

**MINUTES OF THE 23RD REVIEW MEETING OF STATE PROJECT ENGINEERS/CIVIL WORKS
COORDINATORS OF SSA HELD ON 7TH – 8TH JUNE, 2011 AT PUDUCHERRY (UT) TO REVIEW
THE PROGRESS OF CIVIL WORKS AND TEACHER RECRUITMENT UNDER SSA**

1. The 23rd Review Meeting of State Project Engineers/Civil Works Coordinators of SSA was held on 7th & 8th June, 2011 at Puducherry (UT) to review the progress of civil works and teacher recruitment under SSA for the quarter ending 31st March, 2011. The meeting was chaired by Shri. Virendar Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD, New Delhi.
2. The meeting was attended by the State Project Engineers/Civil Works Coordinators, except from the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Meghalaya, Manipur, Nagaland, Rajasthan, UTs of Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep. State Project Director from Delhi and the additional SPD from Kerala and West Bengal also attended the meeting.
3. List of participants is given in **Annexure – I**.
4. At the outset Shri. R. Parthasarathy, State Project Director (SSA), Puducherry welcomed Sh. Virendar Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD, Shri. Arun Sharma, Under Secretary, MHRD, Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi, Infrastructure Adviser & Chief Consultant, Shri. S.C.Girotra, Chief. Consultant from TSG Ed.CIL, State Project Director, Delhi, State Project Engineers, civil works coordinators from the States/UTs and all other participants to Puducherry (UT). During his speech he mentioned that Puducherry is a culturally rich city. More than 60 saints who lived in this area are buried here. Arbindo Ashram, Aroville city is located in the city and peace is prevalent here. V.O.C. school building is famous for its architecture and renovation work is in progress. The French town where the French people lived here could be visited to see the French architecture. He thanked MHRD for selecting Puducherry for holding the 23rd review meeting of State Project Engineers / civil works coordinators in the architecture and cultural rich town. He mentioned that the SSA civil works is implemented through UT PWD. The buildings are designed for cyclone/ earth quake resistance and were

used as shelters during the natural calamities. The unit cost of classroom is high and therefore the cost approved by MHRD is shared by the UT. He welcomed all the participants once again and mentioned that the officers of Puducherry will take care of everybody and wished a happy and pleasant stay in Puducherry. He also wished for a successful review meeting.

5. Subsequently Shri. Arun Sharma, Under Secretary MHRD thanked the State Project Director for hosting the 23rd review meeting of state project engineers/civil work coordinators at Puducherry and for making nice arrangements for the stay and meeting and thanked all the participants for joining the review at Puducherry. He mentioned that during the review meeting, the draft guidelines for Whole School Development Plan would be discussed and finalized. The guidelines will be circulated in the meeting. He also mentioned that the participants will be divided in groups and each group will go through specific chapters of the guideline and requested them to make suggestions wherever necessary. He added that three presentations are also to be made during the meeting and these would be useful to the participants for making additions and alterations in the draft guidelines. He informed that the Whole School Development Plan guideline is likely to be finalized by July, 2011 and sought full cooperation of the participants during the discussion. He once again thanked everybody and mentioned that the coming two days would give an opportunity to all the participants to share their experiences and best practices adopted in their State.
6. Shri.Virendar Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD in his inaugural address thanked Shri. R.Parthasarathy, SPD, SSA Puducherry for hosting the 23rd review meeting at Puducherry and welcomed all the participants from States/UTs to the meeting. He also welcomed Shri. Vivek Pandey, State Project Director, SSA Delhi. He introduced the Core Team members and external resource persons who will be making presentations and welcomed them to the meeting. He mentioned that in SSA Whole School Development Plan (WSDP) is an outcome of RTE where provisions are made for classrooms, facilities, compound wall etc. WSDP is being discussed in the previous meetings and when this is approved by MHRD the

States can use the guidelines for preparing AWP&B proposals in the coming years. The core team formed by MHRD has prepared draft guideline and this would be circulated in the meeting. He insisted that the participants should provide their inputs to improve the draft. All the interventions are to be prepared and incorporated in WSDP guidelines. SSA is an important social sector programme of the Ministry and the norms are flexible in providing certain items of work. The unit cost for various items of work implemented under SSA is to be decided by the States based on State/district schedule of rates. The works are to be implemented through VEC/SMCs which is one of the requirements of SSA. In the implementation of WSDP, the role of SMC/community is important. He also mentioned that in civil works there are large gaps in classrooms and requested the States to take steps for covering these gaps. He added that correct and timely submission of quarterly/monthly progress reports is more important for proper monitoring and submission of information to Parliament etc. He also requested the States to submit the reports (QPR/MPR/MTR/ status of availability of technical staff/ third party evaluation/ environmental assessment of school buildings/ preparation of school layout plan and asset register) in time to MHRD so that the details are compiled before the review meeting to have fruitful discussion. Similarly the progress on recruitment of teachers is more important and recently there was a delay in submission of information to Parliament. He requested state project engineers/ civil works coordinators to make efforts to collect the information pertaining to teachers from the concerned state coordinators. He also mentioned that furnishing of accurate and timely information on the status of third party evaluation, availability of technical staff, preparation of school map and preparation of environmental assessment of school is very important. Submission of the report on environmental assessment of school is also important as it is to be submitted to the Development Partners (DP). The report was to be submitted in three parts in December, 2008, 2009 and 2010. Only two States have alone submitted the full report. He also mentioned that in the previous meeting held in Agra the States have promised to send the report by January/March, 2011. Many States have not even furnished the

information on the status of preparation of the report. Since the target date is over, he insisted that the States should take steps to submit the report immediately and they should send the status report and commitment for submission of the report by 30th June, 2011. While concluding, he mentioned that WSDP would be the main focus of the meeting and sought 100% participation by all concerned in coming up with their suggestions for finalizing the WSDP guidelines.

7. Subsequently Shri.Vivek Pandey, State Project Director, SSA Delhi addressed the participants. During his address he thanked MHRD for inviting him for the review meeting. He mentioned that SSA is a good programme which gives good flexibility to States and one example is unit cost for various items of civil works based on State schedule of rates. In Delhi the civil works are implemented by DSIDC and the unit cost is high when compared to many States. WSDP is a unique thing and it gives different idea for a school. The stake holders (children, Community, teachers etc) are associated for preparing the WSDP document and estimates based on the requirement of schools. The children can learn by seeing and provisions are made accordingly. Delhi is implementing a programme called 'RUPANTAR'. Main aim of this project is for renovating the existing schools, introduction of BaLA elements, play elements, safety features, provision of CWSN toilets, barrier free elements etc. Many States have done best practices in SSA implementation and by participating in the workshop he would learn many things.
8. Dr. Girish Chandra Joshi, Senior Executive (E'quake engg.), DMMC, Uttarakhand made a presentation on 'Seismic Retrofitting of School Buildings in Uttarakhand'. During his presentation he gave an account of major hazards likely to occur/ occurred in the State/region. Many lessons have been learnt from the past occurrences of various hazards. Centre is providing assistance to the affected areas. Uttarakhand falls in Zone 4 & 5. He mentioned that 'Seismic Retrofitting' is a technical job and a model programme for seismic evaluation and retrofitting of school building was developed with joint collaboration with DMMC, Uttarakhand, Nanyang Technological University and IIT Roorkee. He added that

retrofitting is cost effective and easy to adopt and is about 10-30% cheaper than the cost of new building. He explained in detail about the seismic vulnerability assessment and the steps involved in the assessment i.e. (i) Rapid visual screening (RVS) (ii) Simplified vulnerability assessment (SVA) and (iii) detailed vulnerability assessment. He also explained in detail the procedure for retrofitting i.e. preparation of drawings, procedure for analysis for un-reinforced masonry buildings by PIER analysis method as per IS 13935. He also explained in detail (marking, chipping, cutting of wire mesh, treatment of wire mesh with epoxy zinc primer, application of cement slurry, cement mortar, fixing of wire mesh, covering the wire mesh with micro concrete and alternate methods of plastering using gunnitting machine, providing spacers etc. He mentioned that the gunnitting method saves time and ensures proper compaction of concrete. Shri S.C. Girotra, Chief Consultant, TSG mentioned that in Uttarakhand and in some other States the construction is carried out/ supervised by non technical people and insisted that this should be done by engineers only. He informed that gunnitting is now done for RCC and not in masonry construction. Dr. Girish Chandra Joshi mentioned that low power gunnitting machine is used for masonry work. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi, Adviser, Infrastructure requested him to provide inputs for WSDP guidelines. Dr. Girish promised to send the required details for inclusion in the draft guidelines. Copy of presentation is at **Annexure-II**.

9. Subsequently a presentation was made by Dr. A. Kalimuthu, Country Director, India Country Office, Water for People, Kolkatta, on 'School Water and Sanitation'. He mentioned that most of the diseases are related to water and sanitation. He explained in detail about the coverage achieved so far in provision of school toilets, water quality problems in India, water sanitation related diseases. He mentioned that 40% of schools are having fluoride problem. Human excreta (faecal matter) are the root cause for all diseases and one gram of human excreta contain one million bacteria, 10 million viruses, 1000 parasites and 100 parasite eggs. He also gave details of status of school water supply, sanitation and hygiene. He insisted that there should be programme integration. He quoted from the study carried by him that children spend 1/3rd of the time in schools

roughly 2000 hours per year in schools. He added that the study conducted by them reveals that about 31% schools no water source exist, in 93% the available water is not able to meet the demand, 84% schools do not have water available through out the year, 81% of toilets do not have water, 53% of toilet blocks need major repairs, 90% of schools do not have maintenance budget thus lack in maintenance, 58% of them do not have proper disposal system and only 5% of the toilets constructed are child friendly. He added that 27% of boys and 31 % of girls use toilet, 74% of boys and 76% of girls wash their hands and the study reveals that hygiene messages in schools has less impact in actual hygiene practices adopted by the children. In schools, water and environmental sanitation coverage is not sufficient as the coverage does not qualify accessibility to potable water, quantity, quality, separate toilets both for boys and girls according to school strength, running water in sanitary block, drinking water and utensil washing stations, proper drainage/disposal of waste water, safe disposal of solid wastes, awareness creation on hand washing including menstrual hygiene, disease surveillance, review and monitoring. He also insisted that stake holder's convergence is more important. The implementation should be school based and should be through WATSAN committee He also explained in detail about the processes involved in school WES. He also showed a film on water and Environmental sanitation to create awareness and explained about ecosan toilet. Shri. Umapada Chatterjee, additional SPD, West Bengal mentioned that training is given to teachers on 'Sanitation and Hygiene'. Training of resource persons completed. Lot of convergence has taken place with all the concerned departments. He also mentioned that a study has also been conducted on 'What happens after the training'. Dr. Kalimuthu explained about the steps taken up for implementation strategies, involvement stakeholders in micro planning, possible convergence, awareness creation and discussion with all stakeholders regarding implementation and operation and maintenance. He added that solid and liquid waste disposal is more important. He insisted the need for hand washing after defecation and before taking food. Shri. L. Rajan, Additional SPD, Kerala

mentioned that a booklet has been developed in his State for school children on 'How to keep the school clean'. Copy of presentation is given in **Annexure- III**.

10. Subsequently Ms. P. Sumathy, Technical Officer, EcoPro, Auroville made a presentation on 'Ecosan toilets'. She mentioned that several technological options are available and the user has to choose and own and maintain a sanitary latrine without much external support but several inter related factors play important role in installing a sanitary latrine which include (i) affordability, (ii) availability of space, (iii) geographical conditions – soil, ground water table, (iv) cultural habits, (v) availability of water for ablution and maintenance, (vi) availability of skilled/semiskilled manpower. She added that 'Ecosan' is an alternative to flush sanitation and is known as ecological sanitation and in short as ecosan. She also circulated a booklet on 'Wise Water Management in Schools'. Copy is enclosed in **Annexure –IV**. Ecosan toilet is an option suitable for water logged, water scarce, coastal and rocky areas. This avoids contamination of water. The waste (solid [human excreta] and liquid [urine]) can be used as natural fertilizer and waste should be considered as wealth. Ecosan toilet has three portions i.e. for excreta disposal, passing urine and for ablution. The toilet has two chambers for the collection of human excreta and one chamber is used and the other one is closed. The waste (solid [human excreta] and liquid [urine]) is separately collected and ablution water is diverted to a soak pit. Urine is collected in a cane. Urine is rich with NPK and diluted and used as manure. (vii) Promotes soil fertility and improved crop production. Human excreta are collected in the chamber and ash/saw dust is spread over the waste. Every time after defecation this is repeated and the opening is closed. When the pit is full the second unit/chamber provided next to the existing is used. After one year the first is cleaned and can be used as manure. Copy of Ecosan toilet is enclosed in **Annexure V**. (viii) Less water consumption- wise water management. She also showed two films i.e. one on sanitation and another on solid waste management. Copy of news Uganda on 'More than school toilet: a sense of responsibility and a source of income' is enclosed in **Annexure – VI**. She also explained in detail about the need for solid and liquid waste management and its importance. In this connection she

explained in detail about the use of ' Effective Microorganisms' (EM) technology in hygiene and sanitation, the treatment of solid and liquid waste and environmental rehabilitation and the preparation of Maple EM-I solution. She also showed a film on solid waste management.

11. Subsequently Sh. Kabir Vajpeyi, Chief Consultant, TSG, Ed.CIL made a presentation on 'Draft Manual and guidelines for Whole school Development Plan'. During his presentation he explained in detail about the purpose of the manual and guideline and mentioned that under RTE, preparation of school development plan by SMC is mandatory for availing grants from Government. This exercise need to be taken up holistically, for school to be developed according to a vision and a plan. It is important that SMC is aware of its role, purpose, responsibilities and methods to prepare a holistic plan of the school that looks at educational requirements and infrastructural provisions to fulfill it. The document is meant for SMC and a core team is constituted by MHRD and is preparing the document. Each State/UT needs to adapt and develop it according to their requirement and situation. He also explained the role at different levels for WSDP and implementation and role of TSG and SSA units at States with respect to WSDP. WSDP should improve the learning environment and one should look for the out come. Now the committee has prepared the draft guidelines for WSDP which has 14 chapters and is circulated in the meeting. He requested the participants to give feed back on overall document to core team. He also mentioned that Ms. Suvashini Iyer and Shri. Suresh Vaidhiyarajan who are Core Team members and involved in the preparation of draft guideline will explain the work done by them. The participants can use the information gathered from the presentations made during the day for developing/ improving the WSDP guidelines. Copy of presentation made by Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi is at **Annexure- VII.**

12. Subsequently the participants were divided into 8 groups and were requested to study Draft Whole School Development plan document. Each group was assigned 1-2 chapters, based on the technical expertise of the group members who were given ideas for dealing with existing spaces under WSDP. The group

members could discuss among themselves and make suggestions for addition/deletion of various provisions for the relevant chapters allotted to them. Their comments could be on clarity, language, content, what additional data, graphics/pictures/ resource materials needed, whether it covered issues relating the States/ regions adequately, if not make suggestions, whether the good practices adopted in the State to be included. The participants were expected to use their knowledge from their State field experience and also give their ideas on WSDP in the prevailing situation. End of the day, each group made presentation on the chapters allotted to them. Copy of suggestions made by the group is enclosed in **Annexure-VIII**.

13. On 08/06/2011 the participants were divided in three groups and were taken for field visits. All the three groups visited one Ecosan toilet constructed by Ecopro in Idayanchavadi village near Auroville. The construction details were explained by Ms. P. Sumathy, Technical Officer from Ecopro. Subsequently two groups visited the schools in rural areas of Puducherry district and the third group visited schools in urban areas of Puducherry city. The group leaders made a presentation in the review meeting about their observations and few suggestions were also made there groups. Copy of observations made by each group is given in **Annexure-IX**.

14. Subsequently Shri. S.C. Girotra, Chief Consultant, TSG, Ed.CIL made a presentation on 'Issues emerging from AWP&B 2011-12'. He mentioned that his presentation has three parts namely (i) Revised frame work for SSA (ii) strength and weaknesses and (iii) corrective measures to be taken up. He mentioned that RTE requirements form part of 33% of budget. The classroom norm should be as per revised norms and the design should be as per IS 8827 which is being circulated in the meeting. He insisted that as far as possible barrier free access should be provided in all places of school. Indoor, outdoor spaces, safety features, proper/good construction practices, quality measures should be adopted. Any repair noticed in the school building should be taken up in one time and should not be taken up in pieces in different periods. The State should have a design cell consisting of members from all interventions. While giving the

account on the strengths he mentioned that in the last two years WSDP details were shared in the review meetings and few States have proposed WSDP items in their AWP&B proposals and many are yet to open their account. He mentioned that from next year onwards every State should propose WSDP items as pilot project in their AWP&B proposals which can be supported through SSA. Some States have technical staff available for supervision and monitoring of SSA civil works, third party evaluation system for quality monitoring. TPE should be started from the beginning of every year. DISE data should be validated and the requirement of classroom, headmaster room etc should be based on school wise enrollment and available rooms. Many States have prepared the cost estimates based on State/district schedule of rates and the unit cost has been notified by them. Even though the unit cost was prepared based on State schedule of rates by few States, the unit cost was not notified by them and this has delayed the process of the issue of minutes. He insisted that the unit cost should be based on State / district schedule of rates and should be notified. States should identify the priority items and propose accordingly. It was also noticed during appraisal that there was no coordination among the state component coordinators at state level and in some cases the state project engineers were unaware of the proposal submitted by the State. In most of the cases inconsistency of data relating to physical and financial progress (reports given to TSG/MHRD and given in the appraisal format were not matching), physical and financial spill over figures and the figures furnished in table 24, 25 & 26 and given in proposal. Another major thing noticed was the appraisal formats were not completed properly. Fund flow was not uniform. He also insisted that the toilet and drinking water requirement should be worked out separately for urban and rural areas. The States should take immediate action to form SMCs and the implementation should be entrusted/ carried out by them. Quality should be maintained in civil works and quality materials should be used and these should be tested. Pilferage of materials especially cement should be avoided. Steps should be taken to maintain transparency in accounts. The States should take immediate action to reconcile the target figures. Copy of presentation is given in **Annexure – X**.

Review of progress of SSA civil works for the period ending 31.03.2011

15. Subsequently review of monthly and quarterly progress reports submitted by the States and UTs were taken up. Two States (Goa & Manipur) have not submitted QPR and three States (Goa, Sikkim & Manipur) have not submitted MPR. Regarding MPR, the States where the progress of works (completion + in progress) which are lower than the national average was taken up for review. The details of item wise national average progress achieved and the States which are below National average are given below.

Quarterly Progress Report as on 31.03.2011

Item	National Average (Comp %)	States performance below National Average
BRC	91%	Bihar 82%, Chattisgarh 75%, Goa 55%, J&K 75%, Kerala 88%, Mizoram 84%, Nagaland 83%, Orissa 64%, U.P. 83%, Delhi 67%, Pondicherry 67%,
CRC	95%	Goa 23%, J&K 80%, Kerala 86%, Orissa 86%, Chandigarh 40%, Daman and Diu 41%, Pondicherry 61%,
PS	81%	Bihar 53%, J&K 53%, Kerala 61%, Meghalaya 62%, West Bengal 40%, A&N 25%, Chandigarh 5%, Delhi 0%, Pondicherry 0%.
UPS	87%	J&K 61%, Jharkhand 78%, Meghalaya 45%, Nagaland 20%, Sikkim 7%, Tripura 64 %, West Bengal 3%,
ACR	76%	Bihar 59%, Chattisgarh 63%, Goa 43%, J&K 41%, MP 55%, Manipur 36%, Meghalaya 42%, Orissa 71%, Tripura 61%, A&N 49%, Chandigarh 58%, D& N Haveli 62%, Daman and Diu 61%, Delhi 56%, Lakshadweep 27%,
DW	93%	Bihar 83%, Chattisgarh 72%, J&K 63%, Maharashtra 80%, Orissa 78%, U.P. 81%, West Bengal 75%, A&N 73%, Dadar and Nagar 36%, Daman and Diu 81%,
Toilets	75%	Bihar 73%, Chattisgarh 50%, Goa 56%, Himachal Pradesh 57%, J&K 49%, Jharkhand 58%, Maharashtra 62%, Manipur 21%, Orissa 52%, Sikkim 65%, Uttarakhand 59%, West Bengal 64%, A&N 65%, Chandigarh 71%, Dadar and Nagar 15%,

16. While reviewing the progress Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD mentioned that the national average for physical progress is 79% and financial progress is 87%. Bihar has achieved 74% financial progress and physical progress is 63%. In case of primary school the progress is 53% against 81%, additional classroom is 59% against 76% and in case of UPS the State has performed well. Shri. S.N. Pandey, Civil Works Manager, SSA Bihar mentioned that staff has been

increased and the progress will be improved. Shri. S. C. Girotra, Chief Consultant mentioned that for certain items the targets are not matching with PAB targets approved and requested to take immediate action for reconciliation of targets. He was also informed that the SCR is high in Bihar and is more than 85 and RTE requirements are to be fulfilled before 2013 and if the same is not done State has to face court cases. Bihar is having the maximum gap in classroom. Madhya Pradesh has achieved 86% financial progress and physical progress is 68%. In case of additional classroom the progress is 55% against 76%, toilet is 67% against 75%. Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary mentioned that for certain items the targets are not matching with PAB targets approved and requested to take immediate action for reconciliation of targets. Orissa has achieved 96% financial progress and physical progress is 72%. In case of primary school the progress is 65% against 81%, BRC the progress is 64% against 91%, CRC the progress is 86% against 95%, additional classroom the progress is 71% against 76%, drinking water is 78% against 93%, toilet is 52% against 75%. Shri. C. Ganapathy, Senior Consultant mentioned that targets are to be reconciled and a proposal has been received from the State for reconciliation of targets. Uttarakhand has achieved 97% financial progress and physical progress is 71%. In case of primary school the progress is 77% against 81%, Upper primary school the progress is 70% against 87%, drinking water is 81% against 93%, toilet is 59% against 75%. The State representative mentioned that the school buildings were designed by CBRI and the cost increase has delayed the progress. Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary informed State that the targets need to be reconciled and the reconciliation work should be completed before the next review meeting. The representative from the State informed that for reconciliation and will attend TSG shortly for this purpose. He also mentioned that some of the targets approved for 2010 will be spilled over to 2011-12. West Bengal has achieved 78% financial progress and physical progress is 67%. In case of primary school the progress is 40% against 81%, CRC the progress is 76% against 93%, upper primary school is 3% against 87%, additional classroom the progress is 70% against 76%, drinking water is 78% against 93%, toilet is 64% against 75%. Shri. Umapada Chatterjee,

Additional SPD, SSA, West Bengal mentioned that a high level meeting took place to review the progress of works and has taken a decision to speed up the progress but this has not been adhered to by the department. In few cases the funds were not sufficient for construction. Shri. S.C. Girotra, Chief Consultant mentioned that the delay in implementation will lead to cost over run. The State also should immediate action to reconcile the targets. Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD mentioned that a letter should go from additional Secretary to the poor performing sates. Delhi has achieved 44% financial progress and physical progress is 62%. In case of primary school the progress is 75% against 81%, additional classroom the progress is 56% against 76%. For few items the targets are not matching. During the last year the unit cost proposed was not approved and hence the works were not taken up for implementation. Shri. Vivek Pandey, SPD Delhi mentioned that in the minutes issued for supplementary budget mistakes were there and because of this the works were not taken up. Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD mentioned that this has been sorted out and the corrected minutes will be issued shortly.

Monthly Progress Report as on 31.03.2011

Subsequently monthly progress report relating to fresh works approved during 2010-11 was reviewed. While reviewing the progress Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD mentioned that works completed in progress has been considered for review and national average for physical progress is 76% and financial progress is 69%.

Item	National Average (Comp%+ IP)	States performance below National Average
PS	42%	Assam 0%, J&K 4%, Manipur 0%, Nagaland 0%, U.P.0%, West Bengal 30%(Max approved)
UPS	81%	West Bengal 32%, Chattisgarh 53%, Nagaland 0%, West Bengal 33%
ACR	78%	J&K 2%, Manipur 0%, Meghalaya 19%,Tamil Nadu 50%, Tripura 58%, Orissa 57%, Punjab 43%, U.P.22%, Delhi 20%
DW	76%	Chattisgarh 48%, Goa 0%, Karnataka 0%, Nagaland 0%, Tamil Nadu 62%, West Bengal 61%, Pondicherry 50%%
Toilets	74%	Bihar 51%, Chattisgarh 66%, Goa 55%, Haryana 2%, J&K 0%, Jharkhand 50%, Maharashtra 39%, Manipur 0%, Orissa 53%, Tamil Nadu 70%, Sikkim 62%, Pondicherry 61%

17. Haryana has achieved 46% financial progress and physical progress is 76%. In case of primary school the progress is 55% against 42%, additional classroom is 18% against 16%. The State representative mentioned that the fund was received after 15th March and after this the works have been started. He was enquired what are the reasons for late release of funds? The must not have eligible for release of funds. He was informed that the progress of primary school is low. He informed that land for construction was not available hence the delay has occurred. He was informed that if the land is not available the State should not have proposed for construction of building. The State representative mentioned that they have made alternate arrangements for taking up the work.

18. Details furnished by the participants on availability of technical personnel, third party evaluation, preparation of school mapping, maintenance of assets register and environmental assessment are compiled and is given in **Annexure – XI, XII, XIII, XIV & XV.**

19. Physical and Financial Progress of SSA (Civil Works)

The details of progress reported by the States/UTs were compiled and the progress was reviewed with the participants. Updated Monthly Report and Quarterly Progress Reports are given in **Annexure –XVI & XVII.**

Monthly Progress Report on Civil Works for the fourth quarter ending 31.03.2011 for works approved during the year 2009-10 under SSA

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State	Status upto	Financial Progress			Total works sanctioned	Total works completed	%age of works comp	Total works completed and in progress	%age of works comp + IP
			Allocation	Expenditure	%age					
1	Andhra Pradesh	31.03.2011	66246.64	53331.01	80.50	26153	18597	71.11	25884	98.97
2	Arunachal Pradesh	31.03.2011	7407.76	5986.46	80.81	1552	1210	77.96	1553	100.06
3	Assam	31.03.2011	37368.83	33982.23	90.94	16055	13232	82.42	14855	92.53
4	Bihar	31.03.2011	193924.32	135223.34	69.73	73876	11847	16.04	68129	92.22
5	Chhattisgarh	31.03.2011	68035.64	27481.00	40.39	16664	1390	8.34	11770	70.63
6	Goa	31.12.2010	286.39	181.00	63.20	250	0	0.00	120	48.00
7	Gujarat	31.03.2011	43674.74	37946.48	86.88	10043	7705	76.72	10043	100.00
8	Haryana	31.03.2011	24081.29	10983.80	45.61	8130	1973	24.27	6215	76.45
9	Himachal Pradesh	31.03.2011	7384.83	4515.03	61.14	3900	0	0.00	3632	93.13
10	Jammu & Kashmir	31.03.2011	25038.04	228.00	0.91	7429	0	0.00	114	1.53
11	Jharkhand	31.03.2011	84097.78	77319.60	91.94	30868	3716	12.04	23707	76.80
12	Karnataka	31.03.2011	47971.83	40481.59	84.39	18998	1059	5.57	15065	79.30
13	Kerala	31.03.2011	10974.33	7119.65	64.88	6210	4475	72.06	6210	100.00

Sl. No.	State	Status upto	Financial Progress			Total works sanctioned	Total works completed	%age of works comp	Total works completed and in progress	%age of works comp + IP
			Allocation	Expenditure	%age					
14	Madhya Pradesh	31.03.2011	129649.59	90226.50	69.59	40319	261	0.65	36499	90.53
15	Maharashtra	31.03.2011	54984.05	44017.63	80.06	15729	1466	9.32	11374	72.31
16	Manipur	30.06.2010	6816.45	0.00	0.00	2804	0	0.00	0	0.00
17	Meghalaya	31.03.2011	6718.66	6174.71	91.90	1885	0	0.00	550	29.18
18	Mizoram	31.03.2011	4089.34	3092.15	75.61	1549	778	50.23	1549	100.00
19	Nagaland	31.03.2010	10235.69	0.00	0.00	1235	0	0.00	0	0.00
20	Orissa	31.03.2011	61129.48	59800.25	97.83	15754	1689	10.72	9114	57.85
21	Punjab	31.03.2011	21671.65	20505.07	94.62	4868	1364	28.02	2536	52.10
22	Rajasthan	31.03.2011	54803.70	43145.79	78.73	11332	2859	25.23	10822	95.50
23	Sikkim	31.12.2010	1563.36	292.78	18.73	457	82	17.94	281	61.49
24	Tamil Nadu	31.03.2011	44612.45	32683.20	73.26	17081	4754	27.83	11134	65.18
25	Tripura	31.03.2011	6321.30	3906.77	61.80	1870	276	14.76	1248	66.74
26	Uttar Pradesh	31.03.2011	132948.48	63297.57	47.61	40477	10281	25.40	10442	25.80
27	Uttarakhand	31.03.2011	3586.51	3147.48	87.76	7004	1563	22.32	6835	97.59
28	West Bengal	31.03.2011	129977.22	93118.66	71.64	41843	785	1.88	33814	80.81
29	Andaman Nicobar	31.03.2011	1258.70	240.81	19.13	41	0	0.00	0	0.00
30	Chandigarh	31.03.2011	1318.84	1054.84	79.98	89	0	0.00	19	21.35
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	31.03.2011	334.40	152.50	45.60	108	0	0.00	0	0.00
32	Daman Diu	31.03.2011	133.00	75.21	56.55	49	12	0.00	48	0.00
33	Delhi	31.03.2011	9296.85	1022.25	11.00	1282	0	0.00	225	17.55
34	Lakshadweep	31.03.2011	149.32	89.26	59.78	39	0	0.00	36	92.31
35	Pondicherry	31.03.2011	441.70	397.46	89.98	175	88	50.29	107	61.14
TOTAL SSA			1298533.15	901220.07	69.40	426118	91462	21.46	323930	76.02

- Source : (i) Targets have been taken from PAB Minutes 2010-11 for fresh and supplementary approvals.
(ii) The allocation for the current year is Rs.12985 crores and expenditure ending 31, March 2011 is Rs.9012 crores which is 69%.
(iii) The major State/Ut which are not performing well are Chattisgarh, Haryana, J&K, Uttar Pradesh, and Uttarakhand.
(iv) States/Uts not submitting the reports are Goa, Manipur, Nagaland and Sikkim.
(v) Target and Allocation as worked out by States and TSG have been given separately for reconciliation by the States.
(vi) The %age expenditure is now 69% of the allocation.

**Cumulative Progress Report on Civil Works for the fourth quarter ending 31.03.2011 under SSA
(Cumulative from 2001-02 to 31-03-2011)**

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State	Status upto	Financial Progress			Total works sanctioned	Total works completed and in progress	%age of works comp + IP	Total works completed	%age of works comp
			Allocation	Expenditure	%age					
1	Andhra Pradesh	31.03.2011	234234.61	207952.07	88.78	101313	100107	98.81	93333	92.12
2	Arunachal Pradesh	31.03.2011	28014.92	26597.00	94.94	9429	9322	98.87	8979	95.23
3	Assam	31.03.2011	153870.400	150406.83	97.75	76721	76719	100.00	75164	97.97
4	Bihar	31.03.2011	673808.64	495310.02	73.51	273130	247977	90.79	171840	62.92
5	Chhattisgarh	31.03.2011	219022.56	155959.11	71.21	85567	79500	92.91	56805	66.39
6	Goa	31.12.2010	1817.67	1413.45	77.76	1666	1374	82.47	897	53.84
7	Gujarat	31.03.2011	123637.78	116502.89	94.23	47678	48308	101.32	46164	96.82
8	Haryana	31.03.2011	80149.03	65208.68	81.36	47932	46836	97.71	40601	84.71
9	Himachal Pradesh	31.03.2011	30507.90	27154.01	89.01	27204	24842	91.32	19688	72.37

Sl. No.	State	Status upto	Financial Progress			Total works sanctioned	Total works completed and in progress	%age of works comp + IP	Total works completed	%age of works comp
			Allocation	Expenditure	%age					
10	Jammu & Kashmir	31.03.2011	95468.41	66683.65	69.85	31844	22328	70.12	15706	49.32
11	Jharkhand	31.03.2011	321215.66	304224.39	94.71	117386	110122	93.81	84886	72.31
12	Karnataka	31.03.2011	202271.47	193382.43	95.61	123004	118945	96.70	104839	85.23
13	Kerala	31.03.2011	35781.76	29450.90	82.31	36049	36049	100.00	32542	90.27
14	Madhya Pradesh	31.03.2011	459541.41	394974.47	85.95	217392	211576	97.32	147301	67.76
15	Maharashtra	31.03.2011	240426.78	266080.76	110.67	99124	91135	91.94	78747	79.44
16	Manipur	30.06.2010	12640.26	4496.85	35.58	8924	3680	41.24	3141	35.20
17	Meghalaya	31.03.2011	28377.35	17797.96	62.72	13705	13558	98.93	8778	64.05
18	Mizoram	31.03.2011	14365.28	11389.43	79.28	11000	11050	100.45	10279	93.45
19	Nagaland	31.03.2010	20802.66	10648.39	51.19	10104	9227	91.32	8650	85.61
20	Orissa	31.03.2011	249231.74	240068.25	96.32	93572	79079	84.51	67003	71.61
21	Punjab	31.03.2011	73100.44	71309.09	97.55	61914	60582	97.85	59359	95.87
22	Rajasthan	31.03.2011	241568.01	232084.43	96.07	154832	154687	99.91	145156	93.75
23	Sikkim	31.03.2011	3943.33	746.91	18.94	2490	2378	95.50	2338	93.90
24	Tamil Nadu	31.03.2011	172978.00	154261.61	89.18	88032	74547	84.68	70792	80.42
25	Tripura	31.03.2011	23883.53	17402.19	72.86	9240	8618	93.27	7605	82.31
26	Uttar Pradesh	31.03.2011	641195.24	572177.28	89.24	342973	312613	91.15	311851	90.93
27	Uttarakhand	31.03.2011	47181.40	45974.44	97.44	35577	30922	86.92	25177	70.77
28	West Bengal	31.03.2011	414921.05	324922.70	78.31	220244	200471	91.02	147534	66.99
29	Andaman Nicobar	31.03.2011	2903.10	2272.98	78.30	367	308	83.92	211	57.49
30	Chandigarh	31.03.2011	3391.24	1284.73	37.88	355	265	74.65	197	55.49
31	Dadra Nagar Haveli	31.03.2011	1498.09	876.42	58.50	870	751	86.32	422	48.51
32	Daman Diu	31.03.2011	637.56	358.54	56.24	238	224	94.12	168	70.59
33	Delhi	31.03.2011	15385.25	6841.57	44.47	3378	2597	76.88	2095	62.02
34	Lakshadweep	31.03.2011	462.04	171.94	37.21	117	68	58.12	6	5.13
35	Pondicherry	31.03.2011	2107.91	2051.28	97.31	1275	1143	89.65	1084	85.02
TOTAL SSA			4870342.47	4218437.64	86.61	2354646	2191908	93.09	1849338	78.54

- Source:- (i) Civil works progress reported on 23rd review meeting in Pondicherry (Puducherry) on 7th-8th June, 2011
(ii) Cumulative financial achievement is 87% and physical completion rate is 79%.
(iii) The expenditure during the year ending 31.03.11 is Rs.9478 Crores. Where as it was only Rs 5251. crores ending 31.12.10.
(iv) States who have performed below National average of 79% completion rate are Bihar (63%), Chattisgarh (66%), HP (72%), J&K (49%), Jharkhand (72%), MP (68%), Orissa (72%), Uttrakhand (69%) and West Bengal (67%)
(v) States not submitting the progress reports are Goa, Manipur and Nagaland.

Comments on the progress of the year 2011-12 (MPR) and (QPR)

(A) Monthly Progress Report (AWP&B 2010-11 for fresh works up to fourth quarter - 31.03.11)

- (i) States of Andhra Pradesh (allocation not correct), Bihar (ACR, toilet target and allocation not correct), Chattisgarh (allocation not correct), Haryana (UPS, ACR target and allocation not correct), J&K(allocation not correct), Kerala (allocation not correct), Madhya Pradesh (Target and allocation not correct), Mizoram

(allocation not correct), Orissa (allocation not correct), Punjab (ACR target not correct), Sikkim (report not correct- discussed in the meeting), Tamil Nadu (DW target not correct), U.P. (PS target and allocation not correct), Uttarakhand (allocation not correct), A&N Islands (ACR target not correct), Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshwadeep (allocation not correct), Delhi & Pondicherry (target and allocation not correct) have reported wrong target and financial allocation.

(ii) All States and UTs have submitted the progress report for the period ending 31.03.11 except States of Goa (31/12), Manipur (30/06) and Sikkim (31/12).

(I) Financial achievement

(i) Less than 25% Jammu & Kashmir (0.91%), Manipur (0%), Nagaland (0%), Sikkim (18.73%), UTs of A & N Islands (19.13%), and Delhi (11.00%).

(ii) 25-50% Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Dadra & Nagar Haveli

(iii) 50-75% Bihar, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, West Bengal, Daman & Diu and Lakshawdeep

(iv) 75% Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Chandigarh, and Puducherry

(v) Average financial achievement up to 31.03.2011 is **69.40%**

(II) Physical achievement (completed and in progress)

(i) Less than 25% Jammu & Kashmir (1.53%), Manipur (0%), Nagaland(0%), and UTs of A & N Islands (0%), Chandigarh (21.35%), Dadra & Nagar Haveli (0%), Daman & Diu (0%) and Delhi (17.55%).

(ii) 25-50% Goa, Meghalaya and Uttar Pradesh

(iii) 50-75% Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura & Puducherry

(iv) >75% Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala,

Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and Lakshwadeep.

(viii) Average physical achievement against works approved in 2010-11, up to 31.03.2011 is **76.02%**.

(B) Cumulative Progress Report for Fourth Quarter (since inception up to 31.03.2011)

(I) Physical achievement (Completed)

- (i) Less than 25% Lakshadweep
- (ii) 25- 50% Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur and Dadra & Nagar Haveli.
- (iii) 50 - 75% Bihar, Chattisgarh, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Orissa, Uttarakhand, West Bengal, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Daman & Diu and Delhi.
- (iv) > 75% Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and Pondicherry
- (v) Average cumulative physical achievement up to 31.03.2011 is **78.54%**

(II) Financial achievement

- (i) Less than 25% Nil
- (ii) 25- 50% Manipur, Sikkim, Chandigarh, Delhi and Lakshwadeep.
- (iii) 50 - 75% Bihar, Chattisgarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tripura, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu.
- (iv) > 75% Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal, A& N Islands and Pondicherry.

Cumulative average financial achievement up to 31.03.2011 is **86.61 %**

Teacher's Recruitment

20. Shri. Virender Singh, Deputy Secretary, MHRD reviewed the progress of recruitment of teachers. States which were having more than 20000 vacancies

were taken up for review. Details of States having more than 20000 vacancies are given below:

Sl.No.	State	No. of vacancies as on 31.03.2011	Remarks
1	Assam	28793	Due to court cases recruitment is pending
2	Bihar	126821	Due to court cases recruitment is pending. Now the case is with Supreme Court.
3	Jharkhand	20565	No one attended the meeting
4	Madhya Pradesh	82231	94975 recruited up to 31.03.2011 and about 3600 vacancies are there.
5	Maharashtra	34700	The information is to be corrected
6	Uttar Pradesh	181365	State representative was not available at the time of review.
7	West Bengal	70396	The finance department has to approve the sanctioned post and the post has to be created by the state. On 08.06.2011 finance department has approved and the process will start now & it will take some more time for recruitment. DS (MHRD) mentioned that the funds for the posts are released by MHRD and why the approval from state finance department is required?

21. He mentioned that the state project engineers/ coordinators should collect the details from the concerned state coordinators and send the same to MHRD. They may collect the information on the posts sanctioned by the State, MHRD on various types of teacher recruitment (regular teacher, subject specific teachers, part time instructors and para teacher). The total no of sanctioned posts should include the above. The details regarding recruitment of teachers under SSA, furnished by the participants are compiled and given in **Annexure - XVIII**.
22. Subsequently after the review Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi, Adviser, Infrastructure requested for comments from the participants for pages 66-71 of Chapter VI of the draft guidelines on Whole School Development Plan. Shri. Giasuddin Ahmed, State Project Engineer, SSA Assam mentioned that in some of the schools there are excess rooms and suggested that these rooms can be utilized as HM room, library, museum, play rooms etc. Shri. Kanaka Durga Prasad, Executive Engineer, SSA, Andhra Pradesh mentioned that wire fencing should be used for making school boundaries as this will create problem when it brakes and suggested that wire mesh can be used for fencing. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi mentioned that all details for Dos & Don'ts will be provided in the document. To a query relating to unsymmetrical buildings he mentioned that expansion joints are to be provided. Shri. Kanaka Durga Prasad, Executive Engineer, SSA, Andhra Pradesh

mentioned that large projections are not advisable. He was informed that these are sunshades and will take care of. Shri. S. N. Pandey enquired about the provision of solar system facilities and their cost. Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi mentioned that this is being worked out with MNRES and WHO office in Delhi has installed solar panels at the roof top which provide power, hot water to the office complex and the heat inside the building is reduced due to the provision of panels at roof top. Regarding provision of drinking water the existing water supply should be adequate, safe and potable.

23. While concluding the review meeting Sh. Virender Singh Deputy Secretary, MHRD, thanked Shri. Kabir Vajpeyi, Core team members, external resource persons, SPD, Puducherry and his team of officials for making nice arrangement for the review, field visit and the hospitality shown to all and also thanked all the officials from MHRD, TSG, Ed.CIL and all the participants from the State / UTs for participating in the review meeting and making it a success. The workshop was very much useful and had healthy discussion. He added that the external resource persons had made worthy presentations. The review meeting gave an opportunity for all the participants to share their experiences with others and to learn few more things in SSA civil works. He mentioned that he expects full participation from all the States so that the meeting will be fruitful and will give more opportunity to share best practices/ experiences. He mentioned that the participants should give their inputs for improving the WSDP guideline. He insisted that in the next review meeting third party evaluation of civil works should be introduced in every State as this will improve the quality of SSA civil works. States should take immediate action to send report on 'environmental assessment of schools' before the next review meeting as the due date for submission to DPs is already over. AWP&B proposals should be prepared with all the supporting data and the correct information on teacher recruitment details should be collected from the concerned State coordinators and furnished to MHRD. He once again thanked SSA Puducherry officials for making nice arrangements for the meeting.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the chair.