by the Planning Commission. Further releases under NSDP may await our review and communication thereof to the Department of Expenditure.

With regards,
Encl: As above.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Mr. C. Ramachandran,
Secretary, Department of Expenditure,
Ministry of Finance,
North Block,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX IX
COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 12.2.1998 ADDRESSED
TO ADVISOR (HUD) PLANNING COMMISSION

D.O. No. K-11019/29/96-UPA (A&C)/V.5/I-DD (M)

J.P. Murthy,
JOINT SECRETARY (HEPA) Tel: 3017665

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011

February 12, 1997

Dear Madam,

As you are aware under the National Slum Development Programme, additional Central assistance are being provided to the States/UTs for slum development. As per the revised guidelines, Department of Expenditure is to make releases on the recommendation of the Department of Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation which shall be made after the review of expenditure and other performance criteria. Under the scheme Rs. 17.05 crores was allocated to the State of Punjab during 1996-97. The State Government has now stated that they could not utilise the funds released during 1996-97. Their case is that funds were allocated by the Planning Commission, and released by the Department of Expenditure and were directly transferred to the State for being passed on to the implementing agency. However, no information regarding the receipt of the funds was given either by the State Government or by the Planning Commission, to the State Urban Development Agency (SUDA) or even the Local Government Department. The funds were also not transferred during 1996-97. Therefore, the funds released during 1996-97 could not be utilised by the State Government by March 1997 or even by 31.10.97 as decided by the Planning Commission. The release of the funds in this regard was intimated only after the expiry of the extended period. and therefore, the State Government has applied for extension. Similar problems may also have arisen in other States. You are, therefore, requested to consider these special circumstances and allow all the State Governments/UTs to utilise the unspent amount released during 1996-97 by 31.3.98 under the National Slum Development Programme.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/-
(J.P. MURTY)

Ms. Krishna Singh,
Adviser (HUD)
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhavan, New Delhi-110001

APPENDIX X
COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 16.3.1998 ADDRESSED
TO DIRECTOR (HUD), PLANNING COMMISSION

RAJIV TAKRU
DIRECTOR, (EPA)
Tel: 3017665

D.O. No. K-11019/29/96-UPA(A&C)/V.5/I-DD(M)

Dated : 16.3.1998

Dear Shri Choudhury,

Kindly refer to your D.O. letter No. PC/H/4/1/96 dated 18.2.1998 enclosing therewith a copy of the FAX received by you from Secretary (Planning) regarding funds released under NDPS.

As you are aware that Department of UEPA has revised guidelines of NSDP in consultation with Planning Commission and all suggestion suggested by the Planning Commission were incorporated before sending the guidelines to States/UTs.

The revised guidelines were sent to all Nodal Departments in the States/UTs twice by this Ministry. So far, no request has been received by this Ministry to send another copy of the revised guidelines of NSDP. However, an additional copy is being sent to Secy. (Plg.) A.P. for his information.

While offering comments, except few observations, Planning Commission did not point out that funds released under NSDP should be termed as Additional Central Assistance in place of Special Central Assistance and hence it was assumed that Planning Commission was agreed on the rest of terms mentioned in the revised guidelines. However, if Planning Commission is of the view that it should be called as Additional Central Assistance, this Ministry has no objection.

So far as procedure of release of funds under NSDP is concerned, this Ministry is of the view that it should be according to the procedure laid down in the revised guidelines.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(RAJIV TAKRU)

Shri S.N. Brohmo Choudhury,
Director (HUD)
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhawan,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX XI

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 19.3.1998 ADDRESSED TO SPECIAL SECRETARY, PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011

D.O. No. K-11019/29/96-UPA
(A&C)/V.S/I-DD (M)

Dear Shri Pandit,

The National Slum Development Programme was launched in August, 1996 by the then Prime Minister at Kanpur.

2. Subsequently, on the intervention of the Department of Expenditure, it was decided to convert this from a Centrally Sponsored Scheme to Additional Central Assistance to States. In the year 1996-97 a sum of Rs.250 crores was released to the States under the scheme. Sum of Rs.330 crores was stated to be released to States as Central assistance in the current financial year 1997-98.

3. Unfortunately, the system devised for release of this fund was that the Planning Commission made allocations between the States and the Plan Finance Division in the Ministry of Finance issued release orders. As you are aware, this Ministry was designated as the nodal Ministry of monitoring performance of States under this scheme but this Ministry was not in the picture at any stage while the funds were being released. We are agitating this point and had time and again drawn attention to the peculiar situation which had arisen because of funds being released by the Ministry of Finance were known only to the Finance Departments / Planning Department of the State concerned. The nodal implementing departments in the State Governments i.e. Department of Urban Development / Urban Employment / Housing / Slum Development did not even know that funds had been released under this scheme to the States. Many of them approached this Ministry for copies of the release orders later, as and when they came to know about such releases.

4. Fortunately, as you are aware, it was decided in the meeting chaired by you that this Ministry should play a greater role in this programme. Consequently, today this Ministry is playing a role in arranging release of funds to the States through the Ministry of Finance. We have also issued detailed guidelines with your concurrence. It is expected that this programme will now take off in right earnest.

5. However, due to the initial confusion, detailed earlier in this letter, many nodal departments in a number of State Governments were unable to actually access the funds which had been released by the Ministry of Finance in 1996-97 as special Central Assistance. By the time this issue was clarified to the States, the financial year 1996-97 was already over. Therefore the nodal departments sent requests for revalidating the 1996-97 amounts. These requests were duly forwarded with our recommendations to the Planning Commission for concurrence.

6. We were surprised when the Planning Commission decided to turn down these requests for revalidation and suggested that these amounts should be adjusted from the 1997-98 releases. A request for re-examination of this issue was again turned down by the Planning Commission. As a result, you will agree, State Governments are being penalised and the ultimate beneficiaries under the Slum Development Assistance are being deprived of the benefits of the programme on account of factors beyond their control.

7. We are not able to explain the Planning Commission's stand to the State Governments. We feel that revalidation of funds issued in 1996-97 allowing the State Governments to draw and utilise these funds (upto any practical date say 31st May, 1998) is fair and just keeping in view the peculiar circumstances under which nodal departments in State Governments were deprived of access to these funds. As the financial year 1997-98 is now coming to an end, an immediate decision is required in this regard. If required, I would be quite willing to explain the issue to you personally at a time of your convenience.

May I request an immediate response.

With regards.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Shri V.K. Pandit, Special Secretary, Planning Commission, New Delhi.

APPENDIX XII

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 20.3.1998 ADDRESSED TO MWSTRY OF FINANCE

RAJIV TAKRU

D.O. No. K-11019129196-PA(A&C)IV.511-DD(M)

DIRECTOR (EPA & L)

Tel. No. 3018157

March 20, 1998

Dear

Kindly refer to this Ministry's D.O. letter of even number dated 6th March, 1998 requesting Department of Expenditure to release the remaining funds for this year to all the States/UTs as per the apportionment allocation made by the Planning Commission under NSDP at the beginning of the year. So far, no reply has been received from the Department of Expenditure in this regard. Since, only 10 days have been left in closing of this financial year, you are requested to release the rest of the funds to all States under NSDP immediately under intimation to this Ministry.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(RAJIT TAKRU)

Shri A.K. Pradhan,
Joint Secretary (PF.I),
Department of Expenditure,
Ministry of Finance,
North Block, New Delhi.

APPENDIX XIII

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 22.4.1998 ADDRESSED TO SPECIAL SECRETARY, PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRAN AGGARWAL (MRS.)
SECRETARY Tel: 3017444

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS
AND EMPLOYMENT
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY
ALLEVIATION
NIRMAN BHAWAN, NEW DELHI-
110011

D.O. No. K-1101912919&UPA (A&C)

April 22, 1998.

Dear Shri Pandit,

Please refer to my D.O. letter of even number dated March 20, 1998 requesting you to allow the State Governments to draw and utilise the funds released in 1996-97 upto May 31, 1998, keeping in view the peculiar circumstances under which nodal departments in State Governments were deprived of access to these funds. Your reply in this regard is still awaited. As the new financial year 1998-99 has begun, an immediate decision in this regard is required to be taken.

2. As for information regarding the status of utilisation of NSDP funds for the year 1996-97, it is stated that since funds have not been released to many Implementing Agencies, it is becoming difficult to get progress reports from them. For 1997-98, funds are being released and efforts will be made to collect quarterly progress reports. Close monitoring will be ensured.

3. You are, therefore, requested to kindly look into the matter personally and communicate the acceptance of the Planning Commission regarding revalidation of funds earmarked for 1996-97 and permit the States to utilise the same upto a suitable date in 1998. You are further requested to communicate the details of funds earmarked to States/Union Territories under NSDP for the year 1998-99.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/-
(KIRAN AGGARWAL)

Shri V.K. Pandit,
Special Secretary,
Planning Commission,
New Delhi.

APPENDIX XV

COPY OF MINISTRY'S LETTER DATED 10.7.1998 ADDRESSED TO
DIRECTOR (HUD), PLANNING COMMISSION

10.7.1998

Rajiv Takru,
Director (EPA)

D.O. No. K-11019/29/96-UPA (A&C) V-5/I

Dear Shri Choudhury;

Kindly refer to your d.o. letter No. PC/H/4/1/96 dated 6.7.1998 regarding revalidation of funds allocated under the National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) in 1996-97. It is observed that Planning Commission has adhered to its decision not to revalidate the funds released during 1996-97 under NSDP.

Since 1997-98 has already expired, some of the State Governments are approaching this Ministry to revalidate the funds released under NSDP during 1997-98. The decision of the Planning Commission in this regard may also please be communicated to this Ministry urgently.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(RAJIV TAKRU)

Shri Brohmo Choudhury,
Director (HUD)
Planning Commission,
Yojana Bhavan,
New Delhi-110001

APPENDIX XVI

COPY OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED ON 12.6.1998

No. D-563/CA/NA

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE &
ENVIRONMENTS PALIKA KENDRA
NEW DELHI

Dated : 21.7.1998

SUB: *Setting up of a Committee to examine various Technologies available for Rehabilitation of Jhuggi Jhompri Dwellers from N.D.M.C. Area.*

During a meeting about measures to control encroachment/Land grabbing in Delhi held on 12.6.1998 under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Minister for Urban Affairs & Employment a new Committee has been set up under the Chairmanship of the Addl. Secretary (UD), Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, New Delhi. The terms of reference of the Committee will be as follows:

- (a) To examine various cost-effective technologies available for rehabilitation of Jhuggi Jhompri Dwellers in N.D.M.C. area;
- (b) To draw out an action plan for making the NDMC area free from slums;
- (c) To recommend measures for using land as a resource for clearance of JJ Clusters from NDMC Area; and
- (d) To draft a plan of development of an area measuring 1000 acres to be made available by U.P. Government in the periphery of Delhi for rehabilitation of slum Dwellers.

A meeting of this Committee shall be held on Friday, the 24th July, 1998 at 3.00 p.m. in Conference Room No. 123, C. Wing, Nirman Bhawan, First Floor, New Delhi.

All members are requested to make it convenient to attend this meeting.

Sd/-
(R.L. AGGARWAL)
CHIEF ARCHITECT
CONVENER

To:

1. Joint Secretary (UD), M/o Urban Affairs & Employment, New Delhi.
2. Director (DD), M/o Urban Affairs & Employment, New Delhi.
3. Director (Lands), M/o Urban Affairs & Employment, New Delhi.
4. Director (EPA), M/o Urban Affairs & Employment, New Delhi.
5. Secretary, Urban Development/L&D Department, G.N.C.T.D., Vikas Bhawan, I.P. Estate, New Delhi. A representative may kindly be deputed to attend the above meeting.
6. Director General (Works), C.P.W.D., Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi. A representative may be deputed.
7. Vice-Chairman, D.D.A., Vikas Sadan, I.N.A., New Delhi. A representative may be deputed.
8. Dr. Rajesh Kumar, Land & Development Officer, M/o Urban Affairs and Employment, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
9. Addl. Commissioner (Slum), M.C.D., Vikas Bhawan Annexe, I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
10. Shri R.K. Safaya, Chief (Design & Development), HUDCO, HUDCO Bhawan, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
11. Shri T.N. Gupta, Executive Director, BMPTC, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
12. Shri P.K. Gupta, SSW(NDZ-1), C.P.W.D., Ninnan Bhawan, New Delhi.

APPENDIX XVII

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 3RD REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (12TH LOK SABHA)

1. Total number of Recommendations	18
11. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	14
Para Nos. 1.8, 1.9, 1.99, 1.23, 2.12, 2.24, 2.42, 2.43, 3.7, 3.14, 3.15, 4.13, 4.17 and 4.18	
Percentage to Total	77.78
111. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	2
Para Nos. 2.40 and 2.41	
Percentage to Total	11.11
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	2
Para Nos. 4.11 and 4.12	
Percentage to Total	11.11
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	Nil
Percentage to Total	—