MINUTES OF THE 18th MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE MULTI-SECTORAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR MINORITY CONCENTRATION DISTRICTS HELD AT 11.00 A.M. ON 31st AUGUST, 2009 UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF MINORITY AFFAIRS

A list of members and officials present in the meeting is annexed.

2. The Chairman of the Empowered Committee explained the background for identification of minority concentration districts (MCDs) and the scheme of a multi-sectoral development programme (MsDP) designed to address the development deficits of such districts. The Chairman pointed out that the baseline survey not only brought out the updated position in respect of the relevant parameters used for identification of such districts, but also ranked the deficits in order of the extent of deprivation in the districts. It was expected that the plans submitted by the State Governments would address the identified development deficits in order of priority. In case a deficit, ranked higher in the order of deprivation, was not proposed to be addressed by the plan, it would be incumbent on the part of the District Level Committee and the State Level Committee to bring out the reasons for not doing so. The Chairman stressed that the primary objective of this programme was to address the identified development deficits, so that the various interventions would result in the improvement of the backwardness parameters of a minority concentration district and bring it at par with the national average.

3. The Chairman stated that the fact that these districts were not just MCDs, having a substantial minority population, but were also districts comprising of other communities who suffer from the same backwardness and deprivation should not be lost sight of. It was important to keep in mind that the large presence of minorities may have resulted in the identification of such districts for appropriate developmental intervention, but the scheme, while giving priority to villages/areas having a substantial minority population, was intended to benefit the district as a whole. Improving the relevant backwardness indices upto national averages was the primary mandate of the scheme for social inclusion. The scheme provides additional resources to the Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) as there were many existing schemes already addressing national concerns with time-tested guidelines and implementation mechanism, especially those included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities, for saturating them in MCDs. Fund given for supplementing the resources for CSS under MsDP was to be treated as an additionality and the existing level of resources allocated under various CSS to the district was not to be reduced. To prevent diversion of funds from MCDs, the flow of fund to the district concerned in the previous year will be taken as a benchmark. It was crucial that
basic requirements like primary and secondary education, skill development, safe drinking water, housing etc. were addressed first. As envisaged in the scheme, the States/UTs were advised to ensure that topping up Centrally Sponsored Schemes, wherever appropriate, could be proposed as these were established schemes and could be implemented with ease without setting up new structures for implementing them. The Chairman emphasized that deviations from the existing guidelines of Centrally Sponsored Schemes was not permitted under the MsDP. It was stated that the responsibility for eliminating duplication of schemes and avoiding double counting of a scheme under two funding sources vested with both the district authority and the State Government. The Chairman stressed that accounts under MsD programme should be maintained separately. The provision in para 19 of the scheme of MsDP was pointed out with special emphasis on the requirement for display of a board containing information of the date of sanction of the project, likely date of completion, estimated cost of the project, source of funding i.e. MsDP (Government of India), contractor(s) name and the physical target. After completion of projects, a permanent display shall be put up.

4. The provision in para 15.1 of the scheme of MsDP was pointed out. The release of fund would be subject to fulfillment of the eight conditions mentioned in this para by the State Government/UT Administration. The representatives of State Governments informed that the IT enabled cell is yet to be established. However, they assured to establish this cell and also to provide State Govt. share for the schemes wherever applicable. It was further informed by them that they have fulfilled other six conditions. The representatives from the State Governments also confirmed that the process of consultation, recommendation and approval as laid down in the scheme of MsDP has been followed.

5. The Empowered Committee considered the multi-sectoral development plans for the districts of Mamit, Lawngtlai (Mizoram), Wayanad(Kerala). The conclusions that emerged, after a power point presentation by the Additional District Collectors/SDO(S) concerned, for each district considered, clarifications and confirmation of the status and fulfillment of conditions of the guidelines by representative of Govt. of Mizoram and Kerala, comments/clarifications from the members of the Empowered Committee and the representatives of Ministry/Department, were as follows:-

**Item No.1: Mamit (Mizoram)**

The fund tentatively allocated for Mamit district under the MsDP was Rs. 21.60 crore for the 11th Five Year Plan period. A power point presentation of the MsDP plan of the district was made by the Additional District Commissioner. Households with water closet latrines ranked 2nd in the baseline survey but was not proposed in the district plan. It was clarified by the representative of Department of Drinking Water Supply that proposal for this, would be covered under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC). According to 2001 census, the population of minorities
other than the minority community in majority in the State is 15% and above and it was on the basis of their population and the backwardness parameters population that the district was identified as one of the MCDs. Mamit is a sub-category ‘B-2’ district of category B ie., it has basic amenities parameters below the national average.

(i) **Projects approved**

*Indira Awas Yojana (IAY):* Households having pucca walls were ranked 3rd in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The waiting list for IAY houses and the proposed number of units were not given. The unit cost proposed by the State Government was Rs. 0.50 lakh. On the basis of this, it was calculated that Rs. 90.00 lakh had been proposed for construction of 180 IAY houses. It was pointed out that deviation in the unit cost has not been permitted. The unit cost for IAY for hilly region was Rs. 38500. The Empowered Committee considered the matter and approved the proposal in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Total no. units</th>
<th>Unit cost (Lakh Rs.)</th>
<th>Central Share (90%)</th>
<th>State Share (10%)</th>
<th>Total cost (Lakh Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>62.37</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>69.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the total Central share would be released as 1st instalment.

The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that villages having the highest proportion of the population of minorities, other than the minority communities in majority (i.e. other than Christians) in the district would be selected for construction of IAY norms under MsDP. BPL families would be selected from the approved/permanent waiting list, even if they belonged to different communities, strictly in order of their ranking in the list as per the IAY guidelines. It was stressed that no deviation from the guidelines was permitted. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Mizoram would ensure that the IAY units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(ii) **Projects approved in-principle:**

*Construction of Hostel (Boys/Girls):* It was stated that as the villages were scattered in hilly ranges, and high schools were located only in a few big villages, students, especially girls, who were entering high school level, found it difficult to continue studies as it was not easy to find reasonable accommodation. The proposal was for the construction of one boys’/girls’ hostel @ Rs.40.00 lakh The hostel would be located in villages having high/secondary school and would serve a number of students from villages located close to it. The hostels would be under the Department of Education. The matter was considered and it was suggested that the hostel should have two separate buildings i.e. one for girls and other for boys. There should also be a management committee for the hostel based on the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with representatives from the Education Deptt; district institution, school/college authority concerned, village community, students, parents etc.
The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of two separate hostel buildings i.e. one for girls’ and other for boys’ at a total cost of Rs. Rs.40.00 lakh of which central share would be Rs.40.00 lakh. In-principle approval was given on the condition that the State Government would provide a detailed project profile, the hostel would be designed and constructed as per the specification and cost prescribed for Navodaya Vidyalaya hostel and estimates should be prepared as per the schedule of rates of the State Govt., the project approved by the State Education Department, hostel located in a village which has the highest population of minorities other than the minority community in majority in this district (i.e. other than christrians), hostels buildings should be constructed within the premises of an existing government school/college, and a management committee of the hostel would be put in place based on the MOU. A copy of the MOU would be provided and the State Government would provide staff, and meet recurring and maintenance costs.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Total no. units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total cost (Lakh Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of hostel for boys/girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the total central share as 1st instalment would be released after the comments of the concerned Ministry/Department on the DPR are received and proposal is approved.

(iii) **Proposals to be resubmitted to the Ministry of Minority Affairs for consideration of Empowered Committee after incorporating the following information/clarifications:**

(a) **Construction of High school building and Primary school building and completion of High School building:** A revised proposal is required to be submitted to this Ministry with the following information:

(i) The State Education Department should certify that the schools proposed to be provided buildings are not covered under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA).

(ii) The need for a new building if the old building, is to be demolished, is to be certified by the State PWD.

(iii) The estimates should be as per the specification, design and norms prescribed by the Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development.

(iv) The estimates should be approved by the State PWD.

(v) The list of villages alongwith the population of minorities other than the minority community in majority in the State along with their percentage of population is to be furnished where these schools are to be constructed.

So far as the proposal for funding completion of two high school buildings is concerned, it was observed that this was not permitted under MsDP.

(b) **Additional Classrooms (ACRs) in schools and distribution of computer along with printers:**

A revised proposal is required to be submitted to this Ministry with the following information:
(i) The State Education Department should certify that the proposal for providing ACRs is not covered under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA).
(ii) The list of villages alongwith population of minorities other than the minority community in majority in the State and the percentage of their population is to be furnished where these schools are located.
(iii) Additional classrooms should be proposed only for government schools.
(iv) The unit cost of ACRs should be as per the rates approved by the Ministry of HRD under SSA for the State.

(iv) **Proposals to be submitted to other Ministry/Department of the Central Government**

*Providing solar lantern to non electrified villages:*

The representative of Ministry of New and Renewable Energy informed that the proposal could be considered for approval and funded under their scheme. However, the following information should be incorporated in the proposal:

(i) The time schedule for providing solar lantern.
(ii) The permissible ceiling of Govt. subsidy as Rs. 2400 for each solar lantern. Confirmation to the effect that the remaining cost will be borne by the beneficiary or State Govt. should be indicated.
(iii) Mizoram Energy Development Agency should be consulted for preparing and approving the proposal.
(iv) The list of villages indicating the proportion of population of minorities other than minority in majority in the State along with the percentage of that population where the solar lantern should be provided.

(v) **Summary of projects of Mamit (Mizoram) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Name of the project for Mamit district (Mizoram)</th>
<th>Sharing ratio</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central share</th>
<th>State share</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>1st instalment amount to be released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>90:10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>62.37</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>69.30</td>
<td>31.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102.37</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109.30</td>
<td>51.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General observations of the Empowered Committee:** The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan for the balance fund available in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved under MsDP for Mizoram and other States/UTs. The State Govt. should set up an IT enabled cell for monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the programme and submit their proposal based on the type of hardware and configuration as
already advised by this Ministry. State Government was also advised to prepare a revised plan in such a manner that the various development deficits identified by the baseline survey were addressed in order of their priority.

**Item No. 2: Lawngtlai (Mizoram)**

The fund tentatively allocated for Lawngtlai district under the MsDP was Rs. 24.30 crore for the 11th Five Year Plan period. A power point presentation of the MsDP plan of the district was made by the SDO(S). According to 2001 census, population of minorities other than the minority community in majority in the State (i.e. other than Christians) is 15% and above and it was on the basis of their population and the backwardness parameters that the district was identified as one of the MCDs. Lawngtlai is a sub-category ‘B-2’ district of category B i.e., it has basic amenities parameters below the national average.

(i) **Projects approved**

(a) **Indira Awas Yojana (IAY):** Households having pucca walls were ranked 2nd in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The number of IAY houses in waiting list is 5124 and 1234 IAY houses have been constructed in the 11th five year plan period till date. The unit cost proposed by the State Government was Rs. 0.50 lakh and 710 unit of IAY houses have been proposed to be constructed. It was pointed out that deviation in the unit cost has not permitted. The unit cost for IAY for hilly region was Rs. 38500. The Empowered Committee approved this proposal in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Total no. units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central Share (90%)</th>
<th>State Share (10%)</th>
<th>Total cost (Rs. in Lakh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>246.02</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>273.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the total Central share would be released as 1st instalment.

The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that villages having the highest proportion of the population of minorities, other than the minority communities in majority (i.e. other than Christians) in the district would be selected for construction of IAY houses under MsDP. BPL families would be selected from the approved /permanent waiting list, even if they belonged to different communities, strictly in order of their ranking in the list as per the IAY guidelines. It was stressed that no deviation from the guidelines was permitted. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Mizoram would ensure that the IAY units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also reported to the Ministry concerned. The proposal for attached toilets will be covered under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) of Department of Drinking Water Supply.
(b) **Construction of health sub-centres with attached labour room at Lawngtlai, Bungtlangs and Chawngte blocks and construction of Health main centre:**

Percentage of institutional delivery is just 20.2% compared to the national average of 38.7% and required intervention to improve the parameter. The proposal was for the construction of 18 health sub-centres with attached labour room under MsDP @ Rs. 6.00 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs. 108 lakh. Land and personnel were available.

The Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 18 health sub-centres @ Rs. 6.00 lakh at a total cost of Rs. 108 lakh of which Rs. 91.80 lakh would be borne by the Centre and Rs. 16.20 lakh by State. The approval was given on the condition that the State Government would ensure that the centres were located in areas having the highest concentration of minority population, National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) construction norms, design, specification would be followed, the estimates would be based on the approved Schedule of Rate (SOR) of the State Government and approved by the competent engineering authority, and the State share would be provided. Approval of NRHM mission director should be obtained for the proposal indicating clearly that it is not being funded under NRHM. It will also be ensured that the unit cost of Health-sub centres does not exceed the cost approved by the NRHM Mission Director. Availability of land, staff and medicines should be certified by the Health Department. The availability of Health Sub-centres built according to the prescribed standards was expected to improve the rates of institutional delivery. The list of the centres with location would be furnished. To prevent duplication, the Government of Mizoram would ensure that the centres funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of NRHM and information also sent to the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. 50% of the total central share as 1st instalment would be released. The Empowered Committee approved this proposal in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Total no. units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central Share (85%)</th>
<th>State Share (15%)</th>
<th>Total cost (Lakh Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Construction of health sub-centres with attached labour room at Lawngtlai, Bungtlangs and Chawngte blocks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>108.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(II) **Projects approved in-principle:**

(a) **Construction of Girls Hostel at Lawngtlai:**

It was stated that as the villages were scattered in hilly ranges, and high schools were located only in a few big villages, students, especially girls, who were entering high school level, found it difficult to continue studies as it was not easy to find reasonable accommodation. The proposal was for the construction of one girls’ hostel @ Rs.40.00 lakh. The hostel would be located in villages having high/secondary school and would serve a number of students from villages located close to it. The hostels would be under the Department of Education. There should be a management committee for the hostel based on Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with
representatives from the Education Department; district institution, school/college authority concerned, village community, students, parents etc.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of one girls’ hostel @ Rs.40.00 lakh of which central share would be Rs.40.00 lakh. In-principle approval was given on the condition that the State Government would provide a detailed project report having estimates approved by the State PWD. The DPR should also be approved by the State Education Department. The hostel building should be constructed within the premises of an existing government school/college. Availability of land and staff should be ensured. Arrangement proposed for management of the hostel should be brought out clearly in detail in the DPR. The hostel would be designed and constructed as per the specification and cost of Navodaya Vidyalaya hostel and estimates should be prepared as per the schedule of rates of the State Govt. The project should be approved by the State Education Department, hostel should be located in a village which has the highest population of minorities, other than the minority community in majority in the State (i.e. other than Christians), hostel building should be constructed within the premises of an existing government school/college a management committee of the hostel put in place based on MOU. A copy of the MOU would be provided and the State Government would provide staff, and meet recurring and maintenance costs.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Name of the scheme</th>
<th>Total no. units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central Share</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Total cost (Lakh Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of Girls Hostel at Lawngtlai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the total central share as 1st instalment would be released after the comments of the concerned Ministry/Department on the DPR are received and proposal is approved.

(III) Proposals to be resubmitted to the Ministry of Minority Affairs for consideration of Empowered Committee after incorporating the following information/clarifications:

(a) Construction of Middle School and Primary School (P/S)
(b) Reconstruction of Dilapidated School Buildings of at Lawngtlai and Bungtlang blocks:

The revised proposals are required to be submitted to this Ministry with the following information:

(i) The State Education Department should certify that the schools proposed to be provided buildings is not covered under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA).
(ii) The need for a new building if the old building, is to be demolished, is to be certified by the State PWD.
(iii) The building should be as per the specification, design and norms prescribed by the Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development.

(iv) The estimates should be approved by the State PWD.

(v) The list of villages along with the population of minorities other than the minority community in majority in the State and the percentage of their population is to be furnished where these schools are to be constructed.

So far as the proposal for funding completion of two high school buildings is concerned, it was observed that this was not permitted under MsDP.

(c) **Extension of High School Building and extension of High School Building with Toilet blocks:**
   A revised proposal is required to be submitted to this Ministry with the following information:

   (i) Confirmation to the effect that these schools are existing government schools.
   (ii) Estimates should be approved by the State PWD
   (iii) Items to be covered under extension such as additional class rooms, computer room should be indicated
   (iii) Commitment for providing state share
   (iv) Construction of toilets to be proposed under TSC.
   (v) To be certified by the State Education Department that the proposal is not covered under any other government scheme.

(d) **Construction of additional classrooms for Pre-School at Lawngtlai and Bungtlang blocks:**
   The total literacy and female literacy rate has been ranked as 7th and 8th respectively in the baseline survey of the district. It has been proposed in the district plan for the construction of additional classrooms at Bungtlang block at a total cost of Rs. 12.60 lakh. The State representative confirmed that it is a pre-nursery and nursery schools and it is run by the District Council. The State Government could not clarify why pre-nursery and nursery children were not covered by anganwadi centres.

(e) **Construction works in health sector:**
   (i) Construction of Isolation Ward at PHC Sangau
   (ii) Extension of Male & Female Ward at PHC Sangau
   (iii) Construction of Casualty Room at PHC Sangau and Chawngte

       A revised proposal is required to be submitted to this Ministry with the following information:

   (i) Unit cost, design, specification etc. should be as per NRHM norms and approved by NRHM mission director.
   (ii) Reasons for not being covered under NRHM.
   (iii) List of proposed villages and minority population.
(IV) Proposals to be submitted to other Ministry/Department of the Central Government

(a) Drinking Water Supply schemes in gravity pipelines
The representative of Department of Drinking Water Supply mentioned that all the requirement for the district can be covered under their scheme and the proposal may be submitted to them for funding.

(b) Solar Lantern
The representative of Ministry of New and Renewable Energy informed that the proposal could be funded under their scheme. The following information should be incorporated in the proposal:

(i) The list of villages indicating the proportion of population of minorities other than minority in majority in the State where the solar lantern should be provided.
(ii) The time schedule for providing solar lantern.
(iii) The permissible ceiling of Govt. subsidy as Rs. 2400 for each solar lantern. Confirmation to the effect that the remaining cost will be borne by the beneficiary or State Govt. should be indicated.
(iv) Mizoram Energy Development Agency should be consulted for preparing and approving the proposal.

(V) Summary of projects of Lawngtlai (Mizoram) district approved by the Empowered Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Lawngtlai district (Mizoram)</th>
<th>Sharing ratio</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central share</th>
<th>State share</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>1st instalment amount to be released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rupee in lakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>90:10</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>246.02</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>273.35</td>
<td>123.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of health sub-centres with attached labour room at Lawngtlai, Bungtlangs and Chawngte blocks</td>
<td>85:15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>45.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337.82</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>381.35</td>
<td>168.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of Girls Hostel at Lawngtlai</td>
<td>100:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>377.82</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>421.35</td>
<td>188.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General observations of the Empowered Committee: The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan for the balance fund available in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved under MsDP for Mizoram and other States/UTs. The State Govt. should set up an IT enabled cell for monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the programme and submit their proposal based on the type of hardware and configuration as
already advised by this Ministry. State Government was also advised to prepare a revised plan in such a manner that the various development deficits identified by the baseline survey were addressed in order of their priority.

**Item 3. Wayanad (Kerala)**

The fund tentatively allocated for Wayanad district under the MsDP was Rs.15.00 crore for the 11th Five Year Plan period. A power point presentation of the MsDP plan of the district was made by the District Magistrate. The percentage of household with safe drinking water ranked which were ranked 1st and percentage of household with electricity which were ranked 4th respectively in the baseline survey, have not been proposed in the district plan. It was clarified by the district officers that sufficient fund was available under Accelerated Rural water supply Programme of the Department of Drinking Water Supply and Rajiv Gandhi Gramin Vidhutikaran Yojana (RGGVY) under the Ministry of Power respectively. Percentage of households with water closet latrines ranked 7th in the baseline survey was not proposed in the district plan, it was clarified by the district officers that sufficient fund was available under the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC). Similarly, percentage of households with pucca walls ranked 6th in the baseline survey has not been proposed in the district plan and it was clarified by the district officers that enough fund was available under the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) of Ministry of Rural Development to cover the wait list. The district has 3 Taluks, 25 Gram Panchayats, 3 Block Panchayats and 1 Municipality. According to the 2001 census Wayanad has a population of 7,86,627 people out of which 49.36% belongs to the minority communities. Wayanad is a category ‘B-2’ District i.e. it has basic amenities parameters below the national average.

(i) **Projects approved:**

(a) **Construction of Building of Sub-Centres - PHCs:** 97.6% of the deliveries are institutional delivery which is above all India average of 36.7%, in the baseline survey of the district. However, the representative of the Govt. of Kerala pointed out that these health centres were required. The proposal was for the construction of buildings of 10 sub-centres at a total cost of Rs.180 lakhs. The State Government representative confirmed that the health centres were already functioning and land and staff is available. The recurring cost would also be borne by the State Government and design, specification etc., of the building would be as per the NRHM norms. Cost should be approved by the State NRHM Mission Director. To avoid duplication the State NRHM Mission Director will ensure that it is recorded in the requisite records maintained by him and also report the achievements made under MsDP to the M/o Health and Family Welfare. State Govt. representative confirmed that State Share would be provided.

The Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of buildings of 10 sub-centres of PHCs at a total cost of Rs.180 lakhs with Central share and State share as Rs.153 lakhs and
Rs.27 lakhs respectively in the ratio of 85:15. The approval was given on the condition that the State Government in consultation with the NRHM State Mission Director would ensure that the centres are located in areas having the highest proportion of minority population. The list of the centres with location and percentage of minority population would be furnished. NRHM Mission Director would ensure that the construction norms, design, specification and standards under NRHM would be followed and the State share would be provided. Cost should be approved by the NRHM Mission Director/State PWD and should not exceed the cost of similar project under NRHM. To prevent duplication, the State Government should ensure that the centres funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of NRHM. It was agreed for release of 50% of the Central share as first instalment.

(ii) Project approved in- principle:

(a) Infrastructure needs in schools: Total literacy and female literacy rate in the district is 92.6% and 91.1% respectively in the baseline survey of the district and ranked 5th and 8th respectively. State Govt. has proposed for infrastructure development in govt. schools at a total cost of Rs. 350.00 lakh for the total 38 units of high schools.

Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for providing infrastructure needs in schools at a total cost of Rs.350.00 lakh. This would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project profile, indicating details of rooms, design and specification of the building, type of infrastructure to be created, estimates approved by the competent authority, details of laboratory, availability of land, teachers, power supply and facilities for maintenance of equipments obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Human Resource Development. The names of villages where these schools are located with percentage of minority population, list of schools, number of units in each school should be given. ‘Basic infrastructure’ to be developed should be indicated. Mechanism to prevent duplication be indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Wayanad district (Kerala)</th>
<th>Sharing ratio</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central share</th>
<th>State share</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>1st instalment amount to be released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure needs in schools ACRS with lab facilities</td>
<td>65:35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>227.50</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>113.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Proposals requiring project details/profile for appraisal and comments of the Ministry/Department concerned in case the State Government desired to pursue the proposal.

(a) Modernization and renovation of government polytechnic at Meppadi: The State Government was advised to prepare detailed project profile/DPR as per the specification, norms, design and cost etc as per the standard of National Council for Vocational Training (NCVT).
(b) **Skill upgradation and livelihood for women farmers and labourers through training and capacity building:** The State Government was advised to prepare detailed project profile/DPR as per the specification and cost of the training programme and capacity building of Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperation.

(c) **Construction of PHCs:** The State Government was advised to prepare detailed project profile/DPR as per the specification and guideline of the NRHM and cost should be approved by NRHM Mission director/State PWD.

(d) **Infrastructure Development in Government schools including library building, science building, computers and other basic infrastructure.**

The State Government was advised to prepare detailed project profile/DPR as per the specification; norms, design and cost etc as per the RMSA/SSA pattern and cost should be approved by PWD.

(IV) **Summary of projects of Wayanad (Kerala) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no.</th>
<th>Name of the Project for Wayanad district (Kerala)</th>
<th>Sharing ratio</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
<th>Central share</th>
<th>State share</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>1st instalment amount to be released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Construction of Health sub-centres</td>
<td>85:15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>153.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Infrastructure needs in schools ACRS with lab facilities</td>
<td>65:35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>227.50</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>113.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380.50</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>530.00</td>
<td>190.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) **General observation of Empowered Committee:** The state government was advised to make out a revised plan for the balance fund available in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved under MsDP for Kerala and other states/UTs. The State Govt. should set up an IT enabled cell for monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the programme and submit their proposal based on the type of hardware and configuration as already advised by this Ministry. The Empowered Committee advised that the revised plan may focus on a few proposals that address the deficits which could be easily funded in the areas of drinking water, skill development, education, income generating activities, and health including saturating the schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities. State government was also advised to prepare a revised plan in such a manner that the various development deficits identified by the baseline survey were addressed in order of their priority.

******