

Minutes of the tenth Meeting of Expert Committee for the scheme of “Financial assistance for setting up , promotion and strengthening of regional and national museums” held on 5.8. 2011

The tenth 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’ was held on 5 Aug 2011 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 to the meeting and invited them to raise any general issue before the agenda items are taken up. The following general issues were raised/discussed during the course of deliberation on the agenda items:-

- (i) The DPR format that has now been prepared with inputs from the independent evaluators, may be uploaded on the website of the Ministry to provide clarity to prospective applicants;
- (ii) The write up of the scheme may be suitably amended by incorporating the various recommendations/suggestions made by the Committee in its previous meetings and processed for approval of IFD and Secretary, in order to adopt the modifications;
- (iii) It was felt that a panel of consultants whose services could be engaged by applicants for preparation of application/DPR of applicant museums may be drawn so that the DPRs can be prepared professionally and in proper format. Accordingly, it was desired that an EOI may be called for from professionals in the field. It was also noted that a maximum amount of fee may need to be prescribed in order that rent seeking behaviour is prevented. Such panels could be drawn region-wise.
- (iv) DG, NCSM informed that they already have a panel of about 22 architects for similar works in all their zones and it was agreed that the NCSM panels may be utilized for the purpose until the EOI and selection process above mentioned is completed.
- (v) In order to save time on examination of proposals it was decided that in future the sub-committee would meet about 3 weeks before the Expert Committee Meeting. Presentations would be restricted to those organizations who are selected by the sub-committee.

3. The agenda items were than taken up for discussion and decisions taken as under:

3.1 Discussion on the evaluation report on the DPR of Purvasa Museum by Society for Development of Rural Literature, Orissa (Project cost: Rs.426 lakhs).

The Committee noted the evaluation of the consultant on the revised DPR submitted by the Society and the report of the sub-committee. The committee recommended the proposal for sanction of financial assistance of Rs. 300 lakhs, the maximum admissible for a category II museum (which is less than 80 % of their project cost of Rs 426 lakhs). As per the earlier decision, the committee recommended for release of Rs. 180 lakhs (60% of Rs 300 lakhs) as this is for construction of a new museum.

3.2 Discussion on those museums made presentation/additional information called for from them and received.

3.2.1 Arts Acre Foundation Arts Acre Museum & Art Gallery, Salt Lake, Kolkata (Project cost: Rs.30.00 crores)

It was noted that this proposal had earlier been discussed by the Committee in several meetings and the organization was asked to furnish additional information including proof of ownership of the land, recommendation of the State Govt, details of ownership of collections etc. The foundation has submitted some of the requisite report/documents. However, the Committee observed that the applicant has not been able to properly demonstrate arrangement for their collections, which are based merely on pledges of temporary loan from owners. It was also observed that the project (proposed to be implemented in 3 phases) entails estimated expenditure of about Rs.30 crores and that they have sought financial assistance for 1st phase with project cost of Rs.10 crores, but they have not indicated the source of their matching share.

The Committee also took note of photographs submitted by the Trust on the progress of work of construction so far. It was observed that though the Trust has not been able to mention anything about the possible financial support from other sources for the project, it stands to reason that any offer of Central Govt's support will be an important factor to obtaining funding from other private sources. After due deliberation and taking note of the credential of the Managing Trustee Dr. Subhapasannna, as a renowned artist, the Committee recommended to convey an in principle approval to the Trust for their proposal as a category II museum with a maximum financial assistance of Rs.300 lakh. However, the releases to the organization shall be made only after

they demonstrate the funding Plan for their entire project. The Foundation may also be asked to submit following information:-

- (i) The Trust must demonstrate that the collections proposed to acquire on loan from owners, are in the form of an agreement having legal binding. Accordingly, they should enter into agreement with owners of art works for short term/medium term/long term loan having an unfettered minimum fixed period for these to be displayed in the proposed museum;
- (ii) Based on above, the trust must demonstrate the details of collections viz. the number of art works owned by them as well as the total number to be obtained in loan through legally acceptable agreements etc;
- (iii) They must provide the sustainability Plan for the museum;
- (iv) In order to obtain full clarity of land ownership issues, the Ministry may check directly from the Irrigation Department, Govt. of West Bengal about non-encumbrance of the land in possession of the Trust for construction of the museum.

The Committee recommended that it may be made clear to the Trust that it has been categorized as category II museum based on 28 art works owned by the Trust and 201 other works in respect of which letter of intent of loan were submitted. But keeping in view the capability of Dr. Subhprasanna to collect more art works on its own or through loans, the Committee can consider their claim to be upgraded as category I upon submission of additional information. The applicant institution may be called to put forth its case before the Committee, if it so desires.

3.2.2 The City Palace Museum, Maharana of Mewar Charitabe Foundation, Udaipur, Rajasthan (Project cost: Rs.25.00 crores).

The Committee noted that as was desired by the Committee during the their presentation about the proposal on 4.5.2011, the Foundation has submitted a revised DPR containing all item of expenditure being undertaken by them having a total project cost of about Rs 25 crores. They have sought assistance of Rs 6.88 crores and that the remaining amounts are being met by themselves through other sources including internal resources. The Committee desired the updated DPR to be sent for evaluation.

3.3 Discussion on other proposals

3.3.1 Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Museum & Memorial by Symbiosis Society' Pune. (Project cost: Rs. 17.00 lacs)

The Committee noted that the applicant museum, though an important one, has submitted a rather conservative proposal. Dr. A N Reddy, Director SJM apprised the Committee about an exhibition organized by his museum in collaboration with the organization which provided him an occasion to visit this museum. He informed that the institution has many valuable collections including some personal belongings of Dr. Ambedkar. Taking note of this, the Committee felt that the organization has to revisit their proposal and resubmit it with a realistic assessment. It was decided that Dr. S. Mukherjee, Director, CSMVS may be requested to visit the museum to mentor them about the scheme and that the expenses of the visit of Dr. Mukherjee may be funded by the Ministry under the scheme. Pending this, the Committee recommended for sanction of Rs.4.50 lacs asked for by the museums for publication and equipments.

4. Discussion on other proposals

4.1 Proposals from Government of Andhra Pradesh:

- i) Padma Sree Kalluri Subha Rao, Ananthapur. (Project cost: Rs.4.88 cr.)
- ii) Gandhi Centenary Museum, Karimnagar.(project cost: Rs.6.03 cr)
- iii) Bhuvana Vijayam (National Museum on Vijayanagara Heritage), Ananthapur. (Project cost: Rs.15.57 crores)

Professor P. Chenna Reddy, Member informed the Committee that besides these 3 proposals, Andhra Pradesh Tourism has also apparently sent one or two other proposals. The Committee noted that all these proposals were incomplete and recommended that the applicants may be asked to submit complete proposals with fuller documentation. The Committee desired the Govt. of A.P may also be requested to prioritize 3 proposals including those from A.P tourism (one category I and two Category II) and make a presentation before the Committee in respect of those prioritized proposals. The Committee recommended a seed money of Rs. 100 lacs to enable them to prepare DPRs for each of the 3 prioritized proposals and to carry out any immediate emergent work.

**4.2 Foundation for Preservation of Himalayan Arts & Culture, Kangra,H.P
(Project cost: Rs.3.77 Cr.)**

The Committee observed that the organization has been registered only in 2011 which does not meet the criterion of against minimum requirement of 3 years in existence. Moreover, they have also not furnished details of their collections. As such, the proposal cannot be considered at this stage.

**4.3 Museum of Vernacular Architecture and Building Traditions, Nawapind,
Gurdaspur, Punjab,The Lime Centre, Delhi (Project cost: Rs.10.62 Cr.)**

The Committee observed that the proposal submitted by the institution is unique in many respects and that the DPR submitted by the organization appeared to be complete. Hence, it was desired that the DPR may be sent for evaluation. The organization may also be called to make a presentation at the next meeting.

**4.4 DhoroHar Haryana Museum,University of Kurukshetra, Haryana
(Project cost: Rs3.51 Cr.)**

The Committee appreciated the proposal but noted that the organization need to make a proper DPR in respect of their proposal. The Committee recommended an amount of Rs. 7.00 lacs for preparation of DPR. In addition, acknowledging the immediate attention on conservation work of their collections, the committee also recommended Rs. 15.00 lacs in order to enable the organization the carryout the work.

5. Virtual Museums

Since the proposal for setting up/creation of Virtual Museums is a new concept under this scheme, the two organisations who have submitted the proposals were requested to brief the committee on their respective proposal through a Power Point Presentation.

**5.1 Khoj International Artists Association, Delhi
(Project cost: Rs.2.50crores)**

Ms Pooja Sood presented before the Committee about their proposal of a virtual museum. The Committee appreciated the proposal, desired the organisation to spell out their item-wise requirement in the form of DPR. It was made clear to them that the scheme provides for only a one time non-recurring grant. The

Committee recommended an amount of Rs. 7 lakh to enable them to prepare a DPR.

**5.2 Centre for Art & Archaeology, Gurgaon, Haryana
(Project cost: Rs. 5.00 crores)**

Dr. Pradeep Mehendiratta made a presentation about their proposal of a web-based Virtual Museum named 'Museum of Sound and Images'. The Committee desired the organization to submit a revised DPR with item-wise budget allocation. It was made clear to them that no recurring cost be included in the DPR as those are not admissible under this scheme. The Committee recommended an amount of Rs.7 lakh to enable them to prepare a DPR.

5.3 The Committee deliberated upon the two proposals received for establishment of virtual museums. The following points need to be kept in mind for such web based museums:-

- (i) A minimum length of time be fixed for these organization to be on web, if Grant in Aid were given for this purpose;
- (ii) Copyright of all the software developed must be jointly owned with Ministry of Culture, which can be used elsewhere with different content;
- (iii) The applicant museums should be open to sharing of technology;
- (iv) All museums supported under this scheme, should have an access to the technology.

It was recommended that the above conditions may be brought to the notice of the applicant museums, while releasing funds for preparation of DPRs. Further, Dr. G.S. Rautela, DG, NCSM was requested to prepare a set of guideline of technical safety/security etc. and Dos and Don'ts' to be adopted for such web-based museums.

6. Museums called for Presentation.

**6.1 Museum at Vidhan Sabha Bhawan, Town Hall, Jaipur Govt. of Rajasthan
(Project cost: Rs.44.98)**

Ms. Anju Rajpal, Director (Art & Arch) made presentation about the ambitious Project of Govt. of Rajasthan. The Committee desired to know from them the source of funding of about Rs.45 crore project of which Govt. of India can at best

grant Rs. 6.00 crores. They were asked to submit the detail break up of funding promised by Govt. of Rajasthan and the Planning Commission for the project. This information may be submitted along with a DPR for the project.

6.2 The Public Museum, Jiribam, Manipur (project cost: Rs.2.70 Cr.)

Shri K. Anand Kumar Singh made presentation about the proposal. Though he was not able to articulate properly about the proposal, the Committee was of the view that an opportunity may be given to the applicant museum to resubmit a fresh proposal with realistic assessment of their requirement. Since the organization desired to have publication of a catalogue in English and Manipuri language, the committee recommended for Rs.5.00 lac for documentation and publication. The catalogue so published must have full listing of their objects with at least 10% of photographic evidence therein.

**6.3 Jawahar Bal Bhawan, Thrissur, Kerala
(Project cost: Rs.1.13 Cr.)**

Shri C.R.Das made a presentation about the proposal. The Committee observed that the applicants do not seem to have an idea of a museum nor do they have any collection worth a name. As such, this proposal cannot be supported in the present format and was accordingly rejected.

**6.4 Agape Christian museum Centre, Churachandpur, Manipur
(Project cost: Rs.3.28 Cr.)**

Dr. L. Haokip made a presentation about the proposal. The Committee felt that though some of the collections appear to be of high value, this proposal cannot be supported in the present format as it is only construction based and the details of even the basic curatorial practice appear to be defective. Moreover, they have not prepared the estimates as per existing DSR rate. The committee desired that the organization be asked to reassess their requirement and submit a revised proposal including elements such as digitization, documentation and publication.

**6.5 Academy of Fine Art and Literature (AFAL), Delhi
(Project cost: 2.44 crores)**

Ms. Arpana Kaur made the presentation in respect of AFAL proposal. The Committee appreciated their collection and the philanthropic work being

undertaken by the Academy. The report of the Sub Committee on the evaluation report was also noted. It was suggested that the various observations made by the independent evaluator may be intimated to AFAL for seeking their comments thereon. They also need to reassess the conservation work afresh in consultation with NRLC. They should also start the accessioning work right away. The DPR may be revised as per the DSR rates and it must also include all aspects touching upon the observations made by the consultant. In the meantime, the Committee recommended that an amount of Rs.27 lakh (Rs. 7 lakh for publication, Rs.10.00 lakh for conservation, Rs. 10 lakh for documentation) to attend to immediate work.

6.7 Sri Kanakadasa Museum and Art Gallery, Kaginele Development Authority, Kaginele, Kanrataka (Project cost: Rs.2.37 Crores)

Shri Ravanappa made presentation about that proposal. The Committee noted that they have a plan to construct the building first and then start the process of thinking of collection. They do not seem to have any collection at present with them to show that they need to set up a museum. The Committee asked them to come back with a fresh proposal with details of collections and a proper curatorial concept for establishing a museum. It was noted that the proposal cannot be accepted in its present state.

6.8 Mahatma Gandhi Antarrastriya Hindi Vishwavidyalay Wardha, Maharashtra (Project cost: Rs.6.00 crores)

Dr. Nishith Rai made a presentation about the proposal. The Committee appreciated the idea embarked upon by the University. But it was observed that they do not have any collection worth the name, that could be housed in a museum building proposed by them. They should first think of collecting the objects and then for housing them. They may perhaps narrow the proposal down to only tribal culture rather than enlarging the scope. The space has to be determined only accordance with the to the number of collections and not the other way round. The Committee recommended that the applicant museum must first concentrate on collection of objects and then come back to the Ministry with a fresh proposal. It was noted that the proposal cannot be accepted in its present state.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the chair.

List of Participants

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. Dr. Vijay S. Madan, | Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | In Chair |
| 2. Dr. G.S.Rautela | DG, NCSM | |
| 3. Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul | Director(Museum), Ministry of Culture | |
| 4. Dr. B.V. Kharbade, | Director in charge, NRLC | |
| 5. Dr. A. N Reddy, | Director, Salar Jung Museum | |
| 6. Anup K. Matilal | Acting Director, Indian Museum | |
| 7. Ms. Urmila Sant | Director (Museum), ASI | |
| 8. Shri Shiv Sing Meena | Deputy Advisor, Planning Commission | |
| 9. Dr. Meena Gautam | Dy. Director ,(represented DG, NAI) | |
| 10. Dr. Sabyasachi Mukherjee | Director, CSMVS | |
| 11. Shri Karni Singh Jasol, | Director, Mehrangarh Museum, Jodhpur | |
| 12. Shri P. Chenna Reddy | Director, Deptt. Of Archaeology & Museums, Govt. of A.P | |
| 13. Shri N.P. Joshi, | Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | |