

## Ministry of Culture

### Minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of Expert Committee on Museum Grant Scheme held on 14.07.2015

The 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of Expert Committee to consider applications received by the Ministry under the 'Museum Grant Scheme' was held on 14.07.2015 under the Chairmanship of Sh. K.K. Mittal, Addl. Secretary, Ministry of Culture. List of participants is enclosed at Annexure-1.

To begin with Joint Secretary (Museums) informed the Committee members that as two of the Sub-Committee members (Shri Karni Singh Jasol and Dr., A. Nagender Reddy) were unable to attend the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on the previous day, 2 other members viz. Dr. V.K. Mathur, Curator, National Museum and Shri D. Ramasarma, Director, Nehru Science Centre, New Delhi had been co-opted in the Sub-Committee for examining the proposals. Further, it was observed by the Committee that despite the fact that the format of Detailed Project Report (DPR) has been uploaded on the website of the Ministry alongwith the guidelines of the scheme and initial financial assistance is provided in deserving cases for preparation of DPR, the same (DPR) is not found to be satisfactory in most of the cases. To overcome this problem and to help the organizations with expert advice in preparation of DPRs, the Committee revised the four member Sub-Committee constituted vide O.M. No. 14-24/2014-M.I dated 3.9.2014 and included two additional members.. The Chairman of the new Sub-Committee will be Shri Sanjiv Mittal, Administrator, National Museum and Shri Sabyasachi Mukherjee, Director, CSMVS, Mumbai and Dr. B.V. Kharbade, Director In-charge, NRLC, Lucknow will be the additional members of the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee will shortlist and suggest a panel of museum professionals representing each zone for helping the organizations in preparation of DPRs and also formulate guidelines for the preparation of DPRs. Thereafter, the agenda items on the proposals received for financial assistance under the Scheme were taken up for discussion.

## **2. Discussion on the evaluation report of the Consultant**

The reports of the Evaluator alongwith report of the Sub-Committee were placed before the Expert Committee. The Expert Committee deliberated upon these reports and based on further discussion held during the meeting, the following recommendations were made in respect of the proposals under consideration.

### **2(i) G P Museum & Archives and BEG Centre, Roorkee (Project Cost: Rs. 292.00 lakhs)**

The Committee discussed the report of the Sub-Committee and the evaluation report and observed that the organization is a Defence Organization and has 2056 objects in its varied collection like oil paintings, metals, textiles, paper, wood, medals, ledger, war diaries etc. The committee examined the DPR and observed that the estimates for the civil works are not duly countersigned by the MES/Government engineer as per the provisions of the Scheme. Further, the proposal also did not mention anything about the steps taken by the museum regarding conservation/restoration of the artifacts in the museum. Besides it, the proposal also did not mention as to whether the museum has trained manpower for the works relating to conservation and storage of the artifacts. Therefore, the Committee desired that the organization may be requested to re-submit the estimates, duly countersigned by MES/Government Engineer alongwith details regarding conservation/restoration of the artifacts and availability of trained human resources in the museum. After receiving this information, the proposal will be placed before the Expert Committee in next meeting for consideration.

### **2(ii) Medi Leyi Museum at Aalo, Arunachal Pradesh (Project Cost: Rs. 500 lakhs)**

The Committee discussed the report of the Sub-Committee and the evaluation report and observed that there is no accession register and no proper documentation of the collection has been done so far. The Committee members noted that the objects



in the collection of the organization are mostly of general type and not historical, which are found in all ethnographic museums in North East Region.

The proposal was not found convincing by the Committee and hence recommended that the proposal may not be approved and papers submitted by the organization may be returned to them.

**2(iii) Punjab War Memorial-cum-Museum (PWMCM), Amritsar-Attari Road, Punjab (Project Cost: Rs. 1500 lakhs)**

The Committee members noted that the proposed museum has 220 objects as of now in their possession, which are significant as these are related to war memorial-cum-museum. The State Government has also committed to procure more objects in future. The proposal contains estimates for civil works and interiors for three galleries only. However, the estimates for documentation/conservation and curatorial aspect of the museum are not included in the proposal.

The Committee discussed the report of the Sub-Committee and evaluation report and observed that the State Government had not provided details on collections like accession, ownership, state of conservation, registration etc. of the objects. Proper documentation of the artifacts is also not provided in the proposal. The committee desired that before sanctioning the grant, State Govt. may be asked to furnish the details as to what steps will be taken for documentation/ conservation and curation of the artifacts along with a detailed plan for the same. State Govt. may also be requested to furnish the details regarding funding of the remaining 6 galleries of the proposed museum so as to enable the Committee members to get an overall idea of the entire proposed museum.

After receiving the requisite clarification, the proposal will be placed before the Expert Committee in its next meeting.

**2(iv) Sundarayya Vigana Kendram Museum, Hyderabad (Project Cost: Rs. 283.56 lakhs)**



The Committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee and evaluation report observed that the museum authorities has not provided complete list of collection, details as to how the display of the collection is proposed to be carried out alongwith the interiors/display arrangements. The proposal was not found convincing by the Committee and hence it recommended that the proposal may not be approved and papers submitted by the society may be returned to them.

**2(v) Indian Numismatic, Historical and Cultural Research Foundation, Nasik, Mumbai (Project Cost: Rs. 635.00 lakhs)**

The Committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee and evaluation report observed that the diverse collection of the museum are significant having historical and archaeological value. The Committee also noted that the institution had been established in 1984 by Dr. P.L. Gupta, a numismatic scholar and Dr. K.K. Maheshwri, an industrialist and scholar. The museum is already in existence and the financial assistance can be provided for development of museum. Keeping in view the unique and valuable collection of the museum, the Committee recommended that the proposal may be approved and grants may be released, as per norms subject to condition that the collection was held in the name of the Society.

**2 (vi) Siddhapeeth Kabirchura Math Moolgadi Trust, Kabir Chora, Varanasi. (New Museum) (Project Cost: 466.00 Lakhs)**

The Committee discussed the report of the Sub-Committee and evaluation report and observed that The DPR submitted by them does not have any plan or comprehensive vision statement and strategy for management of the Museum. The DPR mentions collection of sculptures, paintings and manuscripts but clear details about the artifacts and their accession are not found in the DPR. Also, it was seen that the major part of the estimates were for civil construction work and there was no clarity on the Registration Certificate submitted by the organization as it was unsigned. The Committee, considering all the facts, agreed to approve the proposal in-principle and desired that the museum authorities be asked to submit a detailed revised DPR containing their curatorial, conservation and human resources related plans. The Committee also recommended an amount of Rs. 5 lakhs to be paid to the organization for the preparation of the DPR.



### **3 Discussions on Complete Proposals**

#### **3(i) Natya Shodh Sansthan, Kolkata (Project Cost: Rs. 63.64 lakhs)**

The Committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee and the proposal of the organization observed that the DPR has now been counter-signed by the Government engineer and the plan drawings have been signed by registered architect. The DPR now submitted is in a single form incorporating all the required details and estimates as required under the scheme. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the proposal may be approved and grants may be released, as per norms.

#### **3(ii) Bombay High Court Museum, Mumbai (Project Cost of Rs. 79.02 lakhs)**

The Committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee observed that the collection of the Museum is quite significant and has an outstanding historic value. They have an existing museum with the building area of 2208 sq ft and the proposal submitted is for upgradation of interiors and museum display. The estimates submitted by them is duly counter-signed by a Government engineer. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the proposal may be approved and grants may be released, as per norms.

### **4. Discussion on proposals for which additional information/documents received**

#### **4(i) Research Institute of World's Ancient Traditions, Cultures Heritage (RIWATCH), Arunachal Pradesh (Project cost: Rs. 350.46 lakhs).**

The Committee was appraised that this proposal was last placed in the meeting held on 26.11.2014 where the committee of a team of officers from IGRMS, NEZCC and Anthropological Survey of India was constituted for ascertaining the originality and genuineness of the objects in possession of the organization. The team visited the site on 7-8 April 2015 and unanimously recommended for providing maximum possible financial assistance for the construction of necessary infrastructure to RIWATCH.



However, keeping in mind the limited collection of objects in possession of the organization, the Committee felt that the area of the proposed museum as contained in the DPR submitted by the organization was inordinately huge. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the organization be asked to curtail the size of its proposed building to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the proposed area for construction of the museum. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that the proposal of the organization may be approved with the project cost of Rs. 87.5 lakhs and grants to be released as per the norms of the Scheme.

**4(ii) National Art Gallery, Egmore Museum, Chennai (Project Cost: Rs. 1100.00 lakhs)**

The committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee and the evaluation report observed that the proposal of the State Government and observed that the Ministry had released Rs. 2.00 Crore as seed money to the State Government for carrying out immediate work on (i) Refurbishment of National Art Gallery and (ii) Modernization of galleries and other infrastructure, however, the State Government has utilized Rs. 1.44 Crore on their second proposal only.

The revised proposal submitted by the State Government for Refurbishment of National Art Gallery is not in proper format and also the details regarding display arrangements, such as props, lighting, security system, internal environmental control etc. are not properly defined. The committee has therefore recommended that State Govt. may be asked to first furnish the revised DPR and thereafter the proposal will be considered in next meeting of Expert Committee.

**4(iii) Maulana Azad Museum, MAKAIAS, Kolkata (Project Cost: Rs. 386.23 lakh)**

The Committee members noted that the organization is an autonomous body under the Ministry and is in possession of a significant collection of belongings of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and his family. The committee after going through the report of the Sub-Committee and the evaluation report observed that the organization

has not submitted the proposal in the proper format and also submitted their proposal under Component B of the Museum Grant Scheme which is meant <sup>for</sup> ~~of~~ large museums.

The Committee recommended that the organization may be granted Rs. 05.00 lakhs for preparation of a proper DPR by engaging a museum professional and factoring in the observations of the evaluator. After receipt of DPR, the proposal will be placed before the Expert Committee in its next meeting.

**5. Proposal received under Scheme for Digitization of Museum Collections**

**5(i) Symbiosis Society's Dr. Baba Sahib Ambedkar Museum and Memorial, Pune (Project cost: Rs. 23.50 lakhs)**

The Expert Committee examined the proposal received from Symbiosis Society's Dr. Baba Sahib Ambedkar Museum and Memorial, Pune for the purpose of digitization of their collections. The Committee noted that the organization had requested grants for procurement of hardware, website development, procurement of Jatan Museum Building Software for digitization of their collections and for digital photography. The Committee examined the details of the collections provided by the Museum and noted that this worthy collection needs to be digitized and shared online for information of the public. However, the Committee felt that since the number of objects in the collection of the organization was limited (928 objects) there was perhaps no reason to procure such a large quantity of hardware as projected in the estimate. The Committee, after careful consideration, recommended that the proposal may be approved with the project cost of Rs. 11,48,600 towards component of website development and procurement of Jatan Museum Building software by the organization and grants may be released as per norms of the scheme.

**6. During the meeting the committee has also made following observations:**

i) An Expert Committee should be constituted for monitoring of the museums covered under Museum Grant Scheme as to whether the documentation/

conservation/ restoration of artefacts are being done in a proper manner and that the staff working in these museums are properly trained or not.

ii) National Museum/ National Museum Institute/NRLC will conduct more workshop/training for the staff of the small museums of the country, covered, under Museum Grant Scheme.

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

\*\*\*\*\*





List of participants who attended the Meeting held on 14.07.2015

1. Sh. K.K. Mittal Additional Secretary : In the Chair  
Ministry of Culture
2. Sh. Pramod Jain Joint Secretary  
Ministry of Culture
3. Sh. Deepak Ashish Kaul Director, Ministry of Culture
4. Prof. Rajeev Lochan Director, National Gallery of Modern Art
5. Dr. B.V. Kharbade Director in-Charge, NRLC, Lucknow
6. Shri G. Kishan Rao Expert Member
7. Shri Sabyasachi Mukherjee Expert Member
8. Ms. Tasneem Mehta Expert Member
9. Shri Ram Pravesh Savita Director (Conservation), National Museum
10. Dr. D.N. Dimiri Director (Antiquity), Archaeological Survey of India
11. Dr. V.K. Mathur Curator, National Museum
12. Shri Rajmani Assistant Director, National Archives of India
13. Sh. Surya Kumar Pandey IGRMS, Bhopal
14. Shri S.K. Singh Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture

