

**Workshop on National Rurban Mission
ICAPs, Status and Way Forward
(Eastern Region)
13th April 2016
Ranchi, Jharkhand**

Key Findings

I. Time Lines committed by States on completion of ICAPs

	State	Institutional Frameworks (SPMU/DPMU/CDMU)	Draft submissions	ICAP
1	Bihar	15 th May, 2016	15 th August, 2016	
2	Chhattisgarh	30 th May, 2016	30 th June, 2016	
3	Jharkhand	30 th May, 2016	30 th July, 2016	
4	Odisha	30 th April, 2016	30 th June, 2016	

II. Declaration of clusters as Planning Areas

Bihar:

- Clusters in the Patna and Gaya district are already under the master plan.
- The clusters in the remaining districts of Rohtas and Saharsa need to be delineated and declared as a planning area.
- The RD department would need to delineate the clusters and approach the T&CP department for further notification processes.

Chhattisgarh:

- All clusters in Chattisgarh fall under an existing Master Plan and hence in Phase 1 further action on notification is not required. Unless the NRuM interventions deviate the approved Master Plan for which an exemption may be sought from the T&CP department on a case by case basis.

Jharkhand:

- Only 1 cluster of the 3, i.e Bhandaridih cluster in Giridih sub district falls under an existing Master Plan area, as per the Improvement Trust Act, 1954. It is suggested that this may continue to be under the purview of this Master Plan area and for any deviations from the Master Plan as a result of NRuM interventions, approvals may be sought from the T&CP department.
- For the other clusters, the Jharkhand Regional Development Authority Act-2001 adopted from Bihar Regional Development Authority Act-1981 could be enforced. However at present this Act is applicable only for Ranchi region and Cabinet decision is awaited for enforcement across the region.
- Further it was suggested by the CTP, Odisha that all States may consider amendment in the respective State Panchayati Raj Act, on the lines of the

amendment carried out by the State of Andhra Pradesh, which empowers the Panchayati Raj department to delineate and notify clusters as planning areas.

Odisha:

- Only one cluster of Banapur in Khurda District is covered by Master Plan. Therefore remaining 4 clusters need to be notified as a planning area.
- The Panchayati Raj Department can forward the proposals to the Town Planning Directorate. The directorate will then submit the proposal to the Housing & Urban Development Department, which will notify these clusters as a planning area.
- Further, as suggested above the necessary amendment in the Panchayati Raj Act may be considered for empowerment to the PR department to carry forward the delineation process.
- The CTP Odisha also clarified, in reply to the possible duality in the roles of planning authority which needs to be set up for controlling the spatial planning aspects of the cluster and the district authorities/committees constituted under NRuM, that by virtue of executive orders/instructions the District Planning Committees can be notified as a planning authority to enforce land use regulations.

West Bengal:

- Amongst the 6 clusters approved for West Bengal, Garalgachha in Chadithala –I falls under a Master Plan area and Part of Chandarhati-I in Chinsurah-Mogra sub district falls within an approved Master Plan area. Hence RD department may apply to T&CP department for extension of this Master Plan area to the entire cluster.
- For the remaining 4 clusters, the RD Department should send a proposal to the Directorate, Town Planning for delineating the clusters and declaring them as planning area.

III-State Institutional Frameworks

- All States requested for a detailed HR Policy from MoRD for appointment of personnel for SPMU/DPMU/CDMU with clear salary scales.

IV-Scope for CGF and Revision in Costing Norms

- It was clarified whether stand alone projects could be entirely funded using the CGF. To this MoRD response was that one of the components chosen under NRuM could be entirely funded by part of the CGF, however taking care that the entire CGF covers upto 30% of the total cost of developing the cluster. For example if it is assessed that a cluster is deficient in 2-3 components, then the CGF could go entirely towards filling the gap in 1 or 2 of the 3 components, with the 3rd component being funded by other means, provided the total CGF is 30% of the cost of providing all 3 components.
- Easy entry point components such as ensuring 100% LPG coverage may be considered as a component under NRuM.

- All States requested for CGF for Tribal/Hilly and Non-Tribal clusters to be the same as cost of implementing infrastructure projects will be more in the tribal/hilly areas considering the difficult terrain and geography.
- It was clarified whether the CGF could be distributed equally between various revenue villages. MoRD responded that this will not be allowed as the distribution of CGF has to be linked with the actual estimate of the work on the ground which may be spread across some revenue villages.
- NRuM gives flexibility in taking up projects, hence the CGF should be allowed to be utilized for stand alone projects with less focus on convergence.

V-Convergence related

- Recently launched programmes like PM Mudra Yojana, Start-up India will create a support infrastructure for realizing the benefits of NRuM.
- MoRD should facilitate convergence between various Ministries by issuing advisories to various Ministries to give priority to the NRuM clusters.
- MoRD may also advise the various Ministries to earmark a portion of the funds from their schemes for NRuM. This will ease the convergence process.
- There are possibilities of audit objections if different line departments divert their funds towards NRuM alone. Therefore the scope of work should be well defined by way of a advisory issued by the Ministry/SLEC.
- Convergence has been largely successful with the schemes of Rural Development therefore in NRuM the focus should be largely on converging resources available within the RD schemes.

VI-Other methods of raising resources

- It was clarified during the ICAP presentation that the resources for the cluster could be mobilized through other sources as well apart from convergence such as CSR etc. To this States requested that in case a National level workshop is being organized with the CSR companies then States may also be invited and further MoRD may provide support and guidance to States to be able to draw CSR resources.

VI-Planning technicalities

- The use of GIS based techniques for mapping and arriving at intervention areas was suggested
- The household survey techniques adopted under IIPPE may also be used under NRuM while ensuring that the compilation is done following the NRuM templates.

VII-Service Level Benchmarks

- While presenting the ICAPs it was explained that CGF estimation has to be based on deficiency analysis which is based on comparison of existing levels with norms. 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.

VIII-Compendium on best practices and workshops

- It was suggested that a compendium of best practices be compiled under NRuM.
- Regional/National level workshops may be organized more frequently to facilitate exchange of ideas and ICAP preparation issues etc.

IX-Stakeholder consultations

- The importance of stakeholder consultations was emphasized greatly during the ICAP presentation and further it was highlighted that citizens should be kept at the center while preparing the ICAP. The recent initiative of the Government of Jharkhand, Yojana Banawo Abhiyan was completely based on bottom-up approach where people themselves prepared the plans.

X-Implementation Strategy

- NRuM should focus on end-to-end implementation of various projects taken up unlike many other schemes where assets created are neither owned nor used by the targeted beneficiaries.