

**Workshop on National Rurban Mission
Status and Way Forward
(Western Region)
26th April 2016
Mumbai**

Key Findings

I. Time Lines committed by States on completion of ICAPs

Sl. No	State	Institutional Frameworks (SPMU/DPMU/CDMU)	Draft ICAP Submissions
1	Maharashtra	15 th June 2016 (SPMU)	30 th July 2016
2	Rajasthan	30 th June 2016	30 th July 2016
3	Gujarat	30 th June 2016	30 th July 2016
4	MP	30 th May 2016 (SPMU)	15 th August 2016
5	Goa	SLEC will be finalized by 15 th May 2016 ; SPMU 30 th June 2016	15 th August 2016

II. Declaration of clusters as Planning Areas

Goa:

- Regional Plans have been prepared for both sub districts by Goa Town Planning Department.
- Further department has also prepared detailed spatial plans for each Village Panchayat at a scale of 1:5000.
- Xeldem cluster is covered under South Goa Regional Plan.
- Only one GP of the sub district is not in cluster. Goa plans to bring this GP in the cluster.
- Delineation and Notification process would require at least two months.

Gujarat:

- All the 4 sub districts covered under the Mission are notified Area Development Authorities carrying the same name as the cluster.
- Except Ambaji all 3 clusters are only partially covered by the Area Development Plan and hence the clusters have to be appropriately realigned to follow the planning boundaries so that a fresh notification may not be required.

Maharashtra:

- Regional plan has been prepared for 4 clusters.
- Only Loni Kalbor cluster is already notified remaining clusters are to be notified.

- Notification process would require at least 60 days.
- Zila Panchyats have been made the planning authorities for Development Plans for non-municipal areas. If the clusters are under DP and RP then the notification process would require more time but otherwise it can be done within 60 days.
- It is to be verified whether all clusters are under the jurisdiction of any Regional Plan.

Madhya Pradesh

- All sub districts have Master Plans ready except Mau.
- For Mau the Master Plan is under process.
- The same may be further verified in writing from the Town Planning departments.
- The clusters in Madhya Pradesh in Phase 1 will not need to go through the notification process once the master plan coverage is confirmed.

Rajasthan

- Except Salawas all the 3 clusters would require notification.
- However, Rajasthan does not have an act allowing notification of rural areas an amendment of the Panchayati Raj Act would be required.

III. Engagement with STSA

- Several States requested MoRD to advice on the cap on the maximum fees for preparation of ICAPs to be given to STSA.
- States also inquired whether the remaining amount out of INR 35 lakh be utilized for establishing State Institutional frameworks.
 - MoRD clarified that it cannot cap the STSA fees and it is between states and STSA to arrive at a mutually acceptable fee. MoRD also requested states to expedite the process of entering into agreements with STSAs.
 - Once the fees to STSA is paid out of INR 35 lakh or INR 25 lakh as the case may be the remaining amount can be utilized for establishing PMUs at State, District and cluster level as per the requirement of the State.

IV. Critical Gap Funding and Convergence

- States raised the query on whether the CGF can be used for recurring expenditure or O&M expenditure.
 - MoRD clarified that CGF is to fund capital investment only. However States need to articulate on the O&M plan for the assets being created under NRuM.
- MoRD was requested to issue advisory to concerned officers of states to ensure that priority is given to the clusters.
- Clarification was raised with reference to phasing of the 70% funds mobilized through convergence.
 - MoRD clarified that it is up to States to phase the investment. It would be preferable that prior commitment from each department is taken and then entire 100% investment requirement is phased across the project construction/execution period.

- It was submitted that the CGF for Tribal and Non Tribal States should be made equal.
 - MoRD clarified that the same could be considered in due course of time.
- It was stated that 2% of CGF as administrative budget is not enough to run the SPMU and other PMUS. Examples of IAY and NREGA was shared where the administrative budgets are between 4-6%. It was suggested that under NRuM, the admin budget shall be enhanced to minimum 5% from existing level of 2%
 - MoRD is considering both the aspects.
- It was clarified whether the fund distribution would be done amongst all GPs in a cluster. The issue of building consensus amongst the various GPs on distribution of the CGF under NRuM would be a challenge.
 - MoRD then clarified that the BDOs present may take the leadership for this. Further the CGF would be linked to the projects rather than GPs and most of the components selected under the Mission would have benefits which would spread across the GPs within the cluster.
- As 70% of investment is to be sourced from state resources, can bank loans be availed to fund this 70% component?
 - MoRD clarified that States are allowed to avail bank loans to source 70% investment requirement.

V. Cluster Formation, Delineation and Notification

- If the proposed cluster is partially under the jurisdiction of a Development Plan or Master Plan then it would be difficult to notify.
 - In such cases it is advisable to remove the villages from the cluster which are not a part of DP/MP as extending boundaries of an existing DP/MP is a time taking process.
- Can GPs be added or removed from the cluster at this stage?
 - Till ICAP is finalized GPs can be added or removed while basic criteria of forming cluster as mentioned in guidelines and framework shall not be violated.

VI. ICAP Preparation

- A query was raised about process for ICAP preparation, whether bottom up approach of preparation of ICAP could be adopted. In other words whether Gram Panchayats could be asked about what is required rather than consulting upfront before preparing the ICAP?
 - MoRD appreciated the approach but still requested states to prepare the base line gap analysis and then consult GPs about their view. However, in the original process as mentioned in the guidelines, ICAP is to be prepared in regular consultations with GPs.
- It was clarified whether the Service Level benchmarks (SLBs) under each permissible component mentioned in the guidelines has to be followed or whether these can be iterated.
 - It was clarified that these SLBs could vary from State to State and the benchmarks given in the ICAP framework are only suggestive and States are free to set benchmarks above the national level

- benchmarks. If it is below then adequate justification needs to be given.
- Whether detailed land use planning is expected to be carried out in the ICAP. As this process is time consuming and will delay the entire process of ICAP.
 - Detailed Land Use planning is not expected in ICAP, ICAP aims at just initiating the process of notification. Activity zones shall be demarcated while submitting the final ICAP but entire process of notification shall continue.
 - There might be some projects which are required by one GP whereas the other GP is not ready to accept it. In such cases arriving at a consensus would be difficult and which authority's decision would be final.
 - MoRD clarified that projects which have larger benefit for the entire cluster may be chosen.
 - However consensus building would still be necessary to ensure smooth convergence.

VII. Institutional Framework

- It was inquired whether it is necessary to establish PMU at all three tiers – State, District and Cluster level.
 - MoRD clarified that it is upto states however, the most advisable structure would be to have at least two tiers one being SPMU other can be at District or Cluster level.