

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF EXPERT COMMITTEE FOR
'SCHEME OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SETTING-UP, PROMOTION AND
STRENGTHENING OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL MUSEUMS'
HELD ON 19 FEBRUARY 2010

The fourth Meeting of the Expert Committee to consider applications under the scheme of 'Financial Assistance for Setting-up, Promotion and Strengthening of Regional and Local Museums' for the year 2009-10 was held on 19 February 2010 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. The list of participants is at **Annexure I**.

2. The Chairman welcomed the Members and Informed the members in brief about the agenda on board for the meeting. He apprised the members that in the absence of a standardized format of a DPR, containing all parameters required; it has not been possible to ensure a uniform assessment on the DPRs submitted by the applicant museums. He further stated that in order to have an appraisal mechanism in place, it has been decided to get an independent evaluation of the DPRs from a Consultant. Till today, only three of the applicants to whom the Committee had recommended to provide grant for preparation of DPR, have submitted their respective DPRs. These have been sent to the consultant for appraisal and only two appraisal reports have been received, which have been placed before the Committee for its consideration. In addition, as per decision of the committee taken in previous meetings, seven applicant museums including three state Governments have been called for making presentations about their museum projects. He then invited the members to put forward any general suggestion/proposal that can be discussed before the agenda items were taken up discussions.

3. Shri Karni Singh Jasol suggested that there may be some fixed date for receipt of applications. Shri Sabayasachi Mukherjee suggested that there Sub-Committee to scrutinize the DPRs and prepare a report. Director General, NCSM suggested that a manual should be prepared in respect of on the scheme, which should act as a guide book for any applicant how to prepare a museum project including DPR and (also fill up the application) keeping in view all parameters those are required for a Museum project.

4. Summarizing the discussions on the above, the Chairman informed that the scheme is primarily promotional in nature rather than being regulatory, and this was one the prime reasons for not fixing a cut-off date for receipt of applications. However, he mentioned that he was open to the idea and suggested that on an experimental basis we could fix June 30 and December 31 as two cut off dates for receipt of applications for the year 2010. However, this would not preclude the Ministry not processing applications prior to the last date as is being done. Since the Committee has not been able to meet as frequently as it should be, there are a large number of proposals put before the Committee. He also suggested that next financial year onwards, the Committee should endeavour to meet once in every two month (April, June, August, October, December, February), so that hon'ble Members can plan their schedules accordingly. As regards, to the suggestion for having a sub-committee, the Chairman informed that the report of the Sub-Committee, in any case,

will require to be discussed again by the full Committee since no useful purpose would perhaps be served. Members agreed to this. The chairman requested DG, NCSM to prepare a draft document on the mini manual, which he agreed. The chairman also indicated that the write up of the schemes need to be revised accordingly to include all the requirements. He also informed the Committee that due to other pressing items of legislative work in the Ministry, he may have to attend another meeting in between. He however requested the committee to deliberate upon the agenda items especially the DPRs and the applicants' museums who have been called for making presentation. He also suggested to hold another meeting in the first week of March 2010 and after seeking convenience of members, it was decided to have the meeting on 8 March 2010. Thereafter the agenda items were taken up.

5. The Chairman informed the members that out of the 3 DPRs received, appraisal report in respect of only two have been received and are placed for discussion.

5.1 The DPR submitted by Jiwajirao Scindia Museum, Gwalior was discussed vis-à-vis the evaluation report thereon. Shri Amaresh Singh, Director (museum) spelt out the report on the DPR underlying the following observations:

- a) To take a decision on to categorizing the Museum as category I or II as per the guidelines;
- b) The Museum authorities may be requested to provide details of receipts from ticketing and other sources. A sustainable model of operation is a must;
- c) The Museum authorities be requested to provide a complete list of all the treasures in the Museum (moveable and immovable) and if possible a tentative valuation of each;
- d) The basis of estimates, wherever they deal with standard items, needs to be acceptable in the Government System. The Architects appointed by the Museum authorities be requested to ensure that the estimation method is consistent with acceptable norms;

5.2 The committee deliberated upon the report and the information furnished by the Museum as also the DPR. Taking into account the fact that the palace itself can be considered to be an exhibit and the exquisite nature of the collections the museum has, committee was of the view that the Museum may be categorized as Category-I Museum. However, the Museum/Trust may be requested to submit detailed information/clarifications on the following:

- a) They must formally demonstrate the sustainability of the museum;
- b) Furnish details of movable and immovable property (including land & building). They must clarify whether the trust is in full control of the Land & Building as also the collections;
- c) Detailed audit report of the last three years;
- d) They must furnish the basis of estimates prepared by the museum has to be clearly specified especially if these were as per acceptable norms prescribed in the guidelines;

- e) The Museum be requested to provide a complete list of all the treasures in the Museum (moveable and immoveable) and if possible a tentative valuation of each;

5.3 Subject to above stipulations, the Committee recommended grant of Rs 384 lakhs out of the original proposal of Rs 480 lakhs. (80% of Rs 480 lakhs). They may be asked to accommodate all the items of work, prioritizing different components laying substantial emphasis on conservation of artefacts. (*The Committee however felt that if the Museum may still come back with proper justification for further grants in future when the recommendation could be revisited*).

5.3 The DPR submitted by Gandhi Memorial Museum, Madurai was discussed vis-a-vis the evaluation report thereon. The evaluation report has emphasized that majority of the requirement projected by the Museum is on construction and less emphasis on Museum related works. After deliberating on the issues, the Committee recommended Rs.250 lakhs under category-II as full details of collections available with the museum had not yet been furnished. The Museum may be asked to prioritize their requirements within the sanctioned amount. The above sanction may be subject to following conditions:-

- a) They must provide the accession list of all the exhibits in their possession (on production of these details, recategorization of the Museum can be reconsidered);
- b) May demonstrate sustainability;
- c) They must furnish the basis of estimates prepared and by clearly specifying, especially, if these estimates were as per acceptable norms prescribed in the guidelines;

6. Shri Vivek Singh, Secretary (tourism), Govt of Bihar made the presentation in respect of the five proposals including that of Patna Museum. The Committee appreciated the presentation and felt that with the exquisite collections the Patna Museum had in its possession, the museum indeed requires to upgrade facilities all the facilities to a modern museum. Keeping this in mind, the committee was of the opinion that proper assessment of requirement has not been made by them. The proposal was supported in principle, but Government of Bihar was requested to revisit the proposal in respect of Patna Museum, which falls under category I and two other category II museums and submit a revised proposal for consideration of the Committee in its meeting on 8.3.2010. It was decided that an amount of Rs.10.00 lakhs may be sanctioned with usual terms and conditions, for preparation of a detailed Project report (DPR). In addition, it was recommended that an amount of Rs.50.00 lakhs as seed money to undertake preliminary activities including preparation of DPRs for the museums which may be prioritized by them.

7. Shri Manoj Govil, Commissioner Archaeology, Government of MP, before making the presentation informed that out of the 19 proposals submitted for financial assistance, they have prioritized 8 proposals for which they have prepared the presentation. He made the presentation in respect of state museum Bhopal and other small museums elsewhere

in the state. The committee appreciated their intentions of upgrading and modernizing the Bhopal museum keeping in view the types of collections they have in possession. However, the committee felt that the estimation made, appears to be unrealistic in general and on a higher side in respect of security system. The committee desired them to revisit their proposal and rework the project entirely so that the due attention is given for upgrading the museum in order to bring it at par with other good museums. As regards to other two museums, namely Gujari Mahal at Gwalior and setting up of a new Museum at Sironj, the Committee felt that the estimates were unrealistic and they were also asked to rework on all these projects and resubmit for further consideration of the committee. It was decided that an amount of Rs. 1.00 crore, as seed money to undertake preliminary activities including preparation of DPRs for the 3 museums, which may be prioritized by them.

8. Shri Venu, Secretary (Culture), Government of Kerala, made presentation in respect of 4 proposals submitted for financial assistance. The Committee, while appreciating the proposals, was of the opinion that the proposals required to incorporate other elements also. Shri Venu requested the Committee to allow him to withdraw the proposals and to resubmit within next one week so that these can be placed before the Committee for consideration in its next meeting scheduled for 8 March 2010. The committee agreed. However, he was requested to submit only 3 priority proposals (one for category I and 2 category II) after necessary prioritization. It was decided that an amount of Rs. one crore, as seed money to undertake preliminary activities including preparation of DPRs for the 3 museums, which may be prioritized by them.

9. The proposal of University Museum, Indira Kala Sangeet Viswavidyalaya, Khairagarh (Chhattisgarh) was submitted before the Committee in its meeting on 3.11.09 and as per the recommendation of the Committee, the University was called for presentation. The University made a presentation on their museum project. The Committee, while appreciating the concept, desired them to rework the proposal giving the detailed break up of items of expenditure projected by them.

10. The Natural and Human Resources Development Organization (NAHRDO) made their presentation before the Committee in respect of their proposal to set up a new museum in Imphal, Manipur. The Committee observed that the Museum in its original proposal had submitted a Project cost of Rs.153.32 lakhs for construction of Museum. Now an expanded proposal has been submitted with additional items viz. Purchase of equipments, on conservation and documentation at a revised total cost of Rs.191.17 lakhs. The Committee, was not able to elicit full response from the applicants with regard to clarification sought and accordingly, recommended that fuller details may be provided by the applicant museum including a Detailed Project Report.

11. Shri Partho Ghose of Artsacre Foundation Kolkata made a presentation in respect of their proposal to create an infrastructure with multifarious activities, the Museum, Galleries, the Archives, other public area etc. The Foundation proposed for construction of ARTSACRE Museum and Arts Gallery. The concept was appreciated by the Committee. The committee was apprehensive about the source of funding and their sustenance given the fact that their total project cost is Rs 30.00 crores to be taken by them in three phases.

The Foundation has asked for assistance of Rs 5.00 crores for its first phase. The Foundation informed the Committee that they have already collected about Rs 3.00 crores and remaining shall be collected in due course. In addition, they have already planned for their sustenance. The Committee was of the opinion that given the types of collections they have, they can be categorized as Category-I museum. However, the proposal with all detailed break up may be got examined from the consultant as was done in case of other proposals discussed at para 2 above and the report placed before the Committee for further consideration.

12. Swami Atmanishthananda of Ramakrishna Mission, Khetri (Rajastan) made the presentation in respect of their proposal for setting up of Vivekananda Museum with a project cost of Rs 287.25 lakhs. The building in which they want to set up the museum carries historic value given the fact that Swami Vivekanada stayed there and started his famous journey to the US. The concept was in principle approved and the Committee recommended to sanction Rs 5.00 lakhs for preparing the DPR. The Committee also desired to ask the Mission to submit other requisite documents along with detailed Project Report.

13. The 'seed money' referred to in para 6, 7 and 8 above was recommended when the committee, during its deliberations (after presentation made by the state governments in respect of their proposals) recognizing that while concept of the proposals were good and worthy of support, the information submitted by them needed further elaboration. In addition, since all the three states had multiple proposals, the committee emphasized the need for prioritizing of the museum proposals and submission of the revised proposals with fuller details to enable the committee to decide on the quantum of assistance that could be supported/ recommended. However, since the museums need assistance to cater to immediate emergent work, an amount as 'Seed Money' was recommended, subject to following conditions:

- a) that the seed money will be in the nature of an on-account payment in respect of the proposals to be prioritized by the State Government to undertake immediate emergent work and preparation of Detailed Project Report for the Museums requiring assistance;
- b) That the amount shall be adjusted from the overall grant sanctioned to the museums of the state;
- c) That the amount shall be reimbursable, in the event of any remaining unadjusted or unutilized.

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

Annexure I

List of Participants

- 1 Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. In Chair.
- 2 Dr. Gautam Sengupta, Director General, ASI.
- 3 Prof. Kishore K. Basa, Director, Indian Museum.
- 4 Shri G S Rautela, DG, NCSM
- 5 Dr. M.V. Nair, Director, NRLC.
- 6 S M R Baqar, DG(i/c), NAI
- 7 Shri Sadasiv Gorakshkar, Expert Member
- 8 Prof. C. Chenna Reddy, Director, D/o Arch. & Museum, AP
- 9 Shri Sabyasachi Mukherji, Director, CSMVS
- 10 Shri Karni S. Jasol, Director, Mehrangarh Museum.
- 11 Shri O P Aggrawal, DG, INTACH-ICCI, Lucknow.
- 12 Shri Amaresh Singh, Director, Ministry of Culture.
- 13 Shri N.P. Joshi, Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture.