

**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 30 July 2009.**

\*\*\*\*\*

The first meeting of the Expert Committee to consider applications submitted 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 30 July 2009 under the chairmanship of Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. A list of participants is enclosed at Annexure 1.

2. At the outset, Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary and Chairman of the Committee welcomed the members to the first meeting of the reconstituted Committee and briefed them about the role of the Committee. He stated that the Scheme for Financial Assistance for Promotion and Strengthening of the Regional and Local Museums was instituted in early nineties and had recently been revised (in 2008) to provide for inclusion of financial assistance for setting up new museum within the scope of the Scheme. The quantum of financial assistance had also been enhanced substantially, with the result that the applications now being received have many more elements and complexities. Acknowledging the presence of expertise and experience regarding management of museums available on the Committee, he invited the members to deliberate upon the applications in keeping with the objectives of the Scheme to strengthen the museum movement in the country. He further stated that a copy of the write up on the Scheme had been sent to the members along with the agenda papers and that it was necessary, in the beginning, to deliberate upon the adequacy of the procedures to appraise / examine the applications, taking into account the fact that the financial assistance under the Scheme was envisaged as a one-time non-recurring grant and that the applicant museum must possess a viable long term plan for meeting its recurring expenditure.

3. Emphasizing the need of a proper appraisal of the applications, somewhat akin to that undertaken by financial institutions, he stated that the Committee would need to meet at least 3-4 times a year, both to consider new applications and to monitor progress made in the previously sanctioned grants. He then invited the members to make suggestions regarding the Scheme and the various procedures / mechanisms envisaged therein.

4. Shri Yogendra Narain (INTACH) stated that the Scheme envisages that the plans / estimates for renovation / repair, extension and other related works should be made through PWD for Government managed museums and by registered architects in respect of museums managed by NGOs, etc. He wished to know whether the estimates prepared by INTACH would be acceptable for the purposes of the Scheme. He opined that a number of museums run in heritage buildings and renovation / repair of such heritage buildings should be in the hands of heritage architects / experts. He further suggested that requests for establishment of conservation laboratories and

implementation of conservation projects must be accompanied by details of experts engaged by the applicant museum.

5. Shri S. Mukherjee (CSMVS) stated that the write up of the Scheme requires to be clearer in terms of eligibility of the museums to apply for financial assistance, particularly in relation to museums run by Registered Society established by the Government.

6. Dr. K.K. Basa (Indian Museum) suggested that the mechanism of appraisal should be based on financial criteria and that there should be an equitable geographical distribution among museums of different regions in grant of financial assistance.

7. Shri Karni Singh Jasol (Mehrangarh Museum) stated that, this being one time grant, full details of the proposal should be made available by the applicant museum including the business plan to indicate how the museum plans to sustain itself over a period of time. He also desired that the progress made by grantee institutions should be monitored over time to ensure proper utilization of funds.

8. Dr. M.V. Nair (NRLC) stated that the second and subsequent installments of funds to grantee institution should be subject to a report based on an inspection by experts deputed for the purpose. He also supported the suggestion that details of experts responsible for implementation of conservation projects must be made by the applicant museums.

9. The chairman thanked the members for their valuable suggestions and stated that these suggestions would be kept in view in revising the write up of the Scheme for better clarity. He then proceeded to seek the views of various members on the installment plan envisaged in the Scheme, particularly in relation to newer organizations that did not have a previous record of working with the Ministry of Culture. He stated that the Government did not wish to squeeze the cash flow available with the museum to undertake the task of setting up or strengthening of the museums, but it was necessary at the same time, to ensure that excessive amount of money is not released at one go.

10. Shri N.C. Goel (National Museum) opined that in the present day world the grant of Rs. 6 crore was not really a big amount and that it was split in 3 installments in any case. Sharing his experience about grants given to beneficiaries under other schemes of the Ministry, he stated that the Government should even consider granting the entire amount in one installment. Several other members, however, reiterated their views relating to monitoring to progress and release of subsequent installments based on satisfactory performance.

11. Summing up the discussion on the point, the Chairman stated that the applicant museums may be advised to furnish a quarterly cash flow statement along with the concomitant physical achievements, in order that monitoring of

progress was possible while maintaining release of adequate funds to the applicant museums throughout the period of implementation.

12. Coming to the consideration of applications received for grant of financial assistance, the Chairman informed the Committee that a total of 47 applications had been received so far for assistance in the current financial year and each of them had been accorded a distinct registration number. Twelve of these applications envisaged setting up of new museums and the remaining 35 are for upgradation / strengthening of existing museums. Of the 14 applications that have adequate details for consideration by the Committee, 6 applicants (11 proposals) have been called for presentation.

### **Presentations**

13. The Principle Secretary, Department of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Punjab made a presentation for the following 4 proposals submitted by them, for which seed money of Rs.150 lakhs has been sanctioned during 2008-09.

| S.No. | Name of the Museum   | Cost of the Project (Rs. In lakhs) |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|
| 1.    | Sheesh Mahal Museum, Patiala, Punjab                           | 314.37                             |
| 2.    | Maharaja Ranjit Singh (Summer Palace Museum), Amritsar, Punjab | 256.04                             |
| 3.    | Archaeological Museum, Sanghol, Punjab                         | 140.04                             |
| 4.    | Anglo-Sikh War Memorial Ferozeshah, Punjab                     | 33.56                              |

On being asked to priorities the museums she informed that all projects were important for them. However, later she requested to drop the Sheesh Mahal Project for which they would submit a comprehensive proposal later.

14. Director, Department of Archaeology and Museum , Government of Rajasthan made presentation for 3 museums that they have prioritized for the grant:

| S.No. | Name of the Museum                       | Cost of the Project (Rs. In lakhs) |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|
| 1.    | Government Museum, Baran<br>(new Museum) | 600.00                             |
| 2.    | Government Museum, Bharatpur             | 495.64                             |
| 3.    | Government Museum, Mandore               | 500.00                             |

Government of Rajasthan had been sanctioned Rs.100.00 lakhs as seed money for the proposals they have submitted during 2008-09 and were asked to priorities 2-3 Museums for consideration of the Committee.

15. Divisional Mechanical Engineer, Mysore Rail Division presented the case for Mysore Rail Museum. The Museum has been given a seed money of Rs.50.00 lakhs during 2008-09.

16. Museum of History and Endangered Trees, Chandigarh (Project cost Rs.195.00 lakhs).

Shri D.S. Jaspal, President, Chandigarh Nature and Health Society, made the presentation in respect of above Museum. He claimed that their venture is a unique one and Botanical Survey of India is already associated with them. Since the project also involves research in respect of endangered trees it would be more appropriate for their organization to be supported by Govt. of India to bring scope of the project.

17. H.H. Maharaja Sir Jiwajirao Scindia Museum, Gwalior (Project cost Rs.540.00 lakhs).

Ms. Bindu Manchanda, Trustee of the Museum made the presentation for the Museum.

18. Shri Shasi Mohan, Member of the Society of Guru Gopinath National Dance Museum made the presentation in respect of their Museum. It is mentioned that seed money of Rs.75.00 lakhs has been provided.

19. The Committee deliberated upon the merits of the 11 proposals presented before it by six above mentioned parties. It was noted that all the presentations largely restricted themselves to information on concept of the museum. Fuller details about items of work, cost estimates including breakup of costs, cash flow details, etc. were not made available. On specific questions being asked, presenters were not able provide specific details and gave only general information. It was also noted that in most of the proposals a substantial proportion of the budget cost was meant for building works (civil, electrical, etc.) and it was necessary that a Detailed Project Report (DPR) in respect of each proposal must be sought in order to undertake a proper appraisal of the individual items of expenditure and their desirability. Since the DPRs submitted by various applicants need to be in a common format it was felt necessary to develop guidelines for preparation / scope of DPR which could then be circulated to all the applicant museums. The following decisions were taken in this regard:

- i) Shri S. Mukherjee (CSMVS) and Shri K.S. Jasol (Mehrangarh Museum), Members of the Expert Committee, were requested to

- prepare a document containing the scope of Detailed Project Report (DPR) that may be provided to the applicant museums along with guidelines for preparation of the document. Formats of cash flow statements containing both financial and physical parameters may also be similarly developed and circulated to the applicants.
- ii) All applicant museums may be advised to submit a DPR and a quarterly / half-yearly cash flow statement indicating items of work to be taken up in each quarter and the financial implication thereof in order for the Committee to assess the genuine requirement of financial assistance and its release in prescribed installments.
  - iii) It was decided that in view of the substantial cost of preparing a DPR document, all such applicant museums whose concept is considered acceptable by the Committee, may be sanctioned an amount up to 10% of the project cost with a ceiling of Rs. 30 lakhs for the purpose of preparing a DPR. It must, however, be made clear to the applicant museums that this amount will be subsumed in the total project cost and not treated as a separate item of work.
  - iv) In respect of museums / organizations where seed money had been sanctioned during 2008-09, any further release of funds for the purpose of DPR preparation shall be considered only in the event that the seed money has been accounted for.

20. Based on the above general decisions taken by the Committee, and further deliberations relating to some of the specific cases, the Committee decided to recommend release of the following amounts of money subject to the conditions mentioned against each proposal:

- i) Maharaja Ranjit Singh (Summer Palace Museum), Amritsar, Punjab. (Project Cost Rs. 256.04 lakhs):

An amount of Rs. 25 lakhs was recommended for sanction for preparation of DPR to be adjusted from the seed money of Rs. 150 lakhs sanctioned during 2008-09. The sanction will, however, be subject to the stipulation contained in Para 19(iii) and Para 19(iv) above.

- ii) Archaeological Museum, Sanghol, Punjab (Project Cost Rs. 140.04 lakhs).

The application contains details of project cost of Rs. 110 lakhs whereas the State Government has recommended the project cost at Rs. 140 lakhs. As per the scheme, 80% of Rs. 110 lakhs (i.e. Rs. 88 lakhs ) can be sanctioned for this project, which the Committee recommended. The amount is to be adjusted from the seed money of Rs. 150 lakhs sanctioned during 2008-09.

- iii) Anglo-Sikh War Memorial Ferozeshah, Punjab. (Project Cost Rs. 33.56 lakhs)

The project was recommended for approval with 80% of Rs. 33.56 lakhs (i.e. Rs. 26.84 lakhs) to be adjusted from Rs. 150 lakhs sanctioned during 2008-09.

- iv) Sheesh Mahal Museum, Patiala, Punjab. (Project Cost Rs. 314.37 lakhs)  
This project was withdrawn by Principal Secretary (Culture), Government of Punjab, after the meeting.
- v) Government Museum, Baran. (Project Cost Rs. 600.00 lakhs).  
The Committee recommended sanction of Rs. 30 lakhs as seed money for development of DPR subject to stipulation contained in Paragraph 19 (iii) and 19 (iv) above. Accordingly, the amount was recommended to be adjusted from Rs. 100 lakhs sanctioned as seed money during 2008-09.
- vi) Government Museum, Bharatpur. (Project Cost Rs. 495.64 lakhs).  
The Committee recommended sanction of Rs. 30 lakhs as seed money for development of DPR subject to stipulation contained in Paragraph 19 (iii) and 19 (iv) above. Accordingly, the amount was recommended to be adjusted from Rs. 100 lakhs sanctioned as seed money during 2008-09.
- vii) Government Museum, Mandore. (Project Cost of Rs. 500.00 lakhs)  
The Committee recommended sanction of Rs. 30 lakhs as seed money for development of DPR subject to stipulation contained in Paragraph 19 (iii) and 19 (iv) above. Accordingly, the amount was recommended to be adjusted from Rs. 100 lakhs sanctioned as seed money during 2008-09.
- viii) Mysore Rail Museum (Project Cost Rs. 250.00 lakhs).  
The Committee recommended sanction of Rs. 25 lakhs as seed money for development of DPR subject to stipulation contained in Paragraph 19 (iii) and 19 (iv) above. Accordingly, the amount was recommended to be adjusted from Rs. 50 lakhs sanctioned as seed money during 2008-09.
- ix) Museum of History and Endangered Trees, Chandigarh (Total Project Cost Rs. 195.00 lakhs, financial assistance sought : Rs. 96.70 lakhs)

The Society has sought a financial assistance of Rs. 96.70 lakhs for the purpose of starting a conservation laboratory with facilities for genetic finger printing and clonal propagation technology, in association with the Botanical Survey of India. The Committee recommended that in view of the uniqueness of the project and its desirability under the Scheme, the non-recurring amount of Rs. 69.40 lakhs may be considered for sanction subject to submission of an Memorandum of Understanding between the

Society and Botanical Survey of India with full details of deliverables, time spans and accountability procedures.

- x) H.H. Maharaja Sir Jiwajirao Scindia Museum, Gwalior (Project Cost Rs. 540.00 lakhs).

It was mentioned during the presentation that a Detailed Project Report had already been prepared but subsequently a letter was received stating that this was yet to be done. Since a DPR is necessarily required, sanction of Rs. 30 lakhs as seed money to be used for preparation of DPR can be recommended for sanction subject to stipulation contained in Para 19 (iii) and 19 (iv) above.

- xi) Guru Gopinath National Dance Museum (Project Cost Rs. 7 crores).

The Committee recommended sanction of Rs. 30 lakhs as seed money for preparation of the DPR, to be adjusted from seed money of Rs. 75 lakhs sanctioned during 2008-09 subject to stipulation contained in Para 19 (iii) and 19(iv) above.

21. Other applications for financial assistance could not be considered for want of time. It was, however, decided that these applicants may also be advised to submit DPRs. It was decided to hold the next meeting of the Committee in 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> week of September 2009. (date to be communicated separately).

## Annexure I

### List of Participants

1. Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. In Chair.
2. Shri N.C. Goel, Director General, National Museum.
3. Dr. B.R. Mani, Joint Director General, Archaeological Survey of India.
4. Prof. Kishore K. Basa, Director, Indian Museum.
5. Dr. M.V. Nair, Director, NRLC.
6. Dr. A.N. Reddy, Director, Salar Jung Museum.
7. Dr. Jayanta Sthanapati, Deputy Director General, NCSM,.
8. Shri P.R. Meena, Deputy Adviser, Planning Commission,.
9. Prof. C. Chenna Reddy, Director, Department of Archaeology and Museum, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh.
10. Shri Sabyasachi Mukherji, Director, Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Vastu Sangrahalaya.
11. Shri Karni S. Jasol, Director, Mehrangarh Museum.
12. Shri Yogendra Narain, Member Secretary, INTACH.
13. Dr. Meenakshi Jolly, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Culture.
14. Shri N.P. Joshi, Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture.