

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

Workshop Proceedings

A Regional Workshop was organized for the Western Region states. Representatives from 5 States participated in this workshop. The primary objective of the workshop was to orient the states on ICAP preparation and various related modalities. The workshop also gave an opportunity to the States to share the work done under NRuM so far and the way forward.

Ms. Nandini Ghanekar, Additional Nodal Officer, Rurban Mission, Government of Maharashtra welcomed the participants.

Ms. Vineeta Hariharan, Chief Programme Manager, NRUM then presented the key objectives of the workshop and invited Director to make a brief presentation on the Mission Overview

Ms. Preeti Nath, Director, Rurban then gave an overview of the Rurban Mission.

This was followed by an address by Shri V. Giriraj, Principal Secretary, Rural Development, Government of Maharashtra. He spoke about the theme of Rurban and the concept as articulated by Mr Patrick Geddes – a renowned urban planner. He dwelled on the themes of conservative surgery vs De Novo interventions in Rurban areas. He also appreciated the Ministry for the commendable efforts made so far with respect to the mission and said that all such Missions would take some time to gain speed and momentum.

This was followed by a detailed presentation on ICAPs by the Chief Programme Manager, NRuM. She gave a detailed overview of the step-by-step process to be followed by the States for preparing the ICAPs.

Shri Rajeev Thakur, Secretary, Rural Development, Government of Rajasthan then made a brief address to the gathering on the specificities of the Mission and encouraged the States to now take lead in the Mission.

This was followed by an interactive session anchored by the Chief Programme Manager, NRuM, wherein the findings of the secondary research done on each State Statute dealing with Town and Country Planning was presented. She highlighted the provisions in various Statutes that deal with planning in the respective States. The process to be adopted for declaration of clusters as planning areas was then discussed with the town planning representatives of each State and a dialogue was facilitated between the RD department and the Town Planning department. This led to clarity on the way forward in the process of the declaration of clusters as planning areas. (The detailed findings of this session is presented in the Key Findings Note)

This was followed by a presentation from each State on the steps taken so far under NRuM and the way forward. The States also gave a brief overview on the various clusters and their features. (The time lines committed for completion of ICAPs are presented in the key findings note).

This was followed by a presentation by Mr. Rakesh Bangera, Teal Leader, NRUM, on contractual framework to be followed by each of the states for engaging STSAs and formation of SPMU, PMU and CDMU.

The queries raised by the States during the open house discussions and the clarifications sought are detailed below:

Goa:

- Clarification was raised with reference to phasing of the 70% funds mobilized through convergence.
 - MoRD clarified that it is up to The 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 clarified whether the benchmarks under each permissible component mentioned in the guidelines has to be followed or whether these can be iterated.
 - It was clarified by the CPM 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.

Rajasthan:

- It was submitted that the CGF for Tribal and Non Tribal States should be made equal.
- 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%.
 - It was clarified that the same is being considered and these points shall be taken into account while planning for phase 2.
- Possibility of approaching Panchayat Samitis instead of requesting individual Gram Sabhas was discussed and MoRD was of the view that it is not advisable to bypass Gram Sabhas.
- 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.

Gujarat:

- 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.

Goa

- 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
- If the proposed cluster is partially under 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.

Madhya Pradesh

- 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.

Maharashtra:

- 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.
 - IEC would play a major role in building the consensus. MoRD directed all states to involve GPs from the beginning of ICAP so that consensus can be developed for developing the priority list of projects across GPs.

The workshop ended with vote of thanks by the Chief Programme Manager, NRuM.
