

15039/03/2020-PMU (UT-Coord.)  
Government of India/Bharat Sarkar  
Ministry of Home Affairs/Grih Mantralaya  
\*\*\*\*\*

North Block, New Delhi  
Dated, the 25<sup>th</sup> August, 2020

**OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

**Subject: Record of Discussion (RoD) of the meeting to review the implementation of Flagship/ development/ welfare schemes in UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu, Delhi, Lakshadweep and Puducherry.**

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith RoD of the meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2020 via Video Conference under the chairmanship of Additional Secretary (UT) to review the implementation of selected flagship schemes in UTs, for further necessary action.

Encl.: As above

North Block, New Delhi  
Dated, the 25<sup>th</sup> August, 2020  
*Ravi Ranjan*  
25/08/2020  
(Ravi Ranjan)  
Deputy Commandant  
Ph.: 23093265

To,

1. Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development
2. Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas
3. Secretary, Ministry of New & Renewable Energy
4. Secretary, Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship
5. Secretary, Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises
6. CEO, Unique Identification Authority of India

Copy to:

1. The Chief Secretary, Govt. of NCT of Delhi, Delhi Sachivalaya, I.P. Estate New Delhi.
2. The Chief Secretary, UT of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Port Blair.
3. The Chief Secretary, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry.
4. The Advisor to the Administrator, UT of Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu.
5. The Advisor to the Administrator, UT of Lakshadweep, Kavaratti.
6. The Advisor to the Administrator, UT Chandigarh, Chandigarh.

Copy for information to:

Sr. PPS to AS (UT)/ PPS to JS (UT)/ PA to Adviser (UT)

## Record of Discussion (RoD)

### Review of Implementation of Flagship Schemes in UTs

11:30 am, 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2020; MHA, North Block, New Delhi

---

A meeting was held under the chairmanship of Additional Secretary (UT) [AS(UT)] to review the implementation of Flagship Schemes in UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands (ANI), Chandigarh (CHD), Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu (DNH and DD), Delhi (DEL), Lakshadweep (LKD) and Puducherry (PUD) via video conference on 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2020, in the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), North Block, New Delhi. The list of participants is at **Annexure-I**.

2. The scheme-wise discussion is as follows:

- ❖ **Himayat/ Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana (DDUGKY)** [Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD)]

3. The **representative from MoRD** informed that while ANI and PUD had been on-boarded for implementation of the Scheme only last year, LKD and DNH&DD were yet to be on boarded. Further, the scheme could not be implemented in DEL and CHD due to the absence of rural areas in both these UTs. He added that the scheme could not be launched in ANI and PUD due to the COVID-19 situation, but he was hopeful of its launch by September-October, 2020 in both the UTs. He requested MHA to review the scheme regularly so that all the UTs could be on-boarded for implementation of the scheme.

4. **Adviser, DNH&DD** stated that since the UT already had ITIs and polytechnics, there was very little need for this skill development scheme. However, the UT had decided to implement the scheme on a pilot basis, which however could not materialise due to the COVID-19 situation. Secondly, he requested that in view of the merger of DNH and DD, the data of both the UTs may also be merged.

5. **Secretary (Education), Government of NCT of Delhi (GNCTD)** submitted that DEL has a sizable rural area. She informed that the Department of School Education, GNCTD was undertaking a project of skill training for school dropouts, and implementation of Himayat/DDUGKY would enhance the skill development project in DEL. She therefore requested MoRD to consider DEL and give it a small target to begin with, which would be beneficial for the UT. **AS (UT) asked MoRD to do the needful so that DEL may benefit from the scheme.**

6. The **representative of LKD** stated that the UT was implementing the National Skill Development Mission and the Pradhan Mantri KaushalVikasYojana (PMKVY) in the UT. He expressed

his willingness to implement the Himayat/ DDUGKY scheme as well and assured that it will be taken up with MoRD.

7. **AS(UT) asked DNH&DD to examine how the UT scheme can be dovetailed with this scheme, and designate the Secretary (Rural Development), DNH&DD, as a nodal officer to start the launch of the scheme. He requested MoRD to advise and handhold the UTs of DNH&DD, LKD and DEL in the implementation of the scheme. Further, MoRD was asked to combine the data of DNH&DD and change its allocation head, to reflect its merger. MoRD was also requested to draw out an action plan and release funds as per the plan for UTs.**

❖ **Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NAREGA) (MoRD)**

8. The **representative of MoRD** congratulated the UTs of ANI, PUD, LKD and DNH&DD for their performance under the scheme. He explained that the scheme was not implemented in CHD due to the absence of rural areas in the UT. He explained that it was a demand-driven scheme, and accordingly adequate funds were being released by MoRD. He asked the Secretary (Labour), PUD to approach MoRD for revision of the labour budget, in order to ensure smooth release of funds next year. He further shared that 100% of funds were being transferred to the accounts of the beneficiaries in PUD through DBT and National Electronic Fund Management System (NEFMS), while the Public Financial Management System (PFMS) was followed for ANI and 91% of the funds were being directly transferred to the workers accounts through DBT. For LKD, he highlighted that there were 462 active job cards, but the percentage of women participation had declined over the years, necessitating the need to encourage women participation in the scheme.

9. **AS(UT) asked all the UTs to continue to maintain their progress under the scheme, and to maintain liaison with MoRD.**

❖ **Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana - Gramin (PMAY-G) (MoRD)**

10. The **representative of MoRD** briefed about the performance status of ANI, explaining that around 1000 units are expected to be completed by October 2020. He assured that there was no shortage of funds. ANI was expected to achieve targets by March, 2021, while the deadline under the scheme is March, 2022. He desired a clarification from ANI whether all the landless beneficiaries have been allotted land under the scheme, as completion of houses would not be an issue once land has been allotted to all beneficiaries. For DNH&DD, he stated that around 4000 houses would be completed latest by December, 2020. He further raised the issue that DNH&DD wanted that funds should be released in 5 installments, instead of 3. While stating that MoRD had no objection to the proposal, he explained that across the country, there was no State/UT where the scheme was being implemented with 5 installments, and advised that the same would lead to further delays. For LKD, he stated that the targets for the UT

had been reduced to 50, but in the system, the data showed approval for 53 houses, which needed to be verified.

11. **Adviser, DNH&DD** informed that in DNH, 421 units had been completed, and 3831 units were under various stages of construction with significant progress having been made. He stated that while COVID-19 and the monsoon season had delayed the progress, he assured that progress would be expedited and 3831 houses would be completed by December 2020. As regards the demand for 5 installments, **Adviser** stated that it was to address a field-level problem, where the UT was only asking to split the installment into 2, and not asking for more funds. This would help accelerate the process of completion of houses. He stated that a reference for the same would be made to MoRD.

12. The **representative of LKD** stated that there was some discrepancy in data which needed to be reconciled. He also stated that the houses would be completed by November, 2020.

13. The **representative of ANI** stated that while there were no issues in completion of 1000 houses by December 2020, ANI would like to reduce their target by 475, since 475 beneficiaries were refusing to accept the land given to them for various reasons.

14. The **representative of PUD** submitted that in PUD, PMAY-Urban also covers the beneficiaries of rural areas. In response, MoRD stated while they were not aware of the issue, the ministry had no objection if the beneficiaries of rural areas are being covered under PMAY-U.

15. **AS(UT)** stated that the PMO had reviewed the scheme recently. For DNH&DD, **AS(UT)** expressed satisfaction with the progress made so far, and observed that after December 2020, around 1300 houses would be left to be completed, which was an achievable target by March, 2022. He asked **Secretary (Rural Development), DNH&DD to intensify efforts**, especially in view of the fact that the scheme had come under adverse notice of the Hon'ble PM. Further, he asked **DNH&DD to make a reference to MoRD regarding the splitting up of installments into 5 instead of 3**, and stated that **MHA will also take up the issue with MoRD**. **AS(UT)** asked **LKD to reconcile the data discrepancies**. He further asked **ANI to refer to MoRD for reduction in targets, and complete construction of 1000 houses till December, 2020, and the remaining 300 houses by 2021**. **AS(UT)** advised **MoRD to assess if there are any disadvantages to the rural population due to non-implementation of PMAY-G in PUD, and in case MoRD is of the opinion that both schemes should be implemented, it may write to the UT and MHA to examine the same**.

❖ **PM Ujjwala Yojana** [Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (MoPNG)]

16. The **representative of MoPNG** stated that DNH must conduct publicity campaigns for the scheme. He further informed that the scheme had been closed, and all future applicants will now have to apply through the normal route.

17. **Secretary, Food and Civil Supplies, DNH&DD** informed that at the time of launch of the scheme in 2016, as per the SECC beneficiary data list, only 13,300 beneficiaires in DNH were supposed to be covered, and they have already been covered. In April, 2017, DNH submitted its saturation certificate when the scheme was extended further. For DD, the SECC beneficiaries list was too large and there were no such beneficiaries without LPG connection. She informed that overall, 96% beneficiaires had been covered in DNH, and 100% in DD.

18. The **representative of LKD** informed that 100% beneficiaires had already been covered, and the data pertaining to the UT needed to be reconciled with MoPNG.

19. **AS(UT)** asked **MoPNG to combine the data for DNH and DD, in view of their merger**. He further asked the **Joint Secretary (JS), MoPNG to speak to the adviser of DNH&DD and LKD and have the data reconciled** to reflect the actual position.

❖ **DBT-LPG (MoPNG)**

20. The **representative of MoPNG** stated that regular transfers were happening under the scheme in all UTs. He explained that the achievement is not 100% as the data showed the percentage of DBTL beneficiaires against the total number of active consumers of LPG.

21. **Secretary, Food and Civil Supplies, DNH&DD** stated that the UT had around 11,000 additional beneficiaires, and with those being included, the percentage of coverage under the scheme would be 98.5%, with the remaining 1.5% beneficiaires having some issues in their bank accounts due to which they could not apply. She further assured that data would be reconciled with the Ministry accordingly.

22. The **representative of PUD** explained that 14,052 beneficiaires have been covered in PUD as on date and there seems to be a discrepancy in the data presented by the Ministry i.e. 13,577 beneficiaires. He stated that the UT has achieved its target and the data would be reconciled with the Ministry accordingly. With regard to DBT-LPG, the UT is currently at 96% and will saturate it as well.

23. The **representative of CHD** stated that 91.3% of the consumers had submitted their claims. In CHD, he informed that 2.55 lakh out of 2.79 lakh people were eligible under the scheme, and the remaining beneficiaires were the ones who did not submit any claims under the scheme.

24. The **representative of ANI** stated that the Indian Oil Corporation (IOC) does not share the beneficiary list, and runs the scheme on its own, with minimal involvement of the UT.

25. The **representative of LKD** informed that out of 9,584 active consumers in the UT, 8,720 eligible beneficiaires have already been covered. Therefore, the UT had already achieved 100% coverage under the scheme.

26. **AS(UT)** asked **DNH&DD** and **PUD** to **reconcile their data with JS, MoPNG**. He further observed that the percentage coverage under the scheme should be calculated against the consumers who claim subsidy, and not against the total active consumers, since it presents a misleading figure as to the progress made under the scheme. He asked the **Ministry to introduce a separate column for the “number of consumers claiming subsidy”**. This would ensure a better reflection of the performance of UTs, and exclude persons who do not wish to/are ineligible to apply for the scheme. He further asked **CHD to increase the number of DBT beneficiaries under the scheme**. He also asked **MoPNG to have the IOC representatives talk to the UTs to improve their performance, wherever required**.

❖ **DBT-Kerosene (MoPNG)**

27. The **representative of MoPNG** informed that the scheme had now been closed, and all UTs had become kerosene-free, except LKD, where allocation for 2020-21 had been maintained at the same level as that of 2019-20, i.e., 768 KL due to transport subsidy issues and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. **AS(UT) stated that the transport subsidy issues in LKD will be taken up with MoPNG.**

**Credit Guarantee Scheme [Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME)]**

28. The **representative of MSME** informed that the scheme was demand driven, and was being fully implemented through banks. Even during the COVID-19 pandemic, there were 1080 proposals amounting to 6786.43 lakh in 2020-21 from the UTs. He expressed satisfaction with the performance of UTs.

29. **Adviser, DNH&DD** requested MSME to combine their data, in view of the merger of the UT.

30. **AS(UT)** asked MSME to merge the data pertaining to DNH&DD, and inform the banks that in case any extra efforts were required on the part of UTs for better implementation of the scheme, they may inform MHA through MSME, and assured that MHA will take action accordingly.

❖ **Pradhan Mantri Employment Generation Programme (PMEGP) (MSME)**

31. The **representative of MSME** stated that PMEGP was a bank-driven scheme, where people approach banks with their projects for loans, and MSME gives subsidies ranging between 15-35% to the banks. He further asked UTs to publicise the scheme for increasing uptake under the scheme.

32. The **representative of CHD** highlighted that in many cases, the banks turned down applications for one reason or the other. However, he assured that more efforts would be made to improve performance under the scheme.

33. The **representative of PUD** stated that there was a slowdown in sanctioning applications in view of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, he assured that the pace will pick up now, and efforts would be made to attain saturation under the scheme.

34. The **representative of DEL** stated that quarterly meetings are held to review progress. He highlighted that almost 92% of the total applications were rejected by the banks on account of being unviable. He informed, that till June, 2020, 122 applications were received and only 6 applications were accepted, and an amount of Rs. 14,49,000 was disbursed. He requested MSME to instruct banks to adopt a more liberal approach. To this, the **representative of MSME** responded that they had a meeting with the CMDs of banks under the chairmanship of the Hon'ble Minister in this regard.

35. **Adviser, DNH&DD** informed that the targets for Diu needed to be moderated, as people were not inclined towards taking loans. For DNH and Daman, he stated that while a number of applications had been sanctioned for loan disbursement, the money was not being disbursed, and requested MSME to issue instructions for disbursement. He further assured that they would put in more efforts to increase the number of applications.

36. The **representative of ANI** assured that they would make a strategy with the lead banks to improve their performance under the scheme, and work towards achieving the targets.

37. The **representative of LKD** stated that the UT aims to disburse Rs. 1.32 crore this year.

38. **AS(UT)** stated that there is a scope for improvement in all UTs, and banks would have to rapidly scale up their performance. He also stated that **he would talk to the Secretary, MSME in this regard and banks could be issued required directions accordingly.** He asked **MSME and its agencies (KVIC/KBIC) to assist UTs and ensure 100% saturation** as it seemed that the UTs were keen on implementing the scheme, but were not getting enough cooperation. He further asked **MSME to combine the data pertaining to DNH and DD, in view of their merger.** He also stated that **instead of reducing the targets for DNH&DD, it would be better to collapse DD's targets into those of DNH.** Further, he asked **MSME to have a separate review meeting with the UTs and aim to achieve saturation.** He also asked the **UTs to take proactive steps at their end, and aim to achieve saturation,** as envisioned by the Hon'ble PM and Hon'ble HM.

❖ **Renewable Energy** (Ministry of New and Renewable Energy)

39. **Director, Solar Energy Corporation of India Ltd. (SECI)** highlighted some discrepancy in the projects (1.7 MW SPV and 6 MW SPV+9MWh) in ANI, and submitted that International Institute for Energy Conservation (IIEC) consultants have been appointed in this regard. A meeting of the IIEC Consultants is scheduled to be held and based on the decisions taken in the meeting, tender will be issued. For DNH&DD, he informed that the tender has been finalised on 10th June, 2020. With regard to NDMC, he stated that the tender for 200 MW RTC power has been given to NDMC, but NDMC is not signing the PSA.

40. **AS(UT)** expressed his concern with regard to poor RPO compliance in UTs, especially Island UTs. He asked the representative of MNRE to request the **Secretary, MNRE to take a separate meeting on the issue of discrepancy in ANI**. He further requested that **Secretary, MNRE and the CMD, SECI may hold a meeting with the UTs to review their progress**.

❖ **Aadhaar Saturation** [Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI)]

41. The **DS, UIDAI**, while expressing satisfaction with the performance of UTs under the scheme, stated that the gaps in Aadhaar saturation may be attributed to the inadequate coverage of Aadhaar for children below 5 years of age.

42. The **representative of PUD** stated that the population projected by UIDAI seemed to be on the higher side than the figure calculated by the UT, and highlighted the need to recalibrate the projection.

43. **Adviser, DNH&DD** also raised the issue of a higher population projection by UIDAI, and the need to recalibrate it. Further, he stated that the UT hosts many migrant labourers, who enroll themselves in the UT, but the Aadhaar so made gets counted in their native states. He assured that the UT will intensify its efforts to enroll children below 5 years of age, and achieve saturation.

44. The **DS, UIDAI** responded that the projections are based on 2011 Census figures, but in case UTs feel that the projections are inaccurate, they can make a reference to UIDAI. UIDAI has no objection to accepting the modified figures sent by the UTs.

45. **AS(UT)** asked all **UTs to note that the Registrar may be asked to have special campaigns and drives to cover all children below 5 years of age and try to achieve 100% saturation** under the scheme. He, further, asked **UTs of DNH&DD and PUD to send in their population projection figures to UIDAI with full justification, with a copy marked to MHA, to reconcile the same**. He also requested the **CEO, UIDAI to personally ensure that population figures are reconciled**.

❖ **State Engagement Component Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana 2.0 (PMKVY 2.0)**  
[Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship (MSDE)]

46. **Deputy Secretary (DS), MSDE** stated that funds had been released to UTs immediately after the scheme had been launched. He mentioned that it is a 100% Centrally Sponsored Scheme. Further, except PUD, CHD and DEL, much ground needs to be covered in UTs of ANI, DNH&DD and LKD. He also stated that since the scheme had now come to an end and PMKVY 3.0 was about to be rolled out, he requested all UTs to submit a statement of fund utilisation to MSDE, along with the reasons for non-utilisation.

47. The **representative of CHD** stated that their revised physical target till March 2020 was 6,522, and 6,522 beneficiaries have been enrolled. Training of around 4,200 beneficiaries has been completed,



and the training for the rest will be completed within 3-4 months, which would lead to an improvement in the UT's performance. He explained that earlier, they were doing physical training, but in view of COVID-19, they were considering online training. To this, **DS, MSDE** stated that online training was not feasible under the scheme since the courses were not aligned with that format. Moreover, there were problems of connectivity, lack of availability of mobiles/laptops/computers with the students etc. He stated that MSDE has issued SOP/guidelines for physical/online training.

48. The **representative of ANI** assured that enrolments would be done under the scheme, connectivity issues would be resolved, and performance would improve.

49. **Secretary, Education, DNH&DD** submitted that further targets are not being given from March 2020. The performance of DD training centres has been better than that of DNH. In DNH, the private training partners were not performing well, even after weekly review meetings being held regularly by the officers, which was the key reason behind the poor performance of the UT. She informed that the UT had also written to MSDE to blacklist non-performing partners. She explained that to resolve the issue, the UT also brought on board the ITIs/polytechnics as training partners. **DS, MSDE** stated that the Ministry would take swift action on the issue raised, as soon as the complaint is received by the Ministry. **AS(UT)** observed that blacklisting training partners could be done, but was not a solution, and the UT would have to come up with new providers. To this, **Secretary, Education, DNH&DD** submitted that if the Ministry permits, a new Expression of Interest would be invited from new partners but since the scheme is on hold, the UT was not allowed to do so.

50. The **representative of DEL** explained that after a few initial hiccups, DEL was successful in enrolling 37,000 candidates and 31 skill training partners. However, since the lockdown, no classes are being held. She informed that after classes restart, the students will be placed within 4 months. She suggested that skill development training could start with social distancing protocols in place. To this, **AS(UT)** responded that MHA had been grappling with the issue of opening educational institutions, and the same was being considered at the highest levels of the government.

51. **AS(UT)** asked **MSDE to extend the date for completion of targets, and consider online training format** under the scheme, in view of COVID-19 situation. He asked **ANI to improve its performance under the scheme and complete the enrollment process**. He also advised **DNH&DD to take up the issue of non-performance of training partners with MSDE**. He asked **all UTs to submit a statement of the funds utilized under the scheme**.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the chair.

\*\*\*

**List of Participants****Ministry of Home Affairs**

- i. Sh. Govind Mohan, Additional Secretary (UT) **(In-chair)**
- ii. Dr. Kumar V. Pratap, Joint Secretary (UT)
- iii. Sh. Jitendra Agrawal, Adviser (UT)
- iv. Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Deputy Commandant

**Union Territories (through VC)**

- i. Sh. Arun Kumar Gupta, Principal Secretary Home, Chandigarh
- ii. Sh. Ajoy Kumar Sinha, FS, Chandigarh
- iii. Sh. Harish Nayar, Special Secretary Finance, Chandigarh
- iv. Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Secretary Finance & Planning, NCT of Delhi
- v. Sh. Ravi Dadich, Special Secretary Power, NCT of Delhi
- vi. Ms. Manisha Saxena, Secretary Education, NCT of Delhi
- vii. Sh. Manoj Kumar Divedi, Additional Commissioner, Food & Supply, NCT of Delhi
- viii. Sh. Vikash Anand, Commissioner, NCT of Delhi
- ix. Sh. K. S. Meena, Special Secretary Revenue, NCT of Delhi
- x. Sh. A.K. Singh, Adviser to the Administrator, DNH & DD
- xi. Sh. Davinder Singh, Financial Secretary, DNH & DD
- xii. Sh. Saurabh Mishra, Secretary Agriculture, DNH & DD
- xiii. Sh. Karanjit, Joint Secretary Finance, DNH & DD
- xiv. Sh. Vijender Singh Rawat, District Collector, Lakshadweep
- xv. Sh. P Abdul Samad, Director Planning, Lakshadweep
- xvi. Sh. T. Kassim, Deputy Collector, Lakshadweep
- xvii. Sh. Ashwani Kumar, Chief Secretary, Puducherry
- xviii. Sh. H.P.S. Saran, Secretary Industry, Puducherry
- xix. Sh. Surbir Singh, Secretary Planning, Puducherry
- xx. Sh. Devesh Singh, Secretary Power, Puducherry
- xxi. Sh. Ravi Prakash, Secretary RD, Puducherry
- xxii. Sh. E. Vallavan, Secretary Labour, Puducherry

**Ministry of Rural Development (through VC)**

- i. Sh. Gaya Prasad, Deputy Director General

ii. Sh. Charanjit Singh, JS(Skills)

iii. Sh. Rohit Kumar, JS (RE)

**Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas (through VC)**

i. Sh. Sushil T Williams, DS

**Ministry of New & Renewable Energy (through VC)**

i. Ms. Sutapa Mazumdar, EA

ii. Sh. S.K. Mishra, Director (SECI)

**Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship (through VC)**

i. Sh. Narinder Singh, DS

**Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (through VC)**

i. Sh. Supriyo Ghosh, Director

ii. Sh. Piyush Srivastava, ADC

**Unique Identification Authority of India (through VC)**

i. Sh. Sandeep P Shah, Sr. Manager

ii. Sh. Wrih Sharma, Sr. Manager