Details of Guidelines/instructions issued by the State Government from time to time for the implementation of MLAs’ priority schemes

- Prior consultation with the concerned local XEN (PWD/I&PH) would be a must before recommending the inclusion of a project proposal in the shelf. The concerned XEN (PWD/I&PH) will review the position of preparing DPRs every quarter and give a project proposal-wise status summary to the concerned Hon’ble MLA and HOD. The concerned Secretary would review the position every six months and apprise the position to the Planning Department on an annual basis. Planning Department would review the position on an annual basis. NABARD will also be invited to participate in the review meetings of the concerned Secretaries and Planning Department. PWD and IPH Department would endeavour to ensure an even sanctioning of projects across all Constituencies. The DPR of project costing more than Rs. 5.00 crore will be posed to NABARD after obtaining the approval of Hon’ble Chief Minister.

- The following sector-wise minimum limit of estimated cost of each DPR of MLA Priority Scheme has been fixed for posing to NABARD for funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Minimum Limit of Estimated Cost of each DPR (Rs. in lakh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2. Rural Water Supply</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3. Minor Irrigation (IPH)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4. Roads &amp; Bridges</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project proposals of less than above mentioned amounts will not be posed for RIDF funding. Therefore, such schemes/proposals need not be prioritized under MLA Priority Schemes. The project proposals of less than above mentioned amount could be taken up under various other State & Central Sector schemes. However, on the request of Hon’ble MLA, project proposal of less than minimum limit could be considered for RIDF funding on case to case basis with the prior approval of State Government.
- There is an urgent need to look for alternative sources for funding developmental projects in the State. For instance, we need to shift more to AIBP/PMKSY for minor irrigation schemes (where part funds are available as grants from Government of India); ARWSP for drinking water schemes, PMGSY and CRF for roads; RKVY for projects in the Agriculture/Horticulture and Animal Husbandry Sectors; and to the extent possible under MNREGA for different sectors projects (under 50% line departments component). Further, in view of the limits in raising loan through NABARD, priority projects of Hon’ble MLAs should also be posed for funding under these sources instead of posing them solely to NABARD. Comprehensive instructions on the subject were also issued by the Planning Department on 2nd December, 2010. Therefore, the departments may reprioritize the pending DPRs of various developmental projects including those falling under priority projects of the Hon’ble MLAs, and pose them for funding under alternative sources of funding instead of restricting such funding only through NABARD. (Instructions issued to the implementing Departments vide letter No. PLG-FC(F)1-30/08/RIDF-HPC(Mtg.) dated 2nd December, 2010).

- In case full funding of any project is not possible under grant based GoI programmes (PMGSY, CRF, NRDWP, AIBP/PMKSY, etc) due to different norms, instructions, etc., at least part funding may be ensured, with the balance funding coming from NABARD. PW and IPH Departments may give invariably the list of MLA priority projects which have been funded outside NABARD funding to Planning Department. (Decision No. 3 (xii) of the minutes of the 37th HPC meeting circulated vide letter No. PLG.FC(F) 1-32/10/RIDF-HPC(Mtg.) dated 20th May, 2011).

- The I&PH Department may enclose a certificate with the DPR that entire available flow Irrigation/Drinking Water potential has fully been utilized / integrated with the proposed Lift Irrigation/ Lift Drinking Water Supply Scheme in the area. There is no alternative other than the proposed Lift Irrigation/Lift Drinking Water Supply in the proposed area to provide Irrigation/Drinking Water facility to the local public. (Instruction issued to I&PH Department vide letter No. PLG.FC (F)1-10/RIDF/2009-loose dated 2nd September, 2011).

- The I&PH Department may enclose a certificate with the DPR that energy consumption in the proposed Lift Irrigation/Lift Drinking Water Supply Scheme has been kept at the bare minimum required level. Presently, there is no
machinery/equipment available to reduce the proposed energy requirement for this Lift Irrigation/Lift Drinking Water Supply Scheme. *(Instruction issued to I&PH Department vide letter No. PLG.FC(F)1-10/RIDF/2009-loose dated 2nd September, 2011).*

- The PW and IPH Departments may pose the DPRs of Hon’ble MLAs priority schemes only after ascertaining that the same can not be funded under Central Sector Programmes like PMGSY, CRF, AIBP/PMKSY, NRDWP, Flood Management Programme, Watershed Development Programme, etc. A certificate may invariably be attached with the DPRs of Road, MI and Rural Water Supply schemes giving detail justification/reasons as to why the scheme can not be covered under GoI grant based programmes. *(Instruction issued to PW and I&PH Departments vide letter No. PLG.FC(F)1-33/11/RIDF-XVII (R&B)-loose dated 2nd June, 2012).*

- Implementing Departments will ensure to avail maximum assistance under GoI grant based programmes/schemes and pose the MLAs priority schemes for funding under PMGSY, CRF, World Bank, RKVY, AIBP, NRDWP, Watershed Development programme, Flood Management programme, etc. The Planning Department will not entertain the DPRs of the MLA priority schemes for NABARD funding for which grant based funds are available with GoI. The implementing departments may pose projects like tunnels and bridges for RIDF funding which can not be covered under above mentioned programmes and for which grant based funds from GoI is not available. *(Decision No. 9 of the minutes of the 39th HPC meeting circulated vide letter No. PLG.FC(F)1-34/12/RIDF-HPC(MTG) dated 8th June, 2012).*

- The implementing departments had been requested to prepare the quality DPRs, ensure the completion of projects within the phasing period and reduce the number of non starter projects. *(Instructions issued vide D.O. letter No. PLG FC(F) 1-27/05/RIDF-XVI (MLAs) 2010-11 dated 7th August, 2012).*
The State Government has approved the following mechanism for substitution for MLAs priority schemes:

A) Substitution Admissible:

1. The substitution of MLAs priority scheme(s) will be allowed subject to the condition that DPR of the scheme(s) is (are) not being prepared, prepared and posed to NABARD.

2. The MLAs priority schemes may be substituted in case it is found infeasible by the implementing departments citing clear reasons for infeasibility.

B) Substitution not Permissible:

1. The projects will not be substituted in case of those MLA priority schemes for which the DPR(s) is (are) being prepared, has/have been prepared by the implementing departments or posed to NABARD.

2. In case any MLA priority scheme is sanctioned through any Central or State Sectors funds, other than NABARD loan assistance, the priority will be considered as sanctioned and no substitution of such schemes will be allowed.

3. With the closing of respective RIDF tranche, the MLA priorities for which the DPRs have not been prepared for the particular closed tranche year will be considered as dropped. Therefore, all the pending priorities of closed RIDF tranches for which DPRs have not been prepared by the implementing departments will be treated as dropped and no DPR is required to be prepared for such priorities. Therefore, substitution of such schemes will not be entertained. (Decision conveyed to the implementing departments vide letter No. PLG FC(F) 1-28/06/RIDF-(MLAs)-2012-13 dated 3rd May, 2013 and letter No. PLG-FC (F) 3-1/2013-14 dated 29th August, 2013).

The implementing departments may pose the DPRs of Hon’ble MLAs priority schemes for NABARD funding in case these schemes are not eligible for funding under grant based programmes of GoI. (Instruction issued vide letter No. PLG FC (F) 3-1/2012-13-Kullu dated 24th August, 2013).

At the district level, a District Level Review Team, headed by the Deputy Commissioner, is in place to review the physical and financial progress of
ongoing RIDF projects on quarterly bases. All the DFOs in each district have also been nominated as members of the District Level Monitoring Team. (Instruction issued vide letter No. PLG FC(F) 1-30/08/RIDF-XIV (Meetings) loose dated 26th August, 2013).

- If there are multiple schemes indicated against a single priority, in that case the department may prepare the DPR of the first scheme only. The other schemes in a priority will not be considered for funding under NABARD loan assistance.

- Multiple schemes under single priority are avoided. However, in case of T/wells, MI and RWSS, multiple schemes proposed under single priority will be considered for sanction under RIDF programme provided single DPR of the priority scheme is prepared.

- Forest clearance must be obtained from GoI before preparing the DPR where diversion of forest land is involved. The copy of the forest clearance should be attached with the DPR.

- The components like residential/non-residential buildings, Rest Houses, Inspection Huts (except Chowkidar quarters) and vehicles are not admissible for funding under RIDF programme. Therefore, these items may not be included in the project proposals while preparing the DPRs of MLAs priority schemes under R & B, MI and RWS sectors.

- If the source of LISs/LWSSs/RWSSs is one, the scheme will be treated one even if the water is provided to several villages/habitations.

- The IPH department should install most energy efficient pumps and machinery and propose more energy efficient solution in respect of lift irrigation and lift water supply schemes. Efforts should be made to harvest the rain water to meet the requirement of water in the summer season.

- IPH Department will reduce the staff liability of those schemes which are proposed for integration/augmentation in new schemes. Reduction of recurring expenditure on staff may be indicated in the project proposal.

- The IPH Department may explore the possibility of partly funding the tube wells through AIBP, except drilling cost of T/wells.
The department may give detailed justification if the per km/per hect./per capita cost of the project is above the Central Sector/World Bank approved norms/parameters.

PW & IPH Departments may endeavour to adhere to the cost norms of GoI / NABARD such as PMGSY, World Bank-Rural Roads, AIBP/PMKSY, NRDNP, etc. NABARD generally considers such scheme for sanction as have the ERR above 15% and BCR greater than one. *(Conveyed to the department vide letter No. PLG FC (F) 1-34/12/RIDF-XVIII (WSS) 2012-13 dated 9th July, 2013 & 12th September, 2013).*

The PW department may take up the issue with GoI for relaxing the population coverage norm of 250 souls in a census village in case of Himachal Pradesh being hilly State with scattered habitations/population. Moreover, State Government is committed to provide all weather road connectivity to each habitation irrespective of its population figure.

I & PH department may re-conduct the survey of NC/PC/FC habitations throughout the State as water sources are depleting with the passage of time. After fresh survey, updated status of NC/PC/FC habitations may be uploaded on the departmental website and the GoI may be requested to increase the grant under NRDWP to Himachal Pradesh accordingly.

In case of Lift Irrigation Schemes, public/beneficiaries may contribute 5% energy charges so as to share some burden of annual energy charges of the scheme. IPH Department will ensure to give undertaking in this regard and attach the same with the DPR of the Project. *(Conveyed to the IPH department vide letter No. PLG FC (F) 1-35/13/RIDF-XIX (WSS) 2013-14 dated 4th July, 2014).*

Implementing departments will ensure the utilization of minimum 80% of the total LOC, issued by the Finance department for RIDF Projects, on the ongoing RIDF projects and not more than 20% funds will be utilized on the new projects. *(Conveyed to the PWD and IPH departments vide letter No. PLG FC (F) 1-35/13/RIDF-XIX (WSS) 2013-14 dated 4th July, 2014).*

Implementing Departments may ensure to start and complete the sanctioned projects/schemes of older tranches first and ensure reducing the number of Non-Starter and slow moving projects.
As per NABARD guidelines, Non starter and slow moving projects have been defined as follows:-

**Non-Stater**: If the project is not grounded within 12 months from the date of issue of sanction letter, irrespective of whether the mobilization advance has been availed or not by the State Government. NABARD will delete such projects where implementation is not initiated within maximum of 18 months from the date of the sanction.

**Grounded Projects**: A project will be treated as grounded only where the work order has been issued and the physical works has commenced.

**Slow Moving**: Projects where the progress falls short of Annual Phasing target by more than 50%.

NABARD has also clarified that in case a sanctioned project is not started within 18 months from sanction, the project will automatically be considered as dropped. Implementing departments (IPH & PW) has been requested on regular intervals to send the cases of such projects to Planning Department for deleting/dropping from the list of sanctioned schemes/projects.
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