

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING AUTHORITY (AMA)

Tabled and accepted in the AMA meeting of May 2nd, 2014. Minutes of the Meeting and the PowerPoint presentation made by Working Group III are also included.

Volume I

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary Pg. 2
2. Recommendations of the Assessment and Monitoring Authority Pg. 8
3. Minutes of the AMA meeting of 2nd May, where the recommendations were discussed and approved. Pg. 15
4. Annexure I: Presentation made by Working Group III on their Report Pg. 23

Executive Summary

Background

1. The Assessment and Monitoring Authority (AMA) was reconstituted vide notification 4th May 2011.
2. The Terms of Reference stated that the AMA would evolve its own procedures.
3. In an attempt to define its responsibilities, the AMA relied on the following paragraph from the Sachar Committee Report: “The Committee recommends the setting up of an **autonomous** Assessment and Monitoring Authority (AMA) **to evaluate the extent of development** benefits, which **accrue to different SRCs through various programmes.**”
4. The AMA met on July 15th and August 27th 2011 and generated short papers, summaries of issues discussed, minutes of meetings and written interventions by individual members. All such material has been archived and annexed to this Report.
5. In its final meeting, the AMA constituted three separate working groups with specific tasks assigned to each. Working Groups 1 and 2 also met independently and submitted their Reports.
6. On August 14th 2013, the term of the AMA was extended until June 30th 2014 to enable it to consider the Reports and make recommendations on the basis of the same.

Positions Taken

7. The AMA put on record that it wished to adopt a liberal reading of its own mandate as described in (3) above. This meant that it would not limit itself to evaluating the participatory parity of different welfare schemes (scheme centric approach), but also

look at the overall benefit that accrued to communities with regard to different schemes/programmes, and also the general social, economic and political contexts (the community centric approach).

8. While it recognized that it could not realistically evaluate the status of socio-religious communities in terms of their historical, social, political and economic contexts, it chose to acknowledge that, in principle, the status of communities depended on many more variables than participatory parity. It depended, for instance, on their own aspirations vis-à-vis the benefits that are sought to be delivered through a specific programme. (How does one view the ‘development benefits’ which accrue to handloom weavers in the context of a programme that encourages the switch to power looms, for instance: in this case, the more the participatory parity, the more complicated the outcome for the community).
9. At the same time, the AMA recognized that participation parity across sectoral schemes was not just an assurance that benefits were accruing to minorities (or to different SRCs) in proportion to their percentage in the total population, but also a comment on good governance: on accessibility and equitability.
10. An evaluation of participatory parity in development schemes across all sectors (or in the Flagship schemes) had also to be matched with an assessment of benefits that accrued from targeted schemes for SRCs (minorities). There was a strong view that some minority concentrated districts/blocks should be chosen to assess the situation of the most marginalized sections there, while also assessing general access to the flagship schemes.
11. This view came from an understanding that in some cases, even when there is overall (or near) parity in proportional participation, there are areas of minority (or tribal) concentration that are completely isolated from receiving benefits. This could be for a variety of reasons. (For instance, in terms of availability of primary schools at a distance of 1 km, the percentage of Muslim households that are included is exactly

similar to the national average of 92%. However, there are several pockets of reduced access, particular to Muslims, Christians and Tribal communities.)

12. The AMA also put on record its concern that at times equitable participation in general may still hide certain trends. (In terms of enrolment at the upper primary level, rates may have gone up for Muslim children, but enrolment in premier institutions like the Navodaya Vidyalayas has been static).
13. The AMA very deliberately chose to evaluate schemes for their inclusiveness, but also to look at benefits from the perspective of communities.
14. Different working groups were formed and were tasked with evaluating schemes and also for getting feedback from communities.
15. In this regard, the AMA also acknowledged that socio-religious communities could include differentials within religious communities. They may also include other 'socio-religious categories', which are marginalized: like denotified and nomadic tribes, Dalit Muslims, Mazhabi Sikhs, etc. These groups may not be officially recognized categories but are 'social realities'. However, the AMA chose to limit its work – in the first round to- religious Minorities.

Action Taken

16. Working group I was tasked with creating an inventory of existing sources of data. It was also requested to collate data on participation parity amongst those SRCs on which data is available; focusing on 3 sectors [Employment/ Livelihood (MGNREGA, SGSY, PMGSY, Education (SSA), and Housing (IAY)]. Later Health [NRHM] was also added.
17. Working group II was tasked with assessing the impact of schemes on selected SRCs. It was decided that members would gather their own impressions from the field, which though anecdotal, will enrich the other strands of data.

18. The two working groups held several interim meetings. Working group I submitted a report detailing an inventory of existing data sources in the four abovementioned sectors.
19. Working group I assessed the Management Information Systems pertaining to existing status of availability of SRC data and the future data needs especially in the context of the 6 National Flagship Programmes (NRHM, SSA, MGNREGA, PMGSY, SGSY and IAY) under implementation by the Ministries of Health & Family Welfare, Human Resource Development and Rural Development.
20. The Report states that “The existing formats of data collection of the six national flagship programmes have been designed to cater to the specific needs of the programme implementing Ministries/Departments in terms of collecting and maintaining information on the execution of the programme and their monitoring. The beneficiary oriented programmes do collect data on the beneficiaries. However, the formats of collection of data on these individuals vary from one programme to the other. At times the same word, i.e., ‘category’ mentioned in different formats of data collection refers to different sets of information depending upon the requirement of the flagship programme.”
21. The Working Group I Report made the following recommendations:
 - i) The Ministry of Minority Affairs may approach the Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs for allowing the dissemination of religion data cross-classified with other socio-economic variables at least at the Block level so that the same could be utilized for assessment and monitoring of the development programmes for the socio-religious categories and ensuring larger public awareness and accountability.
 - ii) The Socio-Economic and Caste Census (SECC), once completed, would throw a wealth of information on the situation of SRCs in India. The Ministries of Rural Development and Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation may provide these data at least at the Block level for the use of AMA.

- iii) Most of the country-wide large scale socio-economic sample surveys invariably collect data on SRCs, tabulate it and make it public. The Ministries of Statistics & Programme implementation (for NSS Surveys), Health & Family Welfare (for NFHS, DLHS and AHS) and Human Resource Development (for DISE) may tabulate SRC data for the surveys having reference period around Census 2001 and provide it in electronic format for uploading it in the National Data Bank for Socio-Religious Categories created in the Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation.
- iv) All MISs should have a plan, if not already done, for collection and tabulation of SRCs data and the same may be furnished at least at the Block level to the Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation for its updation on the National Data Bank portal. The periodicity of reporting may be half-yearly with 30th June and 31st December being the cut-off dates.
- v) The Working group recommends that a national flagship programme while developing its MISs may invariably make provision for collection of information, inter-alia, on the age, sex, social category (SC/ST/OBC/Others) with actual Caste/Tribe name specified and religion of the beneficiary. The list of Minorities as decided by the Central Ministry of Minority Affairs may be followed uniformly in all the MISs for collection of data on minority beneficiaries. Alternately, the Census categorization for Caste/Tribe may be followed uniformly. Consolidated data for SRCs at the level of CD Blocks should be made available for inclusion in the NDB for SRCs.

22. Working group 2 made a visit to Mewat and also submitted a report on findings.

23. The Report describes the objectives of the field study as an effort to examine and analyse the performance of the ongoing schemes with special focus on Minorities and also get first hand feedback from the beneficiaries about the impact of the flagship programmes and other schemes.

24. The Report states that in dialogue with the community, the 'primary' concerns were those that were not touched upon by either the Flagship schemes or the targeted schemes of the Ministry of Minority Affairs. Is there a gap between the needs and aspirations of the community and the welfare programmes?
25. "Most of the schemes, whether of MoMA or Flagship, address a very small requirement of individuals/families and community leaving out major necessities unattended. As a result, the impact of most programmes is slow and large section of population remains un-affected."
26. The Reports of Working Groups I and II were tabled and approved in the AMA meeting of February 1st 2014. Additionally, a Report commissioned on the Rehnuma Programme, a civil society effort that acts as an interface between minority communities and government was also tabled. All the reports were approved. (Complete Reports in Volume II)
27. It was decided in the meeting that Working Group III, under the chairpersonship of Secretary, MoMA will consolidated the 'findings' of Working Groups I and II and draft recommendations. (Detailed Minutes in Volume II)
28. In the AMA meeting of May 2nd, 2014, Working Group III tabled its Report. The Draft Recommendations formulated on the basis of that report, as well as discussions in the AMA meetings, were also tabled and accepted.

Recommendations of the Assessment and Monitoring Authority

1. The Assessment and Monitoring Authority (AMA) adopts the following positions:
 - a. As the 12th Plan also states, evaluation and monitoring of Flagship Programmes and other schemes should focus on **‘participation parity’** of different Socio-religious groups (SRCs). That is, more and more SRCs should be represented in the Flagship schemes in proportion to their population.
 - b. A **‘diversity index’** – reflecting the number of beneficiaries who figure high on an index of disadvantage (religion, caste, class, gender, disabilities, etc.) – should be introduced. Beneficiaries may be ‘overdrawn’ from indices which reflect accumulated disadvantages, in a way that benefits reach the most vulnerable first.
 - c. A balance must be drawn between monitoring of participation parity and that of final outcomes (actual perception of welfare) in the community. The gap between welfare schemes and community aspirations needs to be continuously assessed. Pockets of isolation must also be monitored.
 - d. The AMA realizes that the ‘expectations’ and ‘lived realities’ of the marginalized differ significantly from those of the privileged. Such experiences are often not incorporated in programme design. In such circumstances, pushing the same schemes may be counter indicative and hence ‘community-centric’ assessment of accruing of benefits, in addition to ‘scheme-centric’ evaluations are important.
 - e. The notion of an ‘equity index’ must also be introduced to stress the importance of qualitative data, in addition to quantitative data. AMA recognizes that exclusion sometimes manifests itself in service delivery: thus the **quality and experience of receiving a service** by marginalized SRCs is different. The AMA is therefore conscious of the importance of monitoring ‘equity’ – as distinct from ‘equality’/‘equivalence’ - in service delivery.

- f. The AMA also acknowledges that socio-religious communities could include differentials within religious communities. They may also include other ‘socio-religious categories’, which are marginalized: like denotified and nomadic tribes, Dalit Muslims, Mazhabi Sikhs, etc. These groups may not be officially recognized categories yet but are ‘social realities’.
- g. The AMA recognizes the importance of disaggregated data: non-disaggregated data for marginalized SRCs sometimes makes gaps invisible.

With this as preamble, the AMA makes the following recommendations:

1. Collection and Proactive Dissemination of Disaggregated Data

It is important to have access to data pertaining to socio-religious communities cross-classified with other socio-economic variables at least at the Block level for better identification of the most marginalized groups and consequent appropriate resource allocation and planning in the interests of substantive equality. Such disaggregated data would also help in focused evaluations of impact of programmes on different SRCs.

- a. Religion based data cross-classified with other socio-economic variables at the block level should be made available on the website of the National Data Bank (NDB). **It is recommended that further action in this regard may be expedited for obtaining CCPA approval for dissemination of cross-classified data for various SRCs (community-wise) at the block level.**
- b. There is non-availability of community-wise data of performance of various schemes at the block level. Ministry of Minority Affairs has advised the Ministries/ Departments implementing PM’s 15-PP to capture community-wise SRC data in respect of their schemes. The availability of this data is essential for effectively assessing the impact and reach of various welfare schemes on different SRCs. **It is recommended that Ministries/ Departments implementing welfare**

schemes for education, health, skill, employment generation, etc. should strengthen their MIS to capture community-wise SRC data at block level in respect of their schemes. National flagship programmes while developing their MIS may invariably make provision for collection of information, inter-alia, on the age, sex, social category (SC/ST/OBC/Others) with actual Caste/Tribe name specified and religion of the beneficiary. The list of Minorities as decided by the Central Ministry of Minority Affairs may be followed uniformly in all the MIS for collection of data on minority beneficiaries.

- c. **Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation may also make efforts for compiling all the relevant data on SRCs from the NSSO Report, Census Report, Health surveys, DISE, etc. and putting them on the website of NDB making it more relevant and making the task easier for other Ministries/ Departments.** All concerned Ministries may be requested to send the relevant data to MoSPI for this purpose.
- d. **It is recommended that the data needs and gaps as outlined in the Report of Working Group I may also be addressed.**

2. Effective Implementation of Programmes/ Schemes

A good policy or programme may fail to deliver results on the ground due to poor implementation. Therefore, there is a need to strategize for 'equitable' implementation and also effective monitoring of ongoing programmes / schemes

- a. At this stage of the 12th Plan, there should be more focus on **execution at the lowest levels** rather than change in design, expansion of coverage, etc.
- b. **Stress on multisectoral convergence:** poor infrastructure and facilities is a bane in most minority concentrated areas. The AMA stresses the importance of convergence strategies to maximize benefit, through leveraging of existing schemes/programmes (ICDS, MSDP, etc.)

- c. **The Importance of Pilots:** If we are able to choose a few Blocks/ Towns and focus on full implementation, it would serve two purposes: we would know exactly where the roadblocks are at the lowest levels; having achieved one success, it is relatively easier to scale it up. For instance, an ‘implementation pilot’ could be run in a chosen Minority Concentration Block/Town. In addition, AMA may also commission documentation of successful pilots and other ‘best practices.’
- d. **May utilize Prime Minister’s Rural Development Fellows** already working in relevant Districts (Blocks and Towns). They could act as interface between community and Government and be given the responsibility for complete implementation of demand-driven scholarship schemes. **MoMA (or AMA) could also recruit Fellows for MCBs and MCTs to act as an interface between community and the state and to ensure full implementation of schemes/ programmes.**
- e. Systems have already been developed under PM’s New 15-PP for monitoring and implementation of the schemes/ programmes with participation of stake holders in the State Level and District Level Committees. This system needs to be strengthened. **These State and District Level Committees for PM’s 15 Point Programme should be constituted in all the states and districts and periodic meetings of these Committees should be ensured.**
- f. **The names of all the SLC/ DLC members should be put up District wise on the MoMA website.**
- g. **Apart from the monitoring of schemes/programmes by Government Departments and constituted Committees, there is a need to support the monitoring mechanism by involving independent professionals, agencies and Civil Society. AMA has recognizes the efforts of the Rehnuma programme in this regard. It is recommended that a system may be developed for field monitoring of the schemes/ projects under different programmes/ schemes of the Government**

through independent professionals or agencies for assessment and monitoring of these programmes and facilitation efforts such as Rehnuma should be encouraged and given space.

- h. Through such an exercise, the importance of personal contact with the local implementing officers, finding solutions to local issues with them and also finding ‘champions’ within them, who would make implementation a success, should be stressed.
- i. Qualitative surveys and social audits with the help of independent professionals as well as peoples’ groups should be encouraged. ‘Outcome monitoring’ (the final effect on the targeted community) and also ‘last mile monitoring’ should be emphasized.
- j. Strengthening the institutions responsible for implementation of programmes/schemes is another important issue. A weak or overburdened department/office would not be able to do justice to the responsibility assigned to it. Some of the States with substantial minority populations do not have separate minority welfare departments. **It is, therefore, recommended that in all such States/ UTs having at least 10% minority population, there should be a separate department for minorities. Further, at the District level, there should be a District Minority Officer. Facilitation centres may also be initiated, with the help of civil society groups, to support the district minority officer.**
- k. It is observed that people at large are not aware of the various initiatives of the Government for welfare of different SRCs. **There should be awareness generation among the target groups through various campaigns in the print and broadcast media. Innovations are needed to cover ‘the last mile’ especially as literacy rates are low. Further, community involvement in the implementation of the programmes/ schemes should be encouraged. Also, there should be**

campaigns to increase the awareness of implementing officers, both at the district and block levels about the 15 Point Programme.

1. **It is recommended that stress on improved access and transparency during processing of applications/complaints, as well as a reasonable time limit for clearance, and provisions of reasons for rejection of applications/complaints may be included as a mandatory indicator in the Results Framework Document of MoMA.** Possibilities of notification of entitlements under the Public Services Guarantee Act (PSGA) may be considered, in order to ensure greater accountability. States may be requested to consider the legal feasibility of notifying certain schemes/programmes under the State Acts.
- m. SRCs be recognized as a 'lens' during the mid-term appraisal of the 12th Plan and tracking of monitorable targets in 12th Plan must also include SRCs as lens.

3. **Institutionalizing AMA**

- a. There is a need to institutionalise the system of Assessment and Monitoring. The present approach has not been very effective in addressing the responsibility assigned to AMA. **AMA should be made into an institution with a separate Secretariat under the Planning Commission for concurrent assessment and monitoring of various welfare programmes/ schemes of Government. AMA should come out with periodical reports on various programmes/ schemes and a comprehensive assessment of the status of all SRCs once every five years.**
- b. Tasks in the 'short' – mid-term and long-term for the Working Groups have already been outlined and agreed upon by the AMA [Report 1 at Annexure A]. They may now be considered and Working Groups may take further responsibilities as appropriate.

- c. An institutionalization of evaluation of participation parity among different SRCs by standardizing format for data collection across ministries is recommended.
- d. AMA recommends an institutionalization of field level monitoring of select schemes by designated CSOs and other agencies and creating shadow reports on Government surveys and data.
- e. AMA recommends institutionalization of monitoring of participation and implementation at all the levels of governance, with the participation of stake holders.
- f. It is recommended that there be coordination with state Governments/UTs to institutionalize c, d and e above.

Minutes of Meeting of the Assessment and Monitoring Authority

2nd May, 2014

Yojana Bhavan

The Assessment and Monitoring Authority met on May 2nd, 2014 in order to discuss and adopt recommendations consolidated from the three Reports submitted by Working Groups I, II and III, as well as from the discussions in the previous meetings of the AMA. Working Group III also tabled its final Report. Dr. Syeda Hameed, Member of the Planning Commission and Mr. Soli Sorabjee, eminent jurist and senior advocate, together chaired the meeting.

1. **Dr. Syeda Hameed** welcomed members to the meeting and laid out the agenda. She said that the last meeting of the AMA was held on February 1st, 2014 where reports by Working Groups I and II were tabled. It had been decided in that meeting that Working Group III would consolidate the recommendations made in these reports and submit its final report. Secretary, Ministry of Minority Affairs (MoMA) had chaired the proceedings of Working Group III and the report was ready to be tabled in the present meeting.

Dr. Hameed also said that a non-funded study had been commissioned with the aim of documenting the Rehnuma Programme, which is an effort at introducing ‘facilitation centres at the district level to act as an interface between minority communities and implementing officers of various schemes and programmes of the government. The report documenting the Rehnuma Programme had also been presented at the last meeting.

She invited **Mr. YP Singh, Joint Secretary, MoMA** to present the report of Working Group III and suggested that the consolidated recommendations may be presented and discussed subsequently.

2. **Mr. YP Singh, Joint Secretary, MoMA** presented the report of Working Group III (**Annexure I**).

3. Continuing from the presentation, **Dr. Syeda Hameed** said that she was able to classify the recommendations that the report made into four broad categories:

- a) Those dealing with ‘concepts’ or ‘broad visions’ that the AMA may like to introduce into the discourse on ‘planning for socio-religious categories’: in this regard, the importance of ‘multisectoral planning’ for SRCs, and also, concepts like ‘participation parity’, ‘diversity index’ and ‘equity index’ are stressed. The last is a qualitative measure of services received by marginalized SRCs, in an effort to ensure that the experience of receiving of any service comes with some semblance of dignity.
- b) The second category relates to the importance of availability of disaggregated data based on religion/social indicators cross-classified with other socio-economic variables at the block Level. This is important so that socio-economic gaps are not made invisible, while portraying broader pictures of growth and prosperity. This is also suggested in the hope that gaps in socio-economic indicators along religious/social identities would be met with targeted planning and allocation of suitable resources.
- c) Working Groups I and III have made specific recommendations to actualize the public availability of such disaggregated data. They include obtaining the Cabinet Committee for Political Affairs (CCPA’s) approval for dissemination of census data, as also developing of MISs –particularly for the Flagship Programmes- that would capture the social category of beneficiaries.
- d) The third category comprises suggestions for better monitoring. Working Group III has made some recommendations that include the need for dedicated professionals (Young Professionals on the lines of the Prime Minister’s Rural Development Fellows), as also agencies/civil society groups (like Rehnuma), and also for the increased participation of stake holders (State Level and District Level Committees) for effective monitoring and implementation of programmes and schemes.

- e) The fourth category relates to the institutionalization of the AMA, such that it is able to undertake concurrent assessment and monitoring functions. It may come out with periodic monitoring reports on various programmes/schemes, in addition to producing a comprehensive assessment of the status of all SRCs once every five years.

Dr. Hameed said that these recommendations have emerged from discussions in the previous meetings of the AMA and have also been endorsed in the reports of the Working Groups. She then opened the floor for comments.

Mr. AJ Phillips, Journalist and Member of AMA requested an update on the status of the Rehnuma Programme. **Mr. Gagan Sethi, Chairperson, Centre for Social Justice and special invitee** said that with the Rehnuma Programme, there had been a definite improvement in knowledge of the 15 Point Programme amongst the implementing officers at the District level. He said that Karnataka had shown immense sensitivity towards the 15 PP.

Maulana Mujaddidi, Social Activist and special invitee congratulated the AMA on its report and recommendations and said that it had been a good experience for him to be a part of the proceedings. He hoped that the new government would continue with the good work. He also said that the 12th Plan states that civil society participation should be encouraged in the implementation of the 15 PP at the grassroots level, such that they are able to act as intermediaries between the community and the government and bring forth more active participation therefrom. He was of the opinion that not enough has been done to involve civil society groups in this regard. Many schemes could have been very successful, but for the indifference of district implementing officers. Giving the example of certain districts in UP, he said that there are instances where scholarships have been awarded to students, but money is not disbursed at the local level. Neither are local officers very cooperative in either explaining the reasons for delay, or in helping to resolve it. He felt that certain accredited civil society groups should be authorized to act as intermediaries and to make duty bearers accountable.

He also suggested that electronic numbers (akin to PNR numbers) could be given to each applicant such that s/he is able to track the status of her/his application, as well as the flow of funds, online. There could also be a waitlist for the scholarships.

In response, **Dr. Lalit Panwar, Secretary, MoMA** said that scholarships would be made ‘demand driven’ (as is the case with scholarships for students belonging to the scheduled castes and tribes) in the next fiscal year. He also said that ‘rates’ (or amounts awarded) will be harmonized across different schemes/ministries. Third, to make disbursement more efficient, there will be a shift to ‘direct benefit transfer’ system, where funds would directly be transferred to awardees’ accounts.

Mr. Gagan Sethi also congratulated the AMA and said that he wished to highlight and elaborate certain issues within the set of recommendations.

- i) He said that it should be made clear that the implicit reason for introducing the diversity and equity indices was to measure and identify vulnerability. Thus, focus should not shift away from identifying – and then responding to ‘vulnerabilities’.
- ii) With respect to ‘collection and dissemination of disaggregated data’, he suggested that the word ‘proactive’ may be introduced before ‘dissemination’ to make explicit that particular objective of the AMA.
- iii) He noted that in addition to running pilots, best practices should also be properly documented. There are already many examples of imaginative officers running successful pilots that may be scaled up.
- iv) He suggested that the AMA revisit the idea of recommending the inclusion of applications for beneficiary schemes under the Public Services Guarantees Act (PSGA).
- v) With respect to ‘monitoring of implementation’, he recommended that ‘outcome monitoring’ (the final effect on the targeted community) and also ‘last mile monitoring’ should be emphasized.
- vi) Finally, he said that monitoring and facilitation should be a function of both government and civil society. The two should complement each other. Civil society groups cannot be a substitute for welfare officers appointed by the government – or vice versa.

Mr. Soli Sorabjee, Eminent Jurist and co-chair of the AMA said that he was surprised to learn that not many people were aware of the schemes and programmes. He felt that there should be targeted information campaigns. He also stressed the need for continuous

assessment between aspirations and outcomes. **Mr. Sorabjee** also stated that AMA should be made into a permanent body with some teeth by an Act of Parliament. It would be more relevant as an institutionalized body rather than a 'seminar exercise'.

Dr. Lalit Panwar responded by explaining that a separate budget for 'Information, Education and Communication' (IEC) had been earmarked exactly in order to launch a widespread awareness campaign. Nearly Rs. 39 Crores had been assigned to cover electronic, print and cyber media for a very widespread public campaign. The message was being broadcast/ published in the English, Hindi and Urdu languages. Also, the website of the Ministry of Minority Affairs would soon be made tri-lingual (with versions in English, Hindi and Urdu).

Mr. Sorabjee asked why there was an undue focus on Urdu to the exclusion of other languages commonly spoken by Muslims, such as Tamil, Gujarati, Bengali, etc.

Dr. Wasey, Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities said that sometimes people were not able to benefit from particular schemes despite knowing about them, for various reasons (excessive governmentality and external bias were among the reasons he counted). He said that there were not sufficient intermediaries to ease this process between the intended beneficiaries and the government. **Dr. Wasey** agreed that the AMA should be institutionalized. He also said that while the focus on wide coverage of scholarships for minority students was correct, there should also be an effort to set up vocational education centres (polytechnics and ITIs) in minority concentrated areas. He gave the example of the Jamia area in Delhi and said that there were no vocational training centres there. Further, there was no government hospital, nor shelters for destitute women. He stressed that such areas needed a multisectoral intervention.

Ms. Veena Ish, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development said that her ministry had made a proposal to the Delhi Government regarding two polytechnics, but it was told that no land was available. She said that if the community were able to offer private (or Waqf) land the matter could be taken forward.

Dr. Lalit Panwar informed AMA that the Government of India had recently approved the de-notification of 120 Waqf properties on prime land. Under the aegis of the National Waqf

Development Corporation (NWDC), his ministry would make land available for multisectoral development of Muslim areas.

Ms. Veena Ish said that in such situations the role of the state government was very important (in making land available). Could MoMA communicate the fact of the availability of land through recently de-notified waqf land to all state governments?

Concerns were expressed by several members at the idea that infrastructural needs in minority areas might be met primarily through making Waqf land available. It was inequitable that the problem of availability of public land for basic infrastructural needs be solved either through community-driven/ private efforts or through the provision of waqf land.

Dr. Lalit Panwar said that in 2013-14 the cabinet has approved ‘Minority Blocks’ as the new unit of planning (in place of districts). 710 minority concentrated blocks have been recognized. In addition, 66 minority concentrated towns have also been recognized. Minority clusters have been recognized too and proposals have been initiated with regard to at least 50% of these clusters. His ministry is using new techniques like ‘video conferences’ and ‘empowerment committees’ to process these proposals – and solve related problems – in a transparent manner. He said that wherever availability of land becomes an issue, his ministry would try to resolve it expediently, when brought to its notice.

Shahrukh Alam, Member-secretary, AMA suggested that it might be useful to evolve a system where such obstacles came to the ministry’s notice in the due course of things, rather than wait for an individual/agency to inform the ministry.

Dr. T.C.A Anant, Chief Statistician of India and Secretary, MoSPI said that there should be more clarity on construction of the development and equity indices. He suggested that MoMA could issue guidelines on the question of methodology, since there was no settled methodology to construct the indices. He also asked for a clarification on whether the Equal Opportunity Commission’s mandate extended to all Programmes. **Dr. Anand** also suggested that the AMA’s recommendations should act as a lens in the Mid-Term and other reviews carried out by Divisions at the Planning Commission.

Dr. Rakesh Sarwal, Adviser (Health), Planning Commission of India, said that the NFHS questionnaire included social categories such as caste/tribe and thus the recommendation that ministries should update their MIS and other systems of collection of data to include such information seemed to have been met by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

Ms. Sunita Sanghi, Adviser (Minorities), Planning Commission of India said in a response to **Mr. Gagan Sethi** that the Public Services Guarantees Act was functional only in 11 states. There was no corresponding Act at the Central level.

She also stated that AMA should find for itself a greater role than concurrent monitoring.

Ms. Deepika Shrivastava, OSD (WCD and Nutrition), Planning Commission of India suggested that the recommendations should be included as indicators in the Results Framework Documents.

The discussion was followed by a tabling of the Reports of the Working Groups and of Rehnuma, as well as the draft Recommendations.

Ms. Sindhushree Khullar, Secretary, Planning Commission of India proposed that the reports and recommendations be accepted. She proposed that they may be forwarded to the Planning Commission for further follow up and action. These actions may include the creation of the diversity and equity indices, as well as choosing methodologies for measurement of participation parity. Subsequently, instruments will have to be created to include them in the Results Framework Documents/ major ministry's outcomes. Also, CCPA clearance for dissemination of disaggregated data may be sought.

In conclusion, she said agreeing with Adviser (Minorities) that since each ministry was monitoring its own programmes/schemes, it would be more useful if the AMA took up 'medium-termed' and broader policy issues, rather than scheme-wise monitoring. She agreed that 'inclusiveness' remained an issue across sectors and was one of the challenges to be resolved.

The Meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

List of Members who attended the meeting

1. Dr. Syeda Hameed, Member, Planning Commission of India (Chair)
2. Mr. Soli Sorabjee, Eminent Jurist and Senior Advocate
3. Ms. Sindhushree Khullar, Secretary, Planning Commission of India
4. Dr. TCA Anant, Secretary, Chief Statistician of India & Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI)
5. Dr. Lalit Panwar, Secretary, Ministry of Minority Affairs (MoMA)
6. Mr. Shyam Kapoor, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment
7. Dr. Pratibha Kumari, Assistant Registrar General, ORG & CCI
8. Mr. H. Borah, DDG, CSO, MoSPI
9. Dr. G.M Boopathy, ADG, CSO, MoSPI
10. Dr. S. Prasad, Economic Adviser, Department of Health and Family Welfare
11. Ms. Veena Ish, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development
12. Mr. Y.P Singh, Joint Secretary, MoMA
13. Ms. Sunitha Sanghi, Adviser, Minorities, Planning Commission of India
14. Dr. Rakesh Sarwal, Adviser, Health, Planning Commission of India.
15. Mr. B.K. Pandey, Adviser, WCD, Planning Commission of India
16. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Director, Ministry of Women and Child Development
17. Ms. Roohi Siddiqui, Deputy Adviser, Minorities, Planning Commission of India
18. Mr. Ravi Chandra, Under Secretary, MoMA
19. Mr. Gopal Dass, Consultant, MoMA
20. Professor Akhtarul Wasey, Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities.
21. Mr. Gagan Sethi, Special Invitee, AMA
22. Maulana Mohammad Fazlurrahim Mujaddidi, Member, AMA
23. Mr. A.J. Philip, Member, AMA
24. Dr. SNH Rizvi, Anthropological Survey of India
25. Ms. Shahrukh Alam, Member-Secretary, AMA, Planning Commission of India
26. Ms. Deepika Shrivastava, OSD, WCD and Nutrition, Planning Commission of India.
27. Mr. Imsu Toshi, Consultant, Planning Commission of India

