MINUTES OF THE 9th MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE MULTI-SECTORAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR MINORITY CONCENTRATION DISTRICTS HELD AT 10.30 A.M. ON 30th DECEMBER, 2008 UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF MINORITY AFFAIRS

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

The Chairman of the Empowered Committee explained the background for identification of minority concentration districts (MCDs) and the formulation 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 deficits in order of priority. In case a deficit, ranking 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 main purpose 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 averages.

The Chairman stated that multi-sectoral development plans of 31 districts in 7 States have already been approved so far and with this meeting the tally would go up to 37 districts covering 7 States and one Union Territory. It was noticed from the plans considered so far that the Deputy Commissioners, who have understood the MsDP scheme, have prepared good plans anchored on the findings of the baseline survey for achieving the objectives of the scheme. There have been interesting variations in the type of proposals received and this reflected the varying deficits identified and the needs of the district concerned. The fact that these districts were not just MCDs, having a substantial minority population, but also 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. Equally important was the fact that most of the identified districts were located on the international border and were therefore highly sensitive. Improving the relevant backwardness indices upto national averages was a primary mandate of the scheme for social inclusion. The scheme promotes topping up Centrally Sponsored Schemes, specially those included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities, for saturating them in MCDs, as there were many existing schemes already addressing national concerns with time-tested guidelines and implementation mechanism. What was lacking was sufficient funds for certain programmes in these districts. It was crucial that basic requirements like primary and secondary education, skill development, safe drinking water, housing etc. were addressed first before considering the high end needs like computers and college education. As envisaged in the scheme, the States/UTs were advised to ensure that topping up Centrally Sponsored Schemes wherever appropriate, could be proposed as they were established schemes and could be implemented with ease without setting up new structures for implementing them. The Empowered Committee advised that the responsibility for eliminating duplication of schemes vested with both the district authority and the State Government.

2. The multi-sectoral development plans for the districts of Nicobar (Andaman & Nicobar Island), Shajanpur, Bulandsahar, Rampur, Saharanpur and Balrampur (U.P.) were considered. The DMs of the concerned districts of Uttar Pradesh were present. The Deputy Commissioner of Nicobar district, Andaman & Nicobar Island, made presentation via video conferencing before the Empowered Committee. The conclusions that emerged, after a power point presentation by the Deputy Commissioner concerned, clarifications and confirmation of the status and fulfillment of conditions of the guidelines by the Secretary of the State Government/UT administration concerned, comments/clarifications from the members of the Empowered Committee and the representatives of Ministry/Department, were as follows:-
**Item No.1: Nicobar (Andaman & Nicobar Island)**

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.15.00 crore for the 11th Plan period. The MsDP plan of the district was presented by the Deputy Commissioner, Nicobar and discussed through video conferencing. The Secretary of the Social Welfare department of the UT confirmed that all conditions were fulfilled. There were 22 islands out of which 10 were inhabited. As tsunami rehabilitation programme covered the requirements for housing, toilets and drinking water, these were not proposed in this plan.

(i) **Project approved**

(a) **Construction of anganwadi centres:** It was submitted that 76 anganwadi centres were functional in the district, 29 were having pucca buildings and 35 were functioning in kutchha structures. The proposal was for construction of 35 buildings for anganwadi centres, which were functioning in kutchha structures @ of Rs.6.57 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs.229.95 lakh. The Deputy Commissioner clarified that the unit cost was high due to high transportation cost of building materials and had been approved by the PWD of the U.T.

The Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 35 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.6.57 lakh per unit, at a total cost of Rs.229.95 lakh and subject to condition that the list of centres and the estimates of the unit cost approved by the PWD would be provided. It was agreed that 50% of the central share would be released as 1st instalment.

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

(b) **Providing modern teaching aids:** The proposal was for providing modern teaching aids @Rs0.50 lakh at a total cost of Rs.12.50 lakh in 25 high/secondary/higher secondary schools. It was stated that out of 46 schools, teaching aid requirement of 21 primary schools were covered under SSA and the remaining 25 high/secondary/higher secondary schools were proposed under MsDP.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for providing modern teaching aids in 25 schools @ Rs.0.50 lakh at a total cost of Rs.12.50 lakh. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment. In-principle
approval was given on the condition that the UT administration would provide the list
of teaching aids, the cost estimate of each items and the basis of costing.

(c) **Capacity building of farmers, traders, entrepreneurs on scientific coconut
cultivation & processing technology**: The proposal was for capacity building of
farmers, traders, entrepreneurs in scientific coconut cultivation & processing
technology at a total cost of Rs. 25.00 lakh.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for capacity building
of farmers, traders, entrepreneurs in scientific coconut cultivation & processing
technology at a total cost of Rs. 25.00 lakh. This would, however, be subject to the
condition that the State Government would provide a detailed project report prepared
as per the specification, norms and standards laid down in the relevant scheme of the
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperation for obtaining the advice of the Ministry
concerned. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st
instalment after the advice was obtained.

(iii) **General observations of the Empowered Committee**: The Empowered Committee
noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as they were not
according to the guidelines of the MsDP. The UT administration was advised to make
out a revised plan in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP.

(iv) **Summary of projects of Nicobar (Andaman & Nicobar Island) district approved
by the Empowered Committee**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Nicobar district (Andaman &amp; Nicobar Island)</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>Rupee in lakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Construction anganwadi centres</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>229.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>229.95</td>
<td>114.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Providing modern teaching aid</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Capacity building of farmers, traders, entrepreneurs on scientific coconut cultivation &amp; processing technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>267.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) The representative from the Union Territory was advised to prepare and submit
supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs. 1232.55 lakh. The
Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the district with schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities.

**Item No.2: Shajahanpur (Uttar Pradesh)**

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.53.70 crore for the 11th Plan period. There were 4 teshils and 15 blocks in the district. 3 blocks had high minority concentration. It was pointed out by the Deputy Commissioner that slight changes have been necessitated due to error in translation.

(i) **Projects approved**

(a) **Indira Awas Yojana (IAY):** Households having pucca walls were ranked 1st in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The proposal was for an additional 5000 houses at the approved unit cost of the Ministry of Rural Development i.e. Rs.35,000/-. The Empowered Committee approved construction of 5000 IAY houses at a total cost of Rs.1750.00 lakh. Central contribution from MsDP would be Rs.1312.50 lakh and Rs.437.50 lakh as State share as per the funding pattern of IAY between Centre and State in the ratio of 75:25. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment. The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that the IAY houses would be constructed in 100 villages with the highest minority concentration, BPL families would be selected from the approved waiting list, even if they belonged to communities other than the minority 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. It should be ensured that not less than 20 units were given to any village. The list of the villages, indicating the number of houses to be constructed would be provided. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(b) **Construction of anganwadi centres:** Health indicators i.e. percentage of institutional deliveries were below the national average. Only 15.14% of the
deliveries were institutional. It was submitted that 200 anganwadi centres in the minority concentration areas were not having their own buildings, and 39 were functioning from primary schools. The proposal was for construction of 161 buildings for anganwadi centres, out of about 200, which were not running in government buildings in the minority concentration areas @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit, at a total cost of Rs.474.75 lakh. Land and staff were confirmed to be available. Deputy Commissioner stated that if 200 anganwadi centres, instead of 161, were provided under MsDP it would be possible to saturate the requirement in minority concentration areas. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed.

Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 200 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs.590.00 lakh and subject to the condition that the centres, as per the advice of the M/o WCD, would have a kitchen, store room, toilet and playing space, and would be located in villages which have the highest concentration of minority population. It was agreed that 50% of the central share will be released as 1st instalment. The State Government would provide a list of villages where these centres would be constructed.

(c) Installation of mark-II hand pumps in minority concentration villages: The proposal was for the installation of 500 India Mark-II hand pumps @ Rs. 0.30 lakh each. The Deputy Commissioner clarified that one hand pump was being provided for 100 persons in the district. The State Government representative confirmed that this was the approved cost of hand pumps as per ARWSP norms.

The Empowered Committee approved installation of 500 India Mark-II hand pumps for Rs.150.00 lakh @ Rs. 0.30, of which the Central share would be Rs.112.50 lakh and the State share Rs.37.50 lakh on 75:25 Centre and State sharing ratio as per the ARWSP subject to the condition that these hand pumps would be installed in sourceless or inadequately-sourced villages, having the highest proportion of minority population. The Empowered Committee agreed to release 50% of the Central share. The list of the villages where these hand pumps were to be installed with location would be furnished. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the assets funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Department concerned.
(ii) **Projects approved in-principle:**

(d) **Construction of ITI building:** Total work participation and female work participation have been ranked as 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respectively in the baseline survey of the district. Proposal was for the construction of an existing ITI in Jalalabad at a total cost of Rs.250.00 lakh which was the approved unit cost followed by the UP State Government. The State Government representative confirmed that this ITI has been sanctioned and was operating from the premises of an existing ITI. Land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. However, as advised by the Ministry of Labour & Employment, in earlier meetings of the Empowered Committee, the cost for establishment of a new ITI would be in the range of Rs.400 lakh to Rs.450 lakh, the proposal would need to be re-considered keeping this in mind. The M/o Labour & Employment had been recommending that the building design, specification, etc should be as per the standards of the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT) as it would facilitate better employment prospect.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of an ITI for Rs.250.00 lakh. This would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project report prepared as per the specification, design, norms, modern courses/trades and standard laid down by the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT); locally relevant, modern trade and trades suitable for women should be taken up for obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Labour & Employment. Confirmation of the State Government would be required that the ITI was sanctioned, land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. Also the State Government would be required to provide details in respect of the numbers and type of courses, numbers of students enrolled and its capacity. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1<sup>st</sup> instalment after advice of the M/o Labour & Employment.

(iii) **Proposals requiring project details/profile for appraisal and comments of the Ministry/Department concerned if State Government desire to pursue the proposal:**

(e) **Construction of animal husbandry centres in rural areas:** The proposal was for the construction of 11 animal husbandry centres in rural areas @Rs.4.93 lakh at a total cost of Rs.54.23 lakh. This was proposed as improvement in the facility for animal
care would be beneficial to villagers who depended on animal and bird rearing for livelihood support. The Empowered Committee had no objection to the proposal for construction of 11 animal husbandry centres in rural areas. The State Government would need to provide a detailed project report, prepared as per the specification, design, norms laid down by the M/o Animal Husbandry & Dairying, indicating commitment to provide land, state share, staff, recurring expenditure etc. for obtaining the advice of the Ministry concerned.

(f) **Computer training for unemployed boys and girls of minority communities:** The need for improving female work participation was felt. The State Govt. should, however, send a project profile in accordance with the relevant scheme guidelines of Ministry/Department concerned, bringing out clearly the criteria for selection of students, details of training centres, trainers, type of certificate issued to successful students, employability, and justification of how it would benefit the minority population etc.

(g) **Employment generation:** The State Govt. was advised to propose such income generating activities for self help groups/individuals under SGSY special project pattern. SHGs could be a mixed group of persons from different communities and not necessarily comprising only from the minority communities. Individual schemes could be proposed under SGSY by seeking special relaxation of the ceiling under the SGSY scheme. It was noted that this district was renowned for its carpet and textile products and there could be scope for proposing topping-up CSS schemes for textiles etc. of the M/o Textiles and also under SGSY for providing work sheds to SHGs. While doing this, the State Govt. should ensure that all necessary details like management, maintenance and operation aspects, besides building, were included in the detailed project profile.

(h) **Installation of solar street light:** The State Govt. was advised to make out a project profile prepared as per the guidelines of the Ministry of New & Renewable Energy clearly indicating the source of funding of state and beneficiary contribution, and send the proposal cleared by the Uttar Pradesh Renewable Energy Development Agency (UPREDA).
(i) **Infrastructure development in madarsas:** The Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) has revised the scheme for modernization of madarsas recently which were now called (i) Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madarsas and (ii) Scheme for Infrastructure Development in Private Aided/Unaided Minority Institutes. The revised schemes were attractive and there was sufficient fund available. It was advised that such requirement may be accessed from the new schemes of the Ministry of HRD. Upgradation and establishment of mini ITI in madarsa could be taken under these schemes.

(iv) **Proposals declined by the Empowered Committee as they were not identified as priority items in the baseline survey/not envisaged in the programme:**

(a) **Electricity:** This may be covered under centrally sponsored scheme of RGGVY.

(b) **Construction of community toilets:** This may be covered under centrally sponsored scheme under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) as the Department of Drinking Water Supply had indicated that there was sufficient fund available under this programme.

(v) **General observations of the Empowered Committee:** The Empowered Committee noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as there was in-sufficient justification. The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved for the districts of Uttar Pradesh.

(vi) **Summary of projects of Shajahanpur (Uttar Pradesh) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Shajahanpur district (U.P.)</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>Rupee in lakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1312.50</td>
<td>437.50</td>
<td>1750.00</td>
<td>656.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of anganwadi centres</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>590.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>590.00</td>
<td>295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Installation of Mark-II hand pumps in minority concentrated villages</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015.00</td>
<td>475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2265.00</td>
<td>475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2265.00</td>
<td>475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Construction of ITI building</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2265.00</td>
<td>475.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vii) The representative from the State Government was advised to prepare and submit supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs.3105.00 lakh. The Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the district with schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities.

Item No.3: Bulandshahr (Uttar Pradesh)

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.35.00 crore for the 11th Plan period. There were 16 blocks and 1175 villages in the district. The Deputy Commissioner stated housing was not proposed as there was sufficient fund available.

(i) Project approved

(a) Construction of anganwadi centres: Health indicators i.e. percentage of deliveries in health institutions was below the national average, only 32.24% of the deliveries were institutional. It was submitted that of more than the 3000 anganwadi centres in the district, only 68 centres were having their own building and the rest were functioning from primary schools or rented buildings. The proposal was for construction of 160 buildings for anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit, total costing Rs.472.00 lakh. Land and staff were confirmed to be available. Deputy Commissioner stated that if 500 anganwadi centres, instead of 160, were provided under MsDP it would be possible to reduce the gap. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed.

Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 500 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit for the total cost of Rs.1475.00 lakh and subject to condition that the centres would be located in villages which have the highest concentration of minority population. It was agreed that 50% of the central share will be released as 1st instalment. The State Government would provide a list of villages where these centres would be constructed.

(ii) Projects approved in-principle:

(b) Construction of ITI building: Total work participation and female work participation has been ranked as 3rd and 4th respectively in the baseline survey of the
Proposal was for the construction of one existing ITI at a total cost of Rs.256.00 lakh. The State Government representative confirmed that this ITI has been sanctioned and was operating from the premises of an existing ITI. Land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. However, as advised by the Ministry of Labour & Employment, in earlier meetings of the Empowered Committee, that the cost for establishment of a new ITI would be in the range of Rs.400 lakh to Rs.450 lakh, the proposal would need to be re-considered keeping this in mind. The M/o Labour & Employment had been recommending that the building design, specification, etc should be as per the standards of the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT) as it would facilitate better employment prospect.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of an ITI for Rs.250.00 lakh, i.e the same unit cost as for Shajahanpur district. This would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project report, prepared as per the specification, design, norms, modern courses/trades and standard laid down by the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT); locally relevant, modern trade and trades suitable for women should be taken up for obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Labour & Employment. Confirmation of the State Government would be required that the ITI was sanctioned, and land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. Also the State Government would be required to provide details in respect of the numbers and type of courses, numbers of students enrolled and its capacity. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment after advice of the M/o Labour & Employment.

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

(c) Employment based schemes: The State Govt. was advised to propose such income generating activities for self help groups/individuals under SGSY on the special project pattern. SHGs could be a mixed group of persons from different communities and not necessarily comprising only from the minority communities. Individual schemes could be proposed under SGSY by seeking special relaxation of the ceiling under the SGSY scheme.
(d) **Installation of solar street light:** The State Govt. was advised to make out a project profile prepared as per the guidelines of the Ministry of New & Renewable Energy clearly indicating the source of funding of state and beneficiary contribution, and send the proposal cleared by the Uttar Pradesh Renewable Energy Development Agency (UPREDA).

(e) **Modification of mini ITI in madarsa:** The Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) has revised the scheme for modernization of madarsas recently which were now called (i) Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madarsas and (ii) Scheme for Infrastructure Development in Private Aided/Unaided Minority Institutes. The revised schemes were attractive and there was sufficient fund available. It was advised that such requirement may be accessed from the new schemes of the Ministry of HRD. Upgradation and establishment of mini ITI in madarsa could be taken under these schemes.

(f) **Pottery design training programme:** This could be considered under SGSY pattern and the State Government was advised to send detailed project profile for obtaining the advice of the Ministry/Department concerned.

(g) **Water supply scheme:** The State Govt. was advised that such a proposal entailed detailed survey and study besides being very technical and involving complex operation and maintenance (O&M) issues. Implementation of such schemes also takes a long time. Such schemes should be proposed to the Department of Drinking Water Supply for funding under their scheme.

(iv) **Proposals declined by the Empowered Committee as they were not identified as priority items in the baseline survey/not envisaged in the programme:**

(a) **Electricity:** This may be covered under centrally sponsored scheme of RGGVY.

(b) **Health equipment:** NRHM permits procurement of such equipment and as they were technical and the requirement was linked to the availability of trained and qualified personnel and doctors for operating them, it was advised that the procurement of such equipment may be proposed for funding under NRHM to the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

(c) **Construction of road and drain:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of PMGSY or State plan resources.
(d) **Construction of toilets in schools:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) as the Department of Drinking Water Supply had indicated that there was sufficient fund available under this programme.

(e) **Tube well for irrigation:** The State Govt. was advised that such proposals involved complex operational and maintenance (O&M) issues and tie-up with water user associations of farmers. This should be taken up under the accelerated irrigation benefit programme (AIBP) of the M/o Water resources.

(v) **General observations of the Empowered Committee:** The Empowered Committee noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as there was insufficient write-up and justification. The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved for the districts of Uttar Pradesh.

(vi) **Summary of projects of Bulandshahr (Uttar Pradesh) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Bulandshahr district (U.P.)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rupee in lakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Construction anganwadi centres</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>737.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of ITI building</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1725.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1725.00</td>
<td>862.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) The representative from the State Government was advised to prepare and submit supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs.1775.00 lakh. The Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities.
Item No.4: Rampur (Uttar Pradesh)

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.54.70 crore for the 11th Plan period.

(i) Project approved

(a) Indira Awas Yojana (IAY): Households having pucca walls were ranked 2nd in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The proposal was for an additional 4000 houses at the approved unit cost of the Ministry of Rural Development i.e. Rs.35,000/-. Deputy Commissioner stated that IAY wait list were around 12000-13000 in the district and annual allocation was around 2000 IAY houses.

The Empowered Committee approved construction of 4000 IAY houses at a total cost of Rs.1400.00 lakh. Central contribution from MsDP would be Rs.1050.00 lakh and Rs.350.00 lakh as State share as per the funding pattern of IAY between Centre and State in the ratio of 75:25. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment. The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that the IAY houses would be given to beneficiaries in 100 villages with the highest minority population, BPL families selected from the approved waiting list, even if they belonged to communities other than the minority communities, strictly in order of their ranking in the list as per the IAY guidelines. It should be ensured that not less than 20 units were allocated to any village. The list of the villages, indicating the number of houses to be constructed, would be provided. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(b) Construction of anganwadi centres: Health indicators i.e. percentage of deliveries in health institutions was below the national average, 35.07% of the deliveries being institutional. It was submitted that there were 2171 anganwadi centres in the district and less than 10% had their own building. The proposal was for construction of 217 in the minority concentration areas @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit, at a total cost of Rs.640.15 lakh. Land and staff were confirmed to be available. Deputy Commissioner stated that if 500 anganwadi centres, instead of 217, were provided under MsDP it would be possible to reduce the huge gap of the district. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed.
Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 500 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs.1475.00 lakh subject to the condition that the centres would be located in villages which had the highest concentration of minority population. It was agreed that 50% of the central share would be released as 1st instalment. The State Government would provide a list of villages where these centres would be constructed.

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

(c) **Construction of ITI building:** Total work participation and female work participation have been ranked as 4th and 8th respectively in the baseline survey of the district. Proposal was for the construction of one existing ITI in Bilaspur at a total cost of Rs.250.00 lakh. The State Government representative confirmed that this ITI had been sanctioned and was operating from the premises of an existing ITI. Land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. However, as advised by the Ministry of Labour & Employment, in earlier meetings of the Empowered Committee, that the cost for establishment of a new ITI would be in the range of Rs.400 lakh to Rs.450 lakh, the proposal would need to be re-considered keeping this in mind. The M/o Labour & Employment had been recommending that the building design, specification, etc should be as per the standards of the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT) as it would facilitate better employment prospect.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of an ITI for Rs.250.00 lakh. This would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project report prepared as per the specification, design, norms, modern courses/trades and standard laid down by the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT); locally relevant, modern trade and trades suitable for women be taken up, before obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Labour & Employment. Confirmation of the State Government would be required that the ITI was sanctioned, and land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. Also the State Government would be required to provide details in respect of the numbers and type of courses, numbers of students enrolled and its capacity. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment after advice of the M/o Labour & Employment.
(iii) **Proposals requiring project details/profile for appraisal and comments of the Ministry/Department concerned if State Government desire to pursue the proposal:**

(d) **Infrastructure development in madarsas:** The Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) has revised the scheme for modernization of madarsas recently which were now called (i) Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madarsas and (ii) Scheme for Infrastructure Development in Private Aided/Unaided Minority Institutes. The revised schemes were attractive and there was sufficient fund available. It was advised that such requirement may be accessed from the new schemes of the Ministry of HRD. Upgradation and establishment of mini ITI in madarsa could be taken under these schemes.

(e) **Employment based schemes:** The State Govt. was advised to propose such income generating activities for self help groups/individuals under SGSY on the special project pattern. SHGs could be a mixed group of persons from different communities and not necessarily comprising only from the minority communities. Individual schemes could be proposed under SGSY by seeking special relaxation of the ceiling under the SGSY scheme.

(f) **Installation of solar street light:** The State Govt. was advised to make out a project profile prepared as per the guidelines of the Ministry of New & Renewable Energy clearly indicating the source of funding of state and beneficiary contribution, and send the proposal cleared by the Uttar Pradesh Renewable Energy Development Agency (UPREDA).

(g) **Water supply scheme:** The State Govt. was advised that such a proposal entailed detailed survey and study besides being very technical and involving elaborate operational and maintenance issues. Implementation of such schemes also takes a long time. Such schemes should be proposed to the Department of Drinking Water Supply for funding under their scheme.

(iv) **Proposals declined by the Empowered Committee as they were not identified as priority items in the baseline survey/not envisaged in the programme:**

(a) **Electricity:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of RGGVY.

(b) **Health equipment:** NRHM permits procurement of such equipment and as they are sophisticated and their requirement is linked to the availability of trained and qualified
personnel and doctors to operate them, it was advised that the procurement of such equipment may be proposed for funding under NRHM to the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

(v) **General observations of the Empowered Committee:** The Empowered Committee noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as there was insufficient write-up and justification. The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan, in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP, keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved for the districts of Uttar Pradesh.

(vi) **Summary of projects of Rampur (Uttar Pradesh) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Rampur district (U.P.)</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>Rupee in lakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1050.00</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>1400.00</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of anganwadi centres</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>737.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2525.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>350.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Construction of ITI building</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2775.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>350.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) The representative from the State Government was advised to prepare and submit supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs.2695.00 lakh. The Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the district with schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities. The schemes proposed for urban areas should be deleted as MsDP was meant only for rural and semi-rural areas.
Item No.5: Saharanpur (Uttar Pradesh)

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.48.30 crore for the 11\textsuperscript{th} Plan period.

(i) Project approved

(a) Indira Awas Yojana (IAY): Households having pucca walls were ranked 1\textsuperscript{st} in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The proposal was for an additional 3803 houses at the approved unit cost of the Ministry of Rural Development i.e. Rs.35,000/-.

Deputy Commissioner stated that IAY wait list were around 97096 in the district, and proposed that 4000 IAY houses may be provided to reduce the wait list. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed and to the provision of state share for the enhanced numbers.

The Empowered Committee approved construction of 4000 IAY houses at a total cost of Rs.1400.00 lakh. Central contribution from MsDP would be Rs.1050.00 lakh and Rs.350.00 lakh as State share as per the funding pattern of IAY between Centre and State in the ratio of 75:25. It was agreed that 50\% of the Central share would be released as 1\textsuperscript{st} instalment. The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that the IAY houses would be distributed to BPL families selected from the approved waiting list, even if they belonged to communities other than the minority communities, strictly in order of their ranking in the list as per the IAY guidelines. It should be ensured that not less than 20 units were given to the village. The list of the villages with the highest concentration of minorities should be chosen and that list along with the number of houses to be constructed should be furnished. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(b) Construction of additional class rooms (ACRs) in higher secondary schools:

Literacy rate (total) and female literacy has been identified as the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} deficit in the district respectively. Proposal was for the construction of 30 ACRs @Rs.13.50 lakh at a total cost of Rs.135.00 lakh. The unit cost was considered high and Rs.4.50 lakh approved for construction of ACRs under SSA was proposed to be adopted. The Deputy Commissioner stated that the ACRs were needed to have proper teacher-pupil ratio. The high schools were located in areas having a high concentration of
minority population and ACRs for higher secondary schools were not covered under SSA. Land was stated to be available.

The Empowered Committee approved the proposal for the construction of 30 additional class rooms in existing government higher secondary schools @ @Rs.4.50 lakh at a total cost of Rs.135.00 lakh. Central contribution from MsDP would be Rs.101.25 lakh and Rs.33.75 lakh would be the State share in a ratio of 75:25. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment. The State Government would ensure that the cost for the construction of ACRs was approved by the PWD, provide land and State share, and a list of villages where the schools were situated along with the proportion of minority population. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh may ensure that the ACRs funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(c) **Installation of new hand pumps in Ghar area**: The proposal was for the installation of 96 new hand pumps @ Rs. 1.43 lakh each. The Deputy Commissioner clarified that the unit cost should have been Rs2.16 lakh as this was the rate estimated and approved by the State PHED. The rate was high as the area was rocky. This was confirmed by the State Government representative.

The Empowered Committee approved installation of 96 hand pumps for Rs.207.36 lakh @ Rs. 2.16 lakh each, of which the Central share would be Rs.155.52 lakh and the State share Rs.51.84 lakh on 75:25 Centre and State sharing ratio as per the ARWSP subject to the condition that these hand pumps would be installed in sourceless or inadequately-sourced villages having the highest proportion of minority population. The Empowered Committee agreed to release 50% of the Central share. The list of the villages where these hand pumps were to be installed with location would be furnished along with its minority population and a copy of the cost, approved by the competent authority in the State Government, for the installation of such hand pumps in these areas, should be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the assets funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Department concerned.
(d) **Construction of anganwadi centres:** Health indicators i.e. percentage of deliveries in health institutions was below the national average, only 15.14% of the deliveries being institutional. It was submitted that of the 2398 anganwadi centres in the district, 2031 centres were functioning from primary schools, 229 centres in public buildings and 38 centres were in private buildings, only 100 had their own building. The proposal was for construction of 100 centres in the minority concentration areas @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit, at a total cost of Rs.295.00 lakh. Land and staff were confirmed to be available. Deputy Commissioner stated that if 500 anganwadi centres, instead of 100, were provided under MsDP it would be possible to reduce the huge gap in the district. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed.

Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 500 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs.1475.00 lakh subject to the condition that the centres would be located in villages which had the highest concentration of minority population. It was agreed that 50% of the central share will be released as the 1st instalment. The State Government would provide a list of villages where these centres would be constructed.

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

(e) **Construction of ITI building:** Total work participation and female work participation have been ranked as 4th and 3rd respectively in the baseline survey of the district. Proposal was for the construction of one existing ITI in Deoband at a total cost of Rs.250.51 lakh. The State Government representative confirmed that the ITI has been sanctioned and was operating from the premises of an existing ITI. Land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. However, as advised by the Ministry of Labour & Employment in earlier meetings of the Empowered Committee that the cost for establishment of a new ITI would be in the range of Rs.400 lakh to Rs.450 lakh, the proposal would need to be re-considered keeping this in mind. The M/o Labour & Employment had been recommending that the building design, specification, etc should be as per the standards of the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT) as it would facilitate better employment prospect.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of an ITI for Rs.250.00 lakh i.e. at the same rate agreed for Shajahanpur district. This
would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project report prepared, as per the specification, design, norms, modern courses/trades and standard laid down by the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT); locally relevant, modern trade and trades suitable for women should be taken up for obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Labour & Employment. Confirmation of the State Government would be required that the ITI was sanctioned, and land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. Also the State Government would be required to provide details in respect of the numbers and type of courses, numbers of students enrolled and its capacity. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment after obtaining the advice of the M/o Labour & Employment.

(iii) **Proposals requiring project details/profile for appraisal and comments of the Ministry/Department concerned if State Government desire to pursue the proposal:**

(f) **Infrastructure development in madarsas:** The Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) has revised the scheme for modernization of madarsas recently which were now called (i) Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madarsas and (ii) Scheme for Infrastructure Development in Private Aided/Unaided Minority Institutes. The revised schemes were attractive and there was sufficient fund available. It was advised that such requirement may be accessed from the new schemes of the Ministry of HRD. Upgradation and establishment of mini ITI in madarsa could be taken under these schemes.

(g) **Employment based schemes:** The State Govt. was advised to propose such income generating activities for self help groups/individuals under SGSY on the special project pattern. SHGs could be a mixed group of persons from different communities and not necessarily comprising only from the minority communities. Individual schemes could be proposed under SGSY by seeking special relaxation of the ceiling under the SGSY scheme.

(h) **Installation of solar street light:** The State Govt. was advised to make out a project profile prepared as per the guidelines of the Ministry of New & Renewable Energy clearly indicating the source of funding of state and beneficiary contribution, and
send the proposal cleared by the Uttar Pradesh Renewable Energy Development Agency (UPREDA).

(iv) **Proposals declined by the Empowered Committee as they were not identified as priority items in the baseline survey/not envisaged in the programme:**

(a) **Electricity:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of RGGVY.

(b) **Sanitation:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) as the Department of Drinking Water Supply had indicated that there was sufficient fund available under this programme.

(c) **Health equipment:** NRHM permits procurement of such equipment and as they are technical and this requirement was linked to the availability of trained and qualified personnel and doctors for operating them, it was advised that procurement of such equipment may be proposed for funding under NRHM to the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

(d) **Construction of road and drain:** This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of PMGSY or State plan resources.

(v) **General observations of the Empowered Committee:** The Empowered Committee noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as there was insufficient write-up and justification. The State Government was advised to make out a revised plan, in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP, keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved for the districts of Uttar Pradesh.

(vi) **Summary of projects of Saharanpur (Uttar Pradesh) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Saharanpur district (U.P.)</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><strong>Administrative Approval</strong></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>4000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1050.00</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>1400.00</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Construction of additional classrooms in higher secondary schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>50.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>New hand pumps in Ghar areas</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>155.52</td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td>207.36</td>
<td>77.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Construction of anganwadi centres</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>737.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2781.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In-principle approval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Construction of Govt. ITI in Deoband</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3031.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vii) The representative from the State Government was advised to prepare and submit supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs.1798.23 lakh. The Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the district with schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities.

Item No.6: Balrampur (Uttar Pradesh)

The funds allocated for the MsDP Plan was Rs.46.60 crore for the 11th Plan period.

(i) Project approved

(a) Construction of building of Primary Health Sub-Centres (PHSC): Health indicators i.e. percentage of deliveries in health institutions was below the national average, only 5.80% of the deliveries being institutional. The proposal was for construction of 12 PHSCs @ Rs 6.90 lakh for improving the rate of institutional delivery. Land and personnel were available. It was confirmed that the unit cost of Rs.6.90 lakh was approved by the State Government as per the NRHM pattern.

The Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 12 PHSCs for Rs.82.80 lakh, of which Rs.70.38 lakh would be borne by the Centre and Rs.12.42 lakh by the State. It also approved the release of 50% of the Central share as first installment. 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, NRHM construction norms, design, specification would be followed and the State share would be provided. The list of the centres with location should be furnished. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the centres funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(b) Indira Awas Yojana (IAY): Households having pucca walls were ranked 3rd in the order of deficit in the baseline survey. The proposal was for an additional 5000 houses at the approved unit cost of the Ministry of Rural Development i.e. Rs.35,000/-.
The Empowered Committee approved construction of 5000 IAY houses at a total cost of Rs.1750.00 lakh. Central contribution from MsDP would be Rs.1312.50 lakh and Rs.437.50 lakh as State share as per the funding pattern of IAY between Centre and State in the ratio of 75:25. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment. The approval was given on the assurance that the State Government would ensure that the IAY houses would be distributed to BPL families in 100 villages with the highest concentration of minorities selected from the approved waiting list, even if they belonged to communities other than the minority communities, strictly in order of their ranking in the list as per the IAY guidelines. It should be ensured that not less than 20 units were given to a village. The list of the villages, indicating the number of houses to be constructed, should be furnished. State share would be provided. To prevent duplication, the Government of Uttar Pradesh would ensure that the units funded under MsDP were reflected in the State Action Plan of the scheme and information also sent to the Ministry concerned.

(c) Construction of anganwadi centres: It was submitted that there were 1600 anganwadi centres in the district. The proposal was for construction of 270 in minority concentration areas @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit at a total cost of Rs.796.50 lakh. Land and staff were confirmed to be available. Deputy Commissioner stated that if 500 anganwadi centres, instead of 217, were provided under MsDP it would be possible to reduce the gap in the district. The State Secretary agreed to the enhancement proposed.

Empowered Committee approved the proposal for construction of 500 anganwadi centres @ of Rs.2.95 lakh per unit, at a total cost of Rs.1475.00 lakh and subject to the condition that the centres would be located in villages which had the highest concentration of minority population. It was agreed that 50% of the central share would be released as the 1st instalment. The State Government would provide a list of villages where these centres would be constructed.

(ii) Projects approved in-principle:

(d) Construction of ITI building: Total work participation and female work participation have been ranked as 7th and 5th respectively in the baseline survey of the district. Proposal was for the construction of an existing ITI at a total cost of
Rs.250.00 lakh. The State Government representative confirmed that this ITI has been sanctioned and was operating from the premises of an existing ITI. Land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. However, as advised by the Ministry of Labour & Employment in earlier meetings of the Empowered Committee that the cost for establishment of a new ITI would be in the range of Rs.400 lakh to Rs.450 lakh, the proposal would need to be re-considered keeping this in mind. The M/o Labour & Employment had been recommending that the building design, specification, etc should be as per the standards of the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT) as it would facilitate better employment prospect.

The Empowered Committee accorded in-principle approval for the construction of an ITI for Rs.250.00 lakh. This would, however, be subject to the condition that the State Government should provide a detailed project report prepared as per the specification, design, norms, modern courses/trades and standard laid down by the ‘National Council for Vocational Training’ (NCVT); locally relevant, modern trade and trades suitable for women should be taken up for obtaining the advice of the Ministry of Labour & Employment. Confirmation of the State Government would be required that the ITI was sanctioned, and land, trainers, staff and recurring cost were available. Also the State Government would be required to provide details in respect of the numbers and type of courses, numbers of students enrolled and its capacity. It was agreed that 50% of the Central share would be released as 1st instalment after advice of the M/o Labour & Employment.

(iii) Proposals requiring project details/profile for appraisal and comments of the Ministry/Department concerned if State Government desire to pursue the proposal:

(c) Infrastructure development in madarsas: The Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) has revised the scheme for modernization of madarsas recently which were now called (i) Scheme for Providing Quality Education in Madarsas and (ii) Scheme for Infrastructure Development in Private Aided/Unaided Minority Institutes. The revised schemes were attractive and there was sufficient fund available. It was advised that such requirement may be accessed from the new schemes of the Ministry of HRD. Upgradation and establishment of mini ITI in madarsa could be taken under these schemes.
Employment based schemes: The State Govt. was advised to propose such income generating activities for self help groups/individuals under SGSY on the special project pattern. SHGs could be a mixed group of persons from different communities and not necessarily comprising only from the minority communities. Individual schemes could be proposed under SGSY by seeking special relaxation of the ceiling under the SGSY scheme.

Installation of solar street light: The State Govt. was advised to make out a project profile prepared as per the guidelines of the Ministry of New & Renewable Energy clearly indicating the source of funding of state and beneficiary contribution, and send the proposal cleared by the Uttar Pradesh Renewable Energy Development Agency (UPREDA).

Water supply scheme: The State Govt. was advised that as such proposals entailed detailed survey and study besides being technical and involving complex operational and maintenance (O&M) issues, besides taking a very long time, such schemes should be proposed to the Department of Drinking Water Supply for funding under their scheme.

Proposals declined by the Empowered Committee as they were not identified as priority items in the baseline survey/not envisaged in the programme:

(a) Electricity: This may be covered under the centrally sponsored scheme of RGGVY.

(b) Health equipment: NRHM permits procurement of such equipment and as they are technical and this requirement is linked to the availability of trained and qualified personnel and doctors for operating them, it was advised that procurement of such equipment may be proposed for funding under NRHM to the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

(c) Tube well for irrigation: The State Govt. was advised that such proposals involved elaborate operational and maintenance issues and tie-up with water user associations of farmers. This should be taken up under the accelerated irrigation benefit programme (AIBP) of the M/o Water resources.

General observations of the Empowered Committee: The Empowered Committee noted that the rest of the proposals could not be considered as there was no sufficient write-up and justification. The State Government was advised to make out a revised
plan in accordance with the guidelines of the MsDP keeping in view the proposals which have already been approved for the districts of Uttar Pradesh.

(vi) **Summary of projects of Balrampur (Uttar Pradesh) district approved by the Empowered Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>Name of the project for Balrampur district (U.P.)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Construction of primary health sub centres</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>70.38</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>82.80</td>
<td>35.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1312.50</td>
<td>437.50</td>
<td>1750.00</td>
<td>656.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Construction of anganwadi centres</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td>737.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2857.88</td>
<td>449.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-principle approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Construction of ITI building</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3107.88</td>
<td>449.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) The representative from the State Government was advised to prepare and submit supplementary/revised/modified MsDP plan for a balance of Rs.1552.12 lakh. The Empowered Committee noted that numerous schemes were proposed and advised that the revised plan may focus on a few schemes for addressing the deficits in drinking water, skill development, education, health and income generating activities, including saturating the district with schemes included in the Prime Minister’s New 15 Point Programme for the Welfare of Minorities.

*************