

**Minutes of the eleventh meeting of Expert Committee for the Scheme of
“Financial assistance for setting up , promotion and strengthening of
regional and national museums” held on 25.11. 2011 and 09.12.2011**

The 11th 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 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Vijay S. Madan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture on 25 November and 9 December 2011. The list of participants for the first part of the meeting held on 25 November is at Annexure I-A and the list of participants for the second part of the meeting held on 9 December is at Annexure I-B.

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed the Members and stated that in addition to the Agenda (which was already quite substantial) a presentation on the Google Art Project had been included in order to discuss various issues relating to the latest ICT technologies being deployed in the world of Museums. The presentation, made by a representative of the Google was rather informative and a number of clarifications/ explanations sought by various Members were provided. During the discussion that followed the presentation, the Chairman informed the Committee of the participation of National Museum and National Gallery of Modern Art in the Google Art Project and stated that it is likely to become a universal benchmark for the material uploaded by various Museums on the internet, and a possible platform for establishment of Virtual Museums. He further stated that all museums including those represented by various Members of the Committee, should be encouraged to upgrade their presence on the internet along these lines.

3. In informing the Committee regarding the feedback received by the Ministry from different sources, the Chairman stated that while the impression in the field regarding functioning of the Committee was generally positive, a number of observations regarding the slow pace of decision-making had also been made. During the discussions that followed, it was noted that the Committee had taken a conscious decision to work with the applicant museums for improvement of the proposals until they reached a level of acceptable standard, rather than rejecting the proposals that did not meet such standards. Such exercises had possibly been interpreted by various observers as too time-consuming. In this connection a number of general recommendations were made by the Committee, as under:

- (i) All applicant museums, who have been given some financial assistance for preparation of DPRs but have not submitted the DPRs even after a period of six months or more, may be given one last chance to submit DPR within 30

- days from the date of issue of the letter. If the applicant museums still do not respond, the assistance released for DPR may be recalled.
- (ii) In future, the applicant museums may be given a period of 60 days for preparation of the DPR from the date of release of financial assistance. In the event that the DPR is deficient, the applicant museum may be given one, or maximum two, chances to improve the project. If the project still does not reach and acceptable standards, it may be recommended for rejection. Any subsequent proposal (or revised proposal) may be treated as a fresh application.
 - (iii) The format for preparation of DPR and a set of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), may be uploaded on the official website of the Ministry of Culture, for guidance and assistance of applicant museums.
 - (iv) Allotment of registration number and processing of allocations may be initiated, even if one or two documents, as required under the Scheme write-up, are not included. The applicant museums must, however, be informed clearly of the time-frame within which the remaining documents should be submitted and if these time-frames are not adhered to by the applicant museums, the applications may be recommended for rejection.
 - (v) The Committee recommended that the condition relating to the applicant organization having been in existence for at least three years may not be insisted upon if the collection in the possession of the applicant was of a high quality and the applicant has demonstrated possession of adequate finances to meet its own obligations (20% of the project cost).

After the general discussions the agenda items were taken up one after the other.

4. Discussion on Valuation Reports submitted by the independent Consultant on various DPRs

Reports of the Sub-Committees dated 24.11.2011 and 08.12.2011 were placed before the Committee. These Reports are attached at Annexure II and III. Based on these Reports and further discussions held during the meeting, the following decisions were taken:

4.1 Nourhe Society, Kohima, Nagaland (Project cost: Rs. 273.84 lakh)

The Committee deliberated upon the appraisal report on the DPR submitted by the society and the observations of the sub-Committee. It was noted that the DPR has

not been prepared based on realistic assessment, as such, it was desired the society be asked to rework their DPR. The observations of the consultant may be conveyed to the organization to enable them to address the issues raised.

4.2 Asan Museum and Kavyagramam, Kaikara, Kerala (Project cost: Rs.766.70 lakh)

The Committee deliberated upon the report the consultant as also the observations of the sub-Committee and its earlier deliberation on the proposal. The Committee was of the view that the proposal of the organization, though revised cost-wise, but no perceptible change appears to have been done on the concept of the museum. The proposal is more of a memorial and cultural complex than a museum. It does not fit into the museum scheme altogether. The proposal may be best considered under the recently launched MPCC/TCC Scheme. As such, the Committee recommended forwarding the proposal to the concerned division in the Ministry to be considered under the relevant scheme.

4.3 Sir J C Bose Trust, Kolkata (Project cost: Rs. 698.75 lacs)

The report of the sub-Committee on the appraisal of the DPR was discussed at length. The Committee accepted the recommendation of Sub-Committee to treat the museum managed by J.C.Bose Trust to be a category-I Museum, based on the importance of the collections in possession. The Committee observed that the trust does not appear to have been consulted NCSM/ASI as was asked to them earlier. The Committee desired that the trust be asked to consult NRLC for conservation purposes, ASI for restoration and NCSM to plan science museum. These consultations would, of course, be for technical cooperation. The Committee observed that the Trust has included certain items of expenditure (about Rs. 80 lakh approximately) which are recurring in nature as also that the estimate on security component appeared to be on higher side. But since the museum is being categorized as Category I, and that maximum admissible grant is Rs.500 lakh, which is less than the 80% of the project cost, the Trust may be requested to provide the sustainability plan to meet the remaining amount of the project cost. The Committee recommended for according in principal approval for a category I Museum. However, pending clarifications from the Trust on the above, the Committee recommended for release of seed money of Rs. 50.00 lakh to enable the trust to carry out conservation and other emergent works.

4.4 Madras Craft Foundation, Chennai. (Project cost: Rs.260.74 lakh)

The Committee deliberated upon the observations of the sub-Committee and took note of the fact that the foundation has not submitted the approval of the competent municipal authority on their drawing/plan for new constructions. However,

the committee recommended for approval of the project with cost of Rs 208.59 (80% of the project cost) subject to obtaining the necessary approval for construction from the competent authority. Since the project proposal is predominantly on civil construction i.e. to build a new wing, only 60% of the approved cost can be utilized by the foundation for civil construction (as per earlier decision of the Committee). As such, as of now it recommends for release of Rs.125.15 lacs in instalments (after adjusting the DPR money sanctioned) with condition that the foundation shall start the construction once they obtain the necessary approval..

4.5 Monyul Museum by Arunodaya Welfare Society, Tawang, Arunachal Pradesh (Project cost: Rs.328.20 lakh)

The Committee deliberated upon the report of the consultant and the observations of the Sub-Committee. It was noted that the curatorial aspects of the proposed museum had not been adequately explained. It was recommended that the society may be asked to reassess the estimates of their museum related components on realistic basis.

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

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

The proposal was discussed in the meeting held on 5.8.2011 and observation of the Committee was communicated to the Foundation. They had desired to send a representative to apprise the Committee about their holdings etc. and accordingly, they were invited for this meeting. Ms Debarati Chakraborty from Arts Acre Foundation apprised the Committee about the details about the proposal and their collections. However, the representative could not elucidate the details about their holdings as also their acquisition Plan. The Committee recommended that the application for financial assistance may be considered favourably provided the State Govt. gives an assurance to assist the organization through its own legal and administrative mechanism to assist the museum in ensuring long-term loans.

5.2 Netaji Research Bureau, Kolkata. (Project cost: Rs.637.30 lakh)

The committee was informed that their observations were communicated to The Bureau to clarify the position regarding necessary approval from concerned authority (on heritage) in Kolkata. The reply received from them was deliberated upon and their

clarification that the proposal has two phases of Rs. 295.20 lakh for renovation within the complex and the other Rs. 342.10 lakh for extension etc. which requires approval from the heritage point of view. The committee examined the proposal and opined that the amount of Rs.3.42 Crore required for extension of the museum building may only be delinked and can be considered later after the required approvals had been obtained and submitted by the Museum. Therefore, the committee has recommended for approval of a total amount of Rs. 236.16 lakh (80% of Rs. 295.20 lakh) for renovation of the existing building **after** adjusting the amount already released for DPR, Security and other purposes, subject to confirmation from the Museum that it has obtained necessary permissions from the Municipal/ Heritage authorities for undertaking such renovation. It was further recommended by the Committee that the proposal for extension of the building may be treated on a fresh application, whenever received.

5.3 Aloyseum, St Aloyseum College, Mangalore Jesuit Educational Society, Mangalore, Karnataka. (Project cost: Rs.689.13 lakhs)

The Committee observed that the revised estimates submitted by the organization appears to be very sketchy and without detailed break up with basis of calculations. The Committee desired to ask the organization to submit a revised cost estimate in the DPR format for being evaluated afresh.

5.4 Tribal Art and textile Museum Society, Half Nagarjan, Dimapur, Nagaland (Project cost: Rs.168.87 lakhs)

The Committee noted that the Society has submitted the DPR recently, which will be sent for appraisal.

5.5 Research Institute of World's Ancients traditions Cultures & Heritage, Lower Digang Valley, Roing, Arunachal Pradesh. (Project cost: Rs.324.91 lakhs)

The organization may be called for presentation in the next meeting.

6. Discussion on complete proposals

6.1 Proposals from Gujarat Museum Society, Ahmedabad.

a. N.C.Mehta Gallery (Project Cost: Rs.10.50 lakh)

b. Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidya Mandir, Ahmedabad, (Project Cost: Rs.98.60 lakh)

The Committee recommended for approval of Rs.8.40 lakh (80% of the project cost) for publication, conservation and museum library in respect of the proposal for the

N.C.Mehta Gallery. In respect of the other proposal, the organization may be called to make a presentation before the Committee.

**6.2 Sri Laxminathji Trust, Ahmedabad, Gujarat
(Project cost: Rs.16.76 lakhs)**

The Committee recommended for approval of the project and for release of Rs.13.42 lakh (80% of project cost) in installments.

7. Discussion on proposals with deficiencies

**7.1 Nehru Children Museum, National Cultural Association, West Bengal
(Project cost: Rs.75.81 lakhs)**

The Committee observed that the estimate provided by the organization for repair and renovation of interior of the building is Rs.39.79 lakh for a 342 Sq Mt floor and wall area of 2 galleries appeared to be on a very higher side. The organization may be asked to rework their proposal on a realistic term and resubmit the proposal.

**7.2 Audio Visual Archive and Museum of Academy Theatre, under the Aegis of
Academy theatre, Howrah, West Bengal. (Project cost: Rs.264.00)**

The Committee observed that the organization has submitted a proposal with project cost of Rs.2.64 crore which implies their matching share (20%) would be 51.20 lakh whereas it is seen from the annual accounts that the organization has an average annual turnover of about Rs.6.00 lakh with a cash balance of Rs. 12,782/- in their account as on 31.03.2010. The Committee expressed serious doubts on the sustainability of the project as the organization neither has the plan nor the resources to meet its matching share. As such, it was desired that the organization may be asked to provide a proper sustainability plan and the source of matching share before the proposal could be considered.

**7.3 Bengal Natural History Museum, Darjeeling, West Bengal
(Project cost: Rs.6,62,37,581/-)**

The committee noted the deficiencies and desired that the museum be asked to complete the documentation.

8. Since some of the items of the agenda could not be discussed due to non receipt of evaluation reports of 6 proposals, which would be received in next 3-4 days, the Chairman suggested that the Committee may again reassemble on 9th December to

complete the agenda. All Members expressed their willingness to be available on that date. Prior to that, the Sub-Committee may meet on 08.12.2011 to discuss the evaluation reports on the DPRs. The Expert Committee reassembled on 09.12.2011 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Vijay S Madan, Joint Secretary to discuss the pending agenda items of the meeting held on 25.11.2011. The list of participants is enclosed as Annexure I-B. At the outset, welcoming the Members the Chairman informed that a set of guidelines need to be prepared for appraisal of ethnological museums as there ought to be some framework in place. He further welcomed Dr. K.K. Mishra, Director, IGRMS as a special invitee to this meeting as also to all future meetings till he is inducted as a full member. The agenda of the meeting was then taken up.

9. The Committee deliberated upon the following proposals and the evaluation reports thereon and the observations of the Sub-committee thereon and its recommendations are as under:

**9.1 Mumpa Museum by Bright Future Society, Ziro (Arunachal Pradesh)
(Project cost:Rs.299.96)**

The Committee noted that there were some doubts on the clean title of the land on which the museum is proposed to be built, and recommended that the organization may be asked to furnish clear proof of the title with supporting documents. In addition, following information may be sought from the Society:

- a) Full details of the ethnographic collection held;
- b) Details of revenue generation and sustainability plan;
- c) The Society must start the documentation of their objects which may also be examined as per guidelines to be prepared by Dr. K.K. Mishra in respect of ethnographic museums.

**9.2 Madhubani Eco-Museum by APPER, Madhubani, Bihar
(Project cost: Rs.570.00 lakhs)**

The Committee took note of the fact that the land acquired by the organization is on 34 years lease that too from farmers. The Committee was of the view that the title of land has to be unfettered one and more so, it must also demonstrate if the land acquired has been permitted for use of non-agricultural purposes. At the same time, the Committee, acknowledging the fact that the organization has a sound concept, desired to ask the organization to address this vital issue as also the ones pointed out in the evaluation report. Moreover, given the fact that it can be considered as Category-II Museum, the project cost of Rs.570 lakh amounts to a shortfall of Rs.270 lakh, which has to be generated by the organization. As such, they have to demonstrate a

sustainability Plan as also their source of fund generation. The organization may also be called for making a presentation before the Committee at its next meeting.

9.3 Govt. of Punjab in respect of their proposal for development of museums both at Patiala ‘Sheesh Mahal’ and ‘Quila Mumbark’ (Project cost:Rs.917.00 lacs)

The Committee recommended for approval of Rs. 500 lakh (maximum admissible for a Category I Museum). However, the release of Govt. of India’s share may be linked with expenditure of matching share of Govt. of Punjab, whose share would be Rs.417.00 lakh. The seed money already provided to Govt. of Punjab may be adjusted from the first installment to be released.

9.4 Centre for Art & Archaeology, Gurgaon, Harayana (Project cost:Rs.667.65 lacs)

The Committee agreed with the observation of the Sub-Committee that the proposal can be considered under Category II Museum. Also, the estimates provided by the organization needs to be broken up into itemized components clearly indicating the recurring and non-recurring components distinctly. As such, the organization may be asked to rework the estimates accordingly. However, the Committee recommends to accord in principle approval to the project and for release of Rs.76.69 lacs (80% of 95.86 lakhs) for purchase of equipments, which would be the primary requirement for a virtual museum. They may also be asked to provide a sustainability plan and source of meeting the remaining cost.

9.5 City Palace Museum, Maharana of Mewar Charitable Foundation, Udaipur (Project cost: Rs. 687.71 lakh)

The Committee deliberated upon this proposal at length and noted that the collection held by the City Palace Museum, Udaipur was indeed an exquisite one and worthy of being considered under Category-I. It was also noted that the museum management had taken up an ambitious programme of modernization amounting to Rs. 25 crore-plus and that a substantial part of the work had already been completed. Taking into account the expenditure incurred by the Museum itself and the assistance given to it by other internationally acclaimed partners, the Committee was of the view that the maximum amount admissible for financial assistance (Rs. 5 crore for Category-I Museums) be considered but in order to ensure better monitoring of financial utilization, the Committee recommended that the amount may be released in four equal installments of Rs. 1.25 crore each, after obtaining a waiver from the three-installment plan that is provided in the Scheme write-up.

9.6 The Lime Centre, Delhi for a Museum of Vernacular Architecture and Building Traditions, in village Nawanpind, District Gurdaspur, Punjab (Project cost:Rs.10.29 crore)

The Committee appreciated the concept of the museum put forth by the organization. They may be asked to address the following :

- a. Furnishing proof of clear title of land;
- b. Since the proposal can be considered under category II museum, the project cost of 10.79 crore is much higher than the maximum admissible grant of Rs.3.00 crore. As such, they may be asked to provide their sustainability plan and the source of generating the matching the share;

Other observations of the consultant on the DPR may be communicated to them to furnish information/clarification. The organization may also be called for making a presentation.

10. Museums called for presentation

10.1 Maharaja Fatesingh Museum, Laxmi Vilas Palace Compoun, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Baroda Gujrat. (Project cost:Rs.295.34 lakh)

The representative from the museum made the presentation about their proposal. The museum was asked to rework the proposal with realistic assessment through a Detailed Project Report. The Committee recommended an amount of Rs. 5.00 lacs for preparing a DPR.

10.2 Research Institute of World's Ancients Traditions Cultures & Heritage, Lower Digang Valley, Roing, Arunachal Pradesh (Project cost:Rs.325.00 lakhs)

Shri Vijay Swami, Director of the Institute made the presentation about their proposal. The Committee desired that the organization may be asked to redesign their plan which must be ethnic in nature akin to local traditions. They may also be asked to provide a proper curatorial concept as also the details of collections. The Committee recommended an amount of Rs. 5.00 lakh to enable the Institute to prepare a DPR.

10.3 Virtual Gallery of Indian Miniature Paintings, by M/s Benoy Behl Films, New Delhi (Project cost:Rs.85.00 lakhs)

Shri Benoy Behl made a presentation about their proposal for a virtual museum. While appreciating the proposal, the Committee asked Shri Behl to resubmit the proposal clarifying/ furnishing following information:-

- (i) A proper sustainability Plan demonstrating its capability of having enough revenue generation to run the museum for 20-25 years.
- (ii) Detail breakup of components such as software development, website infrastructure, its designing, digitization, uploading etc.
- (iii) A proper application in the prescribed format with fuller details.

Shri Behl was also informed that any prior expenditure cannot be considered for adjustment through this grant nor any grant be given for procuring the collection or for any recurring expenditure.

10.4 Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidya Mandir Ahmdabad, Gujarat. (Project cost:Rs.98.60 lakh)

The organization was called for to make a presentation but they could not attend the Meeting. The Committee desired that they may be called for the presentation in the next meeting.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the chair.

List of Experts attended the Meeting held on 25.11.2011

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. Dr. Vijay S. Madan, | Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | In Chair |
| 2. Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul | Director(Museum), Ministry of Culture | |
| 3. Dr. B.V. Kharbade, | Director in charge, NRLC | |
| 4. Anup K. Matilal | Acting Director, Indian Museum | |
| 5. Shri D. Rama Sarma | Director, National Science Centre, Delhi | |
| 6. Shri Shiv Sing Meena | Deputy Advisor, Planning Commission | |
| 7. Ms.Jay Shree Sharma | Director, National Museum, Delhi represented DG, NM) | |
| 8. Dr. Meena Gautam | Dy. Director ,(represented DG, NAI) | |
| 9. Shri Rajmani | Archivist, Exhibition, NAI (represented DG, NAI) | |
| 10. Shri Sadashiv Gorakshkar | Expert Member | |
| 11. Shri Karni Singh Jasol, | Expert Member | |
| 12. Shri P. Chenna Reddy | Expert Member | |
| 13. Shri N.P. Joshi, | Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | |

List of Experts attended the Meeting held on 9.12.2011

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. Dr. Vijay S. Madan, | Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | In Chair |
| 2. Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul | Director(Museum), Ministry of Culture | |
| 3. Prof. K. K. Mishra | Director, IGRMS, Bhopal
Special Invitee | |
| 4. Dr. B.V. Kharbade, | Director in charge, NRLC | |
| 5. Shri D. Rama Sarma | Director, National Science Centre, Delhi | |
| 6. Shri Shiv Sing Meena | Deputy Advisor, Planning Commission | |
| 7. Ms.Jay Shree Sharma | Director, National Museum, Delhi represented DG, NM) | |
| 8. Shri Rajmani | Archivist, Exhibition, NAI
(represented DG, NAI) | |
| 9. Shri Sadashiv Gorakshkar | Expert Member | |
| 10. Shri Karni Singh Jasol, | Expert Member | |
| 11. Shri N.P. Joshi, | Under Secretary, Ministry of Culture. | |

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE APPRISAL OF THE DPRs

The meeting of the Sub -Committee of the Expert Committee on Museum Support Scheme to discuss the evaluation report on the DPRs was held on 24 November 2011. The following members were present:

1. Dr B V Kharbade
2. Shri Karni Singh Jasol
3. Dr S Gorakshkar

The Sub- Ccommittee discussed the reports and their observations the evaluation reports on the DPRs are as under:

(i) Madras Craft Foundation, Chennai, Tamilnadu

The committee endorses the observation of the independent consultant that approval of the plan should be obtained from the concerned competent authority in the Municipal corporation and the estimates must be signed by an architect. The sub-committee, after going through the revised DPR and the evaluation report thereon, it is observed that though the DPR contains provision for purchase of conservation equipments, there appears to be no provision for a conservation Laboratory, which incidentally has been deleted in the revised DPR. This also needs to be clarified. It is also observed that more than 80% of the project cost is earmarked for construction of a new building (214.67 lacs out of total cost of Rs 260.74 lacs).. However, as per the earlier decision of the Expert Committee, not more than 60 % of the project cost be given for civil construction, hence the committee may take a decision if the construction part be restricted to only 60% of the total cost. Subject to decisions on the above observations, the proposal may be approved keeping in view the status of the organization.

(ii) Asan Museum and Kavyagramam, Kaikara, Kerala

The Committee endorses the observation of the independent consultant that the DPR submitted by Asan Museum and Kavyagramam does not take any further from the earlier proposal. The sub-Committee feels that if a personalia Museum is anticipated then the old house where the poet stayed/last lived should be converted into such a museum rather than proposing to construct a altogether new building. The committee did not find any merit in the proposal of the organization to construct altogether anew building at a project cost of Rs 7.66 crores whereas the original proposal was for Rs. 1.00 crore.

(iii) Arunodaya Welfare Society, Tawang, Arunachal Pradesh (Monyul Museum).

The Sub-committee went through the revised DPR and the evaluation report thereon and endorses the observation of the consultant that the basis of the cost on museum related items need to be justified as also the sustainability plan has to be reassessed on realistic term. The organisation may be asked to work on this. The Committee recommends to approve the project with the condition that the release of subsequent instalments will be subject to complying with the above.

(iv) Nourhe Society, Kohima, Nagaland

The DPR and the evaluation report thereon were discussed. The organisation has not addressed the issue on their requirement of the museum related items like conservation, storage, lighting etc. The construction cost projected are almost identical. The sub-committee feels that the observation of the consultant on all aspects may be communicated to the organisation and be asked to revise the DPR accordingly.

(v) Sir J C Bose Trust, Kolkata

The Sub-committee observed that the DPR has been prepared by the Trust in consultation with INTACH. However, the advice of the Ministry to the Trust to approach NCSM to plan the science museum and also to approach NRLC and ASI for conservation and restoration of heritage structure respectively has not been adhered to.

The Sub-committee feels that the observation of the consultant on the categorisation of the museum as category II needs to be reassessed by the full committee keeping in view the possession of some of the personal objects of Dr. J.C.Bose by the Trust.

The following items of expenditure proposed may not be considered as they are of recurring nature except for item 1 which is pre-project expenditure.

1. Pre Project Expenses	3500000.00
2. Administrative Costs	1000000.00
3. Maintenance	1000000.00
4. Marketing	2500000.00

The organization be asked to provide the source of funding for their matching share. Even if the museum is to be categorized as category I, the maximum admissible grant would be Rs. 5.00 crores against the project cost of Rs.6.99 crores. Secondly they also need to have a sustainability plan to cater to the running recurring cost which would be around 50-60 lacs per annum.

Sd/-
(Karni Singh Jasol)

Sd/-
(Dr. S Gorakshkar)

Sd/-
(B V Kharbade)

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE APPRISAL OF THE DPRs

The meeting of the Sub -Committee of the Expert Committee on Museum Support Scheme to discuss the evaluation report on the DPRs was held on 8 December 2011. The following members were present:

1. Shri B V Kharbade
2. Shri Karni Singh Jasol
3. Dr S Gorakshkar

The Sub- Committee discussed the reports and the observations of the evaluator on the DPRs at length. The observations of the committee are as under:

i. Mumpa Museum by Bright Future Society, Arunachal Pradesh:

The Sub committee recommends for approval of the project and for release 1st installment for construction of the museum subject to furnishing of proof of clear title of the land. However, before release of the next installment, following information may be sought from the Society:

- a)Details of revenue generation and sustainability plan;
- b)The Society must start the documentation of their objects and the status thereof be furnished at the time of seeking the next installment;

ii. Eco Museum by Association for Protection and Promotion of Environmental Resources (APPER) at Madhubani, Bihar

The Sub Committee observed that the organization has acquired land from farmers on a lease for 34 years. As such, clear title of the land does not appear to be available with the organization. The concerns/observations of the consultant are genuine especially on their sustainability and resource generation for meeting their matching share of the project which is about Rs.270 lacs. The observations of the consultant may be communicated to the organization and they may be asked to addresses these vital issues.

iii. Sheesh Mahal and Qila Mubarak Museums at Patiala by Govt of Punjab

The Sub Committee is of the view that the proposal of Govt. of Punjab merits approval for financial assistance. Since the maximum admissible assistance for their project under category I would be Rs.5.00 crores whereas the project cost is

worth Rs.9.17 crores, they may be asked to submit a vision document and a sustainability plan and especially as to whether the balance amount of Rs.4.17 crores shall be met by the State. Since the matching share for the project almost matches the maximum admissible grant from Govt. of India, it is felt that the release of GOI's share may be linked with expenditure of matching share by Govt. of Punjab given the fact that Rs.50.00 lacs has already been released for the project as seed money. The full Committee may take a view on the project.

iv. Virtual Museum of Sound and Images by Center for Art and Archaeology, Gurgaon

The Sub-Committee was of the view that since a virtual museum is basically the display of digitized versions of antiquities and monuments and that there is no primary collections involved, such projects may only be considered under category II museum.

The estimates provided by CA&A needs to be broken up into itemized components clearly indicating the recurring and non-recurring components distinctly. It is observed that major portion in the estimates provided by CA&A happens to be on salary components, which is not admissible under the scheme. The organization may be asked to rework the estimate. However, it is recommended that in principle approval for the project can be given and the Committee can consider for approval of the immediate requirement for purchase of equipments with an estimated cost of Rs.95.86 lacs.

v. City Palace Museum, Udaipur

The Sub Committee feels that the proposal merits support for financial assistance for the project. Considering the size of the collection of the foundation and the number of foot falls per annum, the Sub Committee suggest that the museum can be considered as a category I museum and recommends for grant of maximum amount admissible as per categorization.

vi. Museum on Vernacular Architecture and Building Traditions at Village Nawanpind, Gurdaspur, Punjab (by the Lime Centre)

The concept put forth by the Lime Centre is appreciated. It is suggested that the organization may be called for making a presentation before the Committee. Also, they may be asked to address the following issues:

- a) Furnishing proof of clear title of land;

- b) Since the proposal can be considered under category II museum, the project cost of 10.79 crores is much higher than the maximum admissible grant of Rs.3.00 crores. As such, they may be asked to provide their sustainability plan and the source of generating the matching the share;

Other observations of the consultant on the DPR may be communicated to them to furnish information/clarification.

sd/-
(Karni Singh Jasol)

sd/-
(Dr. S Gorakshkar)

sd/-
(B V Kharbade)