

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2015-2016)

27

SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'BPL Survey currently Socio Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011'

TWENTY SEVENTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

TWENTY SEVENTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2015-2016)

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'BPL Survey currently Socio Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011']

Presented to Hon'ble Speaker on 31.08.2016

Presented to Lok Sabha on _____

Laid in Rajya Sabha on _____



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

Shravana

August, 2016/Bhadrapada, 1938 (Saka)

CRD No. 124

Price : Rs.

© 2015 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and Printed by _____.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2015-2016)	(ii)
INTRODUCTION	(iii)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government	6
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	15
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	16
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	17

APPENDICES

I. Extracts of Minutes of the Sixteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 19 August, 2016....	18
II. Extracts of Minutes of the Seventeenth Sitting of the Committee held on 29 August, 2016.....	19
III. Enumeration and Cots Time Taken by States/UTs	20
IV. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (16th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development	21

(ii)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2015-2016)

Dr. P. Venugopal -- *Chairperson*

**MEMBERS
LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Sisir Adhikari
3. Shri Kirti Azad
4. Shrimati Renuka Butta
5. Shri Harishchandra Deoram Chavan
6. Shri Biren Singh Engti
7. Shri Vijay Kumar Hansdak
8. Shri Ajay Misra (Teni)
9. Shri Manshankar Ninama
10. Shrimati Mausam Noor
11. Vacant@
12. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
13. Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal "Nishank"
14. Shri Gokaraju Ganga Raju
15. Dr. Anbumani Ramadoss
16. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
17. Dr. Yashwant Singh
18. Dr. Naramalli Sivaprasad
19. Shri Balka Suman
20. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
21. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

RAJYA SABHA

22. Shri Munquad Ali
23. Shri Bishnu Charan Das#
24. Shri D. Bandyopadhyay
25. Shri Ram Narain Dudi
26. Shri Ranvijay Singh Judev
27. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo*
28. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra
29. Vacant**
30. Shri A. K. Selvaraj
31. Shri Rewati Raman Singh\$

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Shri Abhijit Kumar | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri A.K. Shah | - | Director |
| 3. Smt. B. Visala | - | Additional Director |
| 4. Shri Satish Kumar | - | Senior Committee Assistant |

* Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 20.05.2016 vice Shri Ashwani Kumar retired on 09.04.2016.

** Vacancy caused due to retirement of Dr. Vijaylaxmi Sadho w.e.f. 29.06.2016.

Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 20.05.2016 vice Shri Gulam Rasool Balyawi retired on 07.07.2016.

@ Vacancy caused due to appointment of Dr. Mahendra Nath Pandey as Union Minister w.e.f. 05.07.2016.

\$ Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 20.05.2016 vice Smt. Kanak Lata Singh retired on 04.07.2016.

(iii)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2015-2016) having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty Seventh Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (16th Lok Sabha) on 'BPL Survey currently Socio Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011'.

2. The Sixteenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 22 December, 2015. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 21.03.2016.

3. The Draft Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 29 August, 2016.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report of the Committee (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) is given in **Appendix-II**.

NEW DELHI;
29 August, 2016
07 Bhadrapada, 1938 (Saka)

DR. P. VENUGOPAL
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2015-16) deals with the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in their Sixteenth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'BPL Survey currently Socio Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011'.

2. The Sixteenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22.12.2015 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. The Report contained 10 Observations/Recommendations.

3. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report have been received from the Government. These have been examined and categorized as follows: -

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| (i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:
Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3,4, 6, 7, 8 and 9. | Total:08
Chapter-II |
| (ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of replies of the Government:
Serial No. NIL | Total: NIL
Chapter-III |
| (iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:
Serial No. 5 | Total: 01
Chapter-IV |
| (iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:
Serial No. 10 | Total:01
Chapter-V |

4. **The Committee desire that Action Taken Notes on the observations/ recommendations contained in Chapter-I of the Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.**

5. **The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of their Observations/Recommendations that require reiteration or merit comments.**

A. Need for awareness about SECC, 2011 strongly reiterated.

[Recommendation Serial No. 5 (Para No. 2.5)]

6. In the context of the need for awareness about SECC, 2011, the Committee had recommended as under:-

"During the course of examination, the issue of greater awareness about SECC, 2011 among the masses especially in rural areas on the pattern of 'Swachh Bharat Abhiyan' came up before the Committee in a big way. In this connection, the nodal Ministry i.e MoRD candidly admitted before the Committee about essentiality of a mega awareness drive for SECC, 2011. In this connection, the Committee have been informed by MoRD that radio clips, video spots etc. have been made available to State/UTs and State Governments have to assess need for additional campaign, if needed. The Committee, therefore, recommend that there should be mega awareness drive in consultation /coordination with State/UT Governments both in print and electronic media in a big way with a view to making SECC, 2011 a people's programme."

7. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under :-

"Noted for guidance."

8. **While noting the issue of the need for greater awareness about SECC, 2011 among the masses especially in rural areas on the pattern of 'Swachh Bharat Abhiyan', the Committee had recommended the Government that there should be mega awareness drive in consultation/coordination with State/UT Governments both in print and electronic media in a big way with a view to making SECC, 2011 a people's programme. In their action taken reply, the**

Ministry have merely stated that noted for guidance. The Committee feel that Action Taken Reply of the Government must be explanatory enough showing measures initiated, if any, for opening up mega awareness drive in consultation with States/UTs.

The Committee, therefore, strongly reiterate that a mega awareness drive for SECC, 2011 should be launched expeditiously in consultation/co-ordination with States/UT Governments both in print and electronic media on a massive scale, so as to make SECC, 2011, a peoples' programme. The Committee desire to be apprised of the specific action taken in this regard.

B. Publication of Draft List and Final List of SECC, 2011.

[Recommendation Serial No. 10 (Para No. 2.11)]

9. In the context publication of Draft List and Final List of SECC, 2011, the Committee had recommended as under:-

"The Committee's examination has revealed that as on 8th December, 2015 for SECC, 2011, Draft List in all the States has been published whereas Final List has been completed only in 22 States, in 8 States it is in process of publication and in 6 States it is yet to begin. In this connection, the Committee find that 8 States where Publication is in the process are Andhra Pradesh , Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh , Punjab, Rajasthan, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand whereas the six States which are yet to begin the process are UTs of Dadar and Nagar Haveli, Daman& Diu, Delhi, Odisha, Tripura and Maharashtra. The Committee recall that during the evidence of the representatives of MoRD on 13th October, 2015, the committee were informed that the work of SECC, 2011 would be completed by December,2015. Keeping in view that publication of Final List is in the process in 8 States and 6 States are yet to begin the publication process, the Committee apprehend that the MoRD may not be able to meet the deadline. The Committee, therefore, recommend that MoRD should make all out efforts to expedite and impress upon the slow moving States/UTs to move faster for accomplishing the SECC, 2011 work early.

10. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under :-

"Rural census and urban census for identifying poor households have been completed by adopting methodology for identification of BPL households as approved by the Cabinet. The exercise has been completed using 'respondent based canvasser method' on tablets supplied by BEL that carried NPR

information in image form. The decision subsequently to digitize NPR images and adoption of the same in SECC too has also been carried out but for a small chunk of data which is expected to be completed before 31st March 2016. Canvassing of questions on caste and religion too were completed simultaneously. Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs has informed that the data has been examined and 98.87 % data on individuals' caste and religion is error free. ORGI has noted incidence of errors in respect of 1,34,77,030 individuals out of total SECC population of 118,64,03,770. States have been advised to take corrective measures."

11. Keeping in view the delay in publication of final list in some States, the Committee while apprehending the contention of the Ministry for completion of the task of SECC, 2011 by December, 2015, had recommended that Ministry of Rural Development should make all out efforts to expedite and impress upon the slow moving States/UTs to move faster for accomplishing the SECC, 2011 work early.

In action taken reply, the DoRD have spelt out the progress with regard to digitization of NPR images for completion of SECC work and have informed that necessary data is under examination by Registrar-General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs and States have been accordingly advised to take necessary measures.

The Committee note that the Ministry has kept silent on the issue of progress of publication process and Final List in some of the States where it has not been done. The Committee take a serious view of the fact that the Ministry has not been able to meet the deadline of December, 2015 for completion of SECC, 2011. The Committee are constrained to note that even now incidence of errors have been noticed in respect of as large as 1.34 crore individuals of SECC population. The Committee desire the Ministry to pursue with the States for taking remedial measures for necessary rectification of errors. The Committee

also desire to be apprised of the status of publication of Final List in the concerned States/UTs. The Committee feel that the work of SECC, 2011 has been unduly delayed, the Committee reiterate that Government should take concrete measures in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Para No. 2.1)

The Committee find that estimation of poverty is the work of Planning Commission whereas identification of poor in the rural areas is the work of State Governments which get financial and technical assistance from Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD) for necessary target assistance under various programmes of Central Ministries and State/UT Governments. The Committee's examination has revealed that the First, the Second and the Third BPL Censuses for VIII (1992-1997), IX(1997-2002) and X(2002-2007) Plans respectively were conducted. They, however, find with dismay that BPL Census for XI Plan (2007-2012) was not even conducted. As such, there has been no updated data about BPL for a very long span of time, thereby denying the targeted assistance to the needy and downtrodden section of the society in all these years across States/UTs. In this connection, the MoRD argued before the Committee that no deliberate delay has taken place narrating the sequence of events like stay of Hon'ble Supreme Court, setting up of Expert Group headed by Dr.N.C.Saxena, submission of its Report in August, 2009 recommending simple and transparent methodology for identification of poor in rural areas, circulation thereof amongst stakeholders like State/UT Governments and concerned Central Ministries for obtaining their comments, holding of consultation with experts leading to undertaking of Pilot Study spread over 254 villages across States/UTs leading to methodology for conducting Socio Economic and Caste Census,(SECC)2011 and publication of provisional data for SECC, 2011 for rural India by Government in July, 2015. The Committee, however, do not subscribe to the view of MoRD on the ground that it took the Government six long years on arriving at the provisional data as Dr. N. C. Saxena Committee Report was with Government way back in August, 2009. The Committee, thus conclude that the role of Government of India was not at all pro active on this vital aspect of identification of poor in rural areas during all these years. In view of the above, the Committee recommend that the MoRD should analyse the reasons for delay in conducting BPL Census/SECC, 2011 in proper perspective.

Reply of the Government

SECC 2011 has been carried out by the respective State Governments with financial and technical support of Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of HUPA and Ministry of Home Affairs (ORGI). The methodology of the Census was respondent based canvassing method. The Enumerators were from State Government while Data Entry Operators were provided through the Central Public Sector Enterprises by the MoRD to the State Governments to assist in the field level enumeration tasks. Respective Principal Secretaries of the States/UTs were the over all in-charge of conduct of Census.

Methodology for conduct of the combined survey and roles and responsibility of the various stake holders are summaries in the table below.

MoRD	MoHUPA	State Governments	ORGI/MoHA
Policy approval from Cabinet	Policy approval from Cabinet	Approvals of the State/UT Govts.	NPR Data Base
Software Development and Quality check of data	Questionnaire	Appointment of field functionaries	Charge Registers
Questionnaire	Training Manual	Training	Abridged House list
Training Manual	Publicity	Local Level Publicity	Layout Maps
Publicity and setting up Toll Free Call Centre	Continuation of Staff in the States	Coordination and Supervision	Supervision during Training
Continuation of Staff in the States	Monitoring and Supervision	Timely completion of field survey	Supervision during field work
Convening National Meetings	Quality check of data	Timely utilisation of funds	Inputs for developing Training Manual
Financial sanctions for entire Census		Proper accounting of funds	Troubleshooting regarding Software
Procurement of HHDs			
Engaging CPSEs and NIC			
Independent monitoring by research/NGO agencies			

Rural census and urban census for identifying poor households have been completed by adopting methodology for identification of BPL households as approved by the Cabinet. The exercise has been completed using 'respondent based canvasser method' on tablets supplied by BEL that carried NPR information in image form. The decision subsequently to digitize NPR images and adoption of the same in SECC too has also been carried out but for a small chunk of data which is expected to be completed before 31st March 2016. Canvassing of questions on caste and religion too were completed simultaneously. Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs has informed that the data has been examined and 98.87 % data on individuals' caste and religion is error free . ORGI has noted incidence of errors in respect of 1, 34, 77,030 individuals out of total SECC population of 118, 64, 03,770. States have been advised to take corrective measures.

Ministry of Rural Development made all efforts to expedite the Census and impressed upon the slow moving States to adhere to the respective roles and responsibilities.

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016,]

Recommendation (Serial No. 2, Para No. 2.2)

On the issue of fixing responsibility on implementing agencies/stakeholders like Ministry of Rural Development(MoRD), Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation(MoHUPA), Ministry of Home Affairs{Office of Registrar General of India(ORGI)}, State Governments/UT Administrations and Service Providers like NIC, Central Public Sector Units (CPSUs) of ITI, ECIL for conducting SECC , 2011, the Committee find that MoRD have held the view that it is not possible to fix responsibility on any of the stakeholders on the ground that SECC is a massive and complex project undertaken after a long gap of time since 1931 Census for which MoRD had some past experience and MoHUPA was doing it for the first time and main stakeholders being State Governments/UT Administrations. The Committee find that above assertions of the MoRD reflects ill-preparedness on the part of MoRD as also MoHUPA for conducting SECC, 2011 exercise. In Committee's opinion before launching such a programme proper spadework should have been done by the stakeholders. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommend that responsibility and accountability be fixed for prolonged delay in conducting SECC, 2011.

Reply of the Government

The SECC 2011 is a massive and complex exercise involving multiple stakeholders. The responsibilities and roles of the various functionaries involved in SECC were inter and intra differentiated within three ministries/State/UT departments/Central Public Sector Enterprises and private service providing vendors across the country. Besides, all these were experiences of the first time for all the multiple stakeholders. Above all, the different States and UTs have had various levels of involvement and efficiency in the whole processes involved, that too given a federal structure of governance across the country. Multiple stakeholders involved in this massive effort are (MoRD, MoHUPA, CPSUs namely BEL, ECIL, and ITI, State Governments / UT administrations and NIC) and all these worked together for the conduct of SECC 2011. The MoRD had some past experience, while the MoHUPA was doing it for the first time and the Caste Census was the responsibility of ORGI, but this type of Caste Census is done after a long gap from 1931. The State/UT governments are the stakeholders and responsible for all the multiple activities at the field levels. Keeping this in view, it is not possible to fix responsibility on any one of the stakeholder and service providers in SECC. As per available documents in this ministry, the roles and responsibilities of MoRD, MoHUPA, State Governments, ORGI and CPSUs in the conduct of SECC is spelled out as detailed in reply to Para 2.1.

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016,]

Recommendation (Serial No. 3, Para No. 2.3)

The Committee strongly criticize the mishandling of over-all planning and implementation of SECC, 2011 by the Government by way of shortening time limit from one year to six months for undertaking SECC, 2011, starting the process only in June, 2011, as many as 27 States/UTs that had already finalised the BPL, 2002 Census work re-doing the work for SECC, 2011 etc. The Committee are dismayed to note that the reduced time limit from one year to six months left States/UTs of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Nagaland, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal inadequately prepared and as such delayed the starting of Enumeration process only in June, 2012 instead of December, 2011. Various other factors that impeded the implementation of SECC, 2011 including failure to conduct both Enumeration and Supervision concurrently within Tehsils/Districts, failure to provide internet connectivity for data transfer, strikes, bandhs, frequent changes in software as per State specifications etc. have also been outlined before the Committee. The Committee feel that all these issues put a big question mark on the over-all project planning and implementation of SECC,2011 by all stakeholders including the nodal Ministry, the MoRD and does not substantiate the claim of the MoRD about proper coordination between MoRD and States/UTs in the conduct of SECC, 2011. In Committee's opinion, all the reasons responsible for delay as specified above, merit a thorough review with a view to ascertain at what stage and in which State/UT the delay occurred. The Committee desires an explanation in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The rural and urban census for identifying poor households have been completed by adopting methodology for identification of BPL households as approved by the Cabinet. The exercise has been completed using 'respondent based canvasser method' on to tablets supplied by BEL that carried NPR information in image form. The decision subsequently of ORGI to digitize NPR images and adoption of the same in SECC too has also been carried out but for a small chunk of data which is expected to be completed certainly before 31st March 2016. Canvassing of questions on caste and religion too were completed simultaneously. Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs has informed that the data has been examined and 98.87 % data on individuals caste and religion is error free ORGI has noted an incidence of errors in respects of 1, 34, 77030 individuals out of total SECC population of 118, 64, 03,770. All instructions of ORGI(MHA) relating to supervision, trouble shooting regarding software etc. were duly conveyed to appropriate authorities in the States/UTs.

Across the nation, the Enumeration took the minimum of 58 days in Lakshadweep and maximum of 1493 days in Himachal Pradesh for completion. So is with Supervision, only 57 days in Lakshadweep and maximum of 1412 days in Rajasthan. The verification and correction exercise took minimum of 21 days in Sikkim, while it was a maximum of 1023 days in Odisha. Similarly, in conduct of COTS it took only 49 days for Mizoram as against a maximum of 569 days in Gujarat. These are some evidences as to wherein the delays occurred on the part of the States /UTs in the conduct of various processes of SECC2011. In this respect examination of delay in States/UTs reveals that claims and objections were organized in a participative exercise that over stretched the time lines of SECC **Annexure-I.**

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016,]

Recommendation (Serial No. 4, Para No. 2.4)

The Committee find that based on the recommendations of DR.N.C.Saxena Committee, the MoRD has finally come out with a methodology for SECC-2011 for identification of BPL households in the country in the form of automatic exclusion, automatic inclusion and ranking of remaining households as per deprivations. In this connection, the Committee find that under automatic exclusion criteria, there are thirteen different indicators from owners of two, three and four wheelers/fishing boats requiring registration to households owing 7.5 acres or more land with at least one equipment such as diesel/electric operated, bore well/tube well. Similarly, under automatic inclusion criteria come five indicators viz. households without shelter, destitute/living on alms, manual scavengers, primitive tribal groups and legally released bonded labourers. Likewise for ranking of households using seven deprivations. These are one room with kuchha walls and kuchha roof, no adult member between 16 to 59, female headed households with no adult member between 16-59, household with any disabled member and no able bodied adult member, SC/ST households, households with no literate adult above 25 years and landless households deriving the major part of their income from manual casual labour. The Committee are constrained to find with dismay that as per provisional data made available by MoRD, out of 24.39 crore total households in the country as high as 17.94 crore are rural households and after exclusions/inclusions, the total households which households have been considered for seven different deprivations is a large as 10.71 crore out of which 2.01 crore have not reported for deprivations and there are 8.70 crore households with deprivations. In this connection, the Committee have been informed by Secretary, DoRD that henceforth, Ministry of Rural Development(MoRD) does not intend to bring out BPL list and has outlined the possible applications of data for programmes like implementation of National Food Security Act, Housing for all, education and skills thrust, MGNREGA focus villages etc. The Committee while appreciating this new approach being followed by the Government, however, apprehend that without the cooperation of State/UTs, it is still a far way to go. The Committee, therefore, urge upon the MoRD to work in close coordination with Stakeholders viz. Central Ministries, service providers CPSUs and State Government for uninterrupted and updated flow of data for the above purpose.

Reply of the Government

Noted for guidance. All states are now using SECC data for implementation of rural development programmes/schemes.

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016]

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para No. 2.6 and 2.7)

The Committee's examination has revealed that there is an urgent need to re-visit the existing criteria of exclusion/inclusion for identification of rural poor on various grounds. These include differentiating land in terms of productivity across the country comparing the fertile land like in Punjab with very less and no fertility like in Rajasthan , re-defining the term households with three or more rooms with all rooms having pucca walls and pucca roof, inclusion of shelter less person living along roadways and near temples, refugees and need for generating uniform nationwide data for various social welfare schemes etc. health, sanitation etc. On the issue of differentiating land in terms

of productivity and re-defining the term household with pucca wall and pucca roof, the MoRD has stated that land holding and its size per se is not an exclusion criteria and 13 exclusion criteria and seven deprivations have mapped poverty adequately. Therefore, Gram Panchayat and State Governments have been enabled to prepare a list of families that need to receive benefits under rural development programme. On the issue of inclusion of shelter-less persons specified above, the view of MoRD has been that poverty is multi-dimensional in nature and income is not an explicit criteria. Further DoRD has decided to use deprivation criteria to rank poor household with the BPL list in future. Likewise on the issue of inclusion of refugees, the MoRD has admitted candidly that this issue was not at all considered all as MoRD has no access to the citizenship wise data. Finally on the issue of coming up with uniform data for social welfare schemes like sanitation, health etc., the MoRD has come up with the idea of social registry data for mapping the progress of households. The Committee do not subscribe to the view of MoRD that land holding and its size per se is not an exclusion criteria whereas under criterion numbers 11, 12 and 13 different size of land for exclusion have been given. The Committee recommend MoRD to re-visit the issue.

The Committee find that although shelterless households is one of the indicators for automatic inclusion, yet the Committee feel that shelterless households along roadways and near temples need special attention and be reckoned for their proper and comprehensive inclusion. On the issue of use of national data on social welfare schemes like health, sanitation etc., the Committee appreciate that MoRD has come up with the idea of a Social registry data for mapping the progress of households. The Committee desire the MoRD to expedite the same.

Reply of the Government

Agricultural land in States is placed in two categories viz irrigated and unirrigated. The SECC questionnaire addresses concerns of both groups. The SECC exclusion parameters numbered 11, 12 and 13 are reproduced: - (11). Own 2.5 acres or more of irrigated land with at least one irrigation equipment; (12). Own 5 acres or more of irrigated land for two or more crop seasons; and (13). Owning at least 7.5 acres of land or more with at least one irrigation equipment.

From the above description of those 3 parameters it is evident that the exclusion is not essentially based on land holding size but on irrigation availability or otherwise which inter-alia, defines the quality of land.

It is pertinent to mention that the houseless households as defined in SECC are - "households which do not live in buildings or houses but live in the open or roadside, pavements, in hume pipes, under fly-overs and staircases, or in the open areas near places of worship, mandaps, railway platforms/stations etc". Therefore the recommendation 2.7 has already been used in the SECC 2011. Houseless households were enumerated during the course of census field work by the enumerators. This group has been treated as poorest of the poor and has been automatically included for receiving benefits of Government programmes.

The matter of Social Registry is being earnestly pursued and is noted for guidance.

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7 and 8, Para No. 2.8 and 2.9)

The Committee during its course of examination came across the issue of wrong exclusion/inclusion of names in Draft List published in Districts covered in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & Rajasthan and MoRD have held the view that this is not applicable to SECC, 2011, as such referred incidents have occurred in BPL Census held in the past and no such complaints have come to MoRD and even if such complaints come, action has to be taken by concerned States/UTs. The Committee find that the Draft List and Final List have been published in three States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan. The Committee also find that in order to deal with any further exclusion / inclusion, it has been decided to give one more appellate opportunity in Gram Sabha/Panchayat and before competent State Government authority wherever programme specific list is drawn and made public and during the process of periodic update in every two years. The Committee from the State-wise list of Nodal Officers for SECC, 2011(Annexure II) find that in respect of Rajasthan (at Serial No.2), it has been mentioned that for BEL "it will be given shortly", further for Uttar Pradesh (at Serial No.4) against one Nodal Officer no contact numbers and email addresses of service provider CPSUs has been shown. The Committee feel that with absence of the basic data, the complaints of common man can hardly be addressed. The Committee also feel that the issue be taken up with concerned State Governments so that it is sorted out before the process of periodic update begins, say in every two years. The Committee thus, strongly recommend that basic mechanism be first strengthened in States/UTs across the Country.

Recommendation Sl.No. 7 (Para No. 2.8)

The Committee find that under Socio- Economic and Caste Census, 2011, data is collected at field level and no household is identified as BPL or Non-BPL and in the process of enumeration, PRI Members, NGOs, etc. usually accompany enumerator hailing from different villages subsequently, the data is read out to the respondent and acknowledgement slip is issued and data so collected is electronically shared. In this connection, it came out during the course of examination that instance of mis-reporting, absence of enumerators and figuring in of ineligible in Draft List have been reported in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Bihar. In this connection, the Committee are amazed to hear from MoRD that it has not received such complaints and lapse like no enumerators visible in the field level might have happened and it is for the States/UT Governments to take corrective actions on such cases.

Further, the Committee are astonished to note the submission of MoRD that local MPs might have been apprised of the conduct of SECC by local officials and that local MPs as well could have brought to the notice of District Collector for that purpose. Further, such complaints are addressed by States/UT Governments/CPSUs and these have been accordingly instructed to do the needful. Further, complaints on enumeration stage are resolved at data charge centers by charge officers and officials of MoRD visited Uttar Pradesh and Bihar for this purpose. The Committee do not appreciate such kind of approach on the part of Government in as much as it admit the possibility of lapse on the part of concerned State Governments in enumeration process and lack of proper interface between the Nodal Officers of District level and local MPs. The above assertion by MoRD strengthens the belief of the Committee that all is not well with entire process of enumeration of SECC, 2011 particularly of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan. The Committee are also dismayed to find that MoRD has not evolved an independent evaluation system for addressing different complaints of District/State level and have expressed the view that States can undertake the same at their level. The

Committee feel that MoRD should take up the issue with State Governments of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan on problems being faced in these States and action taken there on be conveyed to the Committee.

Recommendation Sl.No. 8 (Para No. 2.9)

Reply of the Government

The SECC data collection involved enumeration, supervision, verification & correction, draft list publication, inviting of claims and objections, holding of Gram Sabhas and final list publication. The display of draft list at prominent places in the Panchayat, placing it in the Gram Sabhas, inviting claims and objections and resolution of the same by appropriate two tier government authorities were ensured and thereafter the final publication was done after inducting appropriate changes in claims and objections.

At the time of enumeration the Data Entry Operators and Enumerators read out the data entered in the tablet PCs to the respondents and also issued to every house hold an acknowledgement slip duly signed by the respondent and the enumerator. The Panchayat representatives and other influential persons of the locality were to accompany the enumerator in the field and they rendered necessary support for smooth data collection. While the enumerator was an officer of the State /UT government, the data entry officer was provided by the Central Public Sector Enterprises. Corrective follow up action on the enumerated data was undertaken by Supervisors. These Supervisors performed the verification in areas other than the place of their residence.

The draft lists published were presented in the Gram Sabhas of the Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRIs) in the rural and urban areas and necessary claims and objections were invited for resolution. The procedures of conduct of Gram Sabhas for scrutinizing the draft list data were recorded and follow up action was taken up by the Data Charge Centre Officers. The various SECC procedures required that an important role be given for the conduct of settlement of different type's errors of exclusion/ inclusion and corrections that came up. Five separate forms were used for effecting addition/deletion and corrections; Form A , B, C, D, E and F were made available freely for use by the people. These forms respectively were for filing up objections, modifications, addition/deletions, for making resolutions in the Gram Sabha and for effecting the corrected data to be printed for issue to the public.

The procedures of conduct of Claims and Objections were streamlined and instructed for meticulous implementation which lead to considerable time and cost overrun by the Panchat Raj Institutions and in the Gram Sabhas. These were aimed at taking care of the requests from respondents for modification, addition, and deletion of information in the drat list published in the public domain. On each of the claims that came up from the public an enquiry was got conducted by the States through their 'Disposing Officers'. Those not satisfied with the verdict of the disposing officer had an option to file appellate petitions with the District Collector.

Overall, in the country 1.36 Crore households out of 24.64 Crore raised claims and objections on SECC data and got the corrections made. In the State of Bihar 22 per cent households came up with claims and objections and got it resolved. In Uttar Pradesh about 209182(about 0.22 per cent of total households) petitions came up for scrutiny through the Claims and Objections Tracking System (COTS) and got those resolved. In Rajasthan about 45550 petitions came up from among 1.31 Crore households for processing and successfully went through the COTS procedures. This

supports the view that households were aware of SECC processes and wherever needed they intervened for necessary corrections. It is submitted that no state government has informed any serious discrepancy which can put the credibility of SECC data and its processes as inferior to any of the other set of data available for targeting poor beneficiaries.

It is pertinent to mention that Independent Concurrent Monitoring of SECC was also carried out by third party organization. In respect of Bihar the monitor reported that 96% of rural and 98% of urban households studied did recall use of Tablet PCs and “only about less than one percent households could not recall the survey” for Bihar. The monitoring reported that Gram Sabha were held and 97% rural & urban households reported availability of draft list for verification.

In respect of Rajasthan independent monitor reported that 66% of rural households could recall use of Tablet PCs for conduct of SECC 2011 and only 50% of households in rural areas and 58% in urban areas reported publication of SECC draft list. In Kerala, household and Gram Sabha did not disclose any input to doubt the credence on the conduct of Census.

All the above logically supports that the household/individuals data had been placed in the public domain by the appropriate state departmental authorities and the public went through the processes of verification, disposal and appellate hearing mechanisms and got their grievances redressed.

Reply to the recommendation Serial Nos. 7 and 8 (Para No. 2.8 and 2.9)

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016]

Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Para No. 2.10)

It came out during the course of examination that there is a need for fair and transparent procedure for identification of household under SECC, 2011 in Gram Sabhas as decisions of Gram Sabhas are largely influenced on Party Lines. In this connection, the MoRD has candidly admitted before the Committee that failures and shortcoming would be examined in due course. Further, the process of conduct of claims and procedure enable fool-proof and transparent identification of beneficiaries. The Committee desire that MoRD should ensure that the Gram Sabha should perform their job fair and transparent manner and without fear or favour for bringing fairness and transparency in identification of rural poor.

Reply of the Government

Noted for compliance. Households data used for identifying beneficiaries and for excluding households would be displayed in Gran Sabha for inviting claims and objections and the same would be placed before two layers of dispute resolution authorities before inducing any change in the SECC data.

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016]

Chapter III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

-NIL-

Chapter IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Para No. 2.5)

During the course of examination, the issue of greater awareness about SECC, 2011 among the masses especially in rural areas on the pattern of 'Swachh Bharat Abhiyan' came up before the Committee in a big way. In this connection, the nodal Ministry i.e MoRD candidly admitted before the Committee about essentiality of a mega awareness drive for SECC, 2011. In this connection, the Committee have been informed by MoRD that radio clips, video spots etc. have been made available to State/UTs and State Governments have to assess need for additional campaign, if needed. The Committee, therefore, recommend that there should be mega awareness drive in consultation /coordination with State/UT Governments both in print and electronic media in a big way with a view to making SECC, 2011 a people's programme.

Reply of the Government

Noted for guidance.

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 8 of Chapter I of the Report)

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016,]

Chapter V

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Para No. 2.11)

The Committee's examination has revealed that as on 8th December, 2015 for SECC, 2011, Draft List in all the States has been published whereas Final List has been completed only in 22 States, in 8 States it is in process of publication and in 6 States it is yet to begin. In this connection, the Committee find that 8 States where Publication is in the process are Andhra Pradesh , Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh , Punjab, Rajasthan, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand whereas the six States which are yet to begin the process are UTs of Dadar and Nagar Haveli, Daman& Diu, Delhi, Odisha, Tripura and Maharashtra. The Committee recall that during the evidence of the representatives of MoRD on 13th October, 2015, the committee were informed that the work of SECC, 2011 would be completed by December,2015. Keeping in view that publication of Final List is in the process in 8 States and 6 States are yet to begin the publication process, the Committee apprehend that the MoRD may not be able to meet the deadline. The Committee, therefore, recommend that MoRD should make all out efforts to expedite and impress upon the slow moving States/UTs to move faster for accomplishing the SECC, 2011 work early.

Reply of the Government

Rural census and urban census for identifying poor households have been completed by adopting methodology for identification of BPL households as approved by the Cabinet. The exercise has been completed using 'respondent based canvasser method' on tablets supplied by BEL that carried NPR information in image form. The decision subsequently to digitize NPR images and adoption of the same in SECC too has also been carried out but for a small chunk of data which is expected to be completed before 31st March 2016. Canvassing of questions on caste and religion too were completed simultaneously. Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs has informed that the data has been examined and 98.87 % data on individuals' caste and religion is error free. ORGI has noted incidence of errors in respect of 1,34,77,030 individuals out of total SECC population of 118, 64, 03,770. States have been advised to take corrective measures.

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 11 of Chapter I of the Report)

[O.M. No. H.11018/20/2015-SECC (RD) dated 21.03.2016,]

NEW DELHI;
29 August, 2016
07 Bhadrapada, 1938 (Saka)

DR. P. VENUGOPAL
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2015-2016)

**EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SIXTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD
ON FRIDAY, THE 19 AUGUST, 2016**

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1120 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

Dr. P. Venugopal -- *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok sabha

2. Shri Sisir Adhikari
3. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
4. Dr. Yashwant Singh
5. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
6. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

7. Shri Ram Narain Dudi
8. Shri Ranvijay Singh Judev
9. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
10. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra

Secretariat

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri Abhijit Kumar | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Smt. B. Visala | - | Additional Director |
| 3. Smt. Emma C. Barwa | - | Deputy Secretary |

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members of the Committee to the sitting convened to consider and adopt three Draft Reports viz. (i) XXX XXX XXX, (ii) XXX XXX XXX and (iii) Draft Report on the Action Taken by the Government on observation/recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'BPL Survey currently Socio-Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011 in respect of Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development).

3. During the course of deliberation one of the Member requested the Chairperson for some more time to study the draft Reports in detail. The Committee therefore, decided to meet on 29.08.2016 to consider and adopt the aforesaid draft Reports.

The Committee then adjourned.

XXX Not related to the Draft Report.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2015-2016)**EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SEVENTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON MONDAY, THE 29 AUGUST, 2016**

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1145 hrs. in Committee Room No. 139, First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

Dr. P. Venugopal -- *Chairperson*

MEMBERS**Lok Sabha**

2. Shri Sisir Adhikari
3. Shri Kirti Azad
4. Shri Ajay Misra (Teni)
5. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
6. Shri Gokaraju Ganga Raju
7. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
8. Dr. Yashwant Singh
9. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
10. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Bishnu Charan Das
12. Shri Ram Narain Dudi
13. Shri Ranvijay Singh Judev
14. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
15. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra

Secretariat

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Shri Abhijit Kumar | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Smt. B. Visala | - | Additional Director |
| 3. | Smt. Emma C. Barwa | - | Deputy Secretary |

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members of the Committee to the sitting convened to consider and adopt three Draft Reports viz. (i) XXX XXX XXX (ii) XXX XXX XXX (iii) Draft Report on the Action Taken by the Government on observation/recommendations contained in the Report on 'BPL Survey currently Socio-Economic & Caste Census (SECC), 2011 in respect of Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development).

3. After discussing the above Draft Reports in detail, the Committee adopted the same without any modifications. The Committee then authorised the Chairperson to finalize the aforesaid Draft Reports and after factual verification from concerned Ministry/Department present the same to the Hon'ble Speaker.

4. The Committee appreciated the work done and the assistance rendered to them by the Secretariat.

The Committee then adjourned.

Appendix-III

ENUMERATION AND COTS TIME TAKEN BY STATES /UTS

Sl. No.	Name of State/UT	Enumeration Period		COTS		
		Starting date	Ending date	Starting date	Ending date	Days
1	ANDAMAN & NIS	2/10/2012	8/28/2014	4/20/2015	5/13/2015	23
2	ANDHRA PRADESH	11/22/2011	9/1/2015	8/22/2014	10/10/2015	414
3	ARUNACHAL P	11/22/2011	12/19/2014	12/18/2014	8/5/2015	230
4	ASSAM	2/8/2012	12/6/2014	12/18/2013	9/13/2014	269
5	BIHAR	1/10/2012	6/6/2014	12/4/2014	5/25/2015	172
6	CHANDIGARH	1/18/2012	5/16/2013	4/2/2014	4/2/2014	0
7	CHHATTISGARH	10/6/2011	12/5/2014	2/2/2015	11/27/2015	298
8	DADRA & N HAVELI	8/23/2011	10/22/2011	NA	NA	NA
9	DAMAN AND DIU	8/30/2011	5/30/2012	NA	NA	NA
10	GOA	12/1/2011	4/30/2014	3/21/2014	5/16/2014	56
11	GUJARAT	1/28/2012	5/13/2014	10/29/2013	5/21/2015	569
12	HARYANA	11/27/2011	9/1/2014	10/8/2012	2/18/2014	498
13	HIMACHAL P	10/22/2011	11/23/2015	4/9/2015	10/31/2015	205
14	JAMMU & K	12/9/2011	4/11/2014	8/11/2014	5/2/2015	264
15	JHARKHAND	2/12/2012	4/6/2015	6/11/2014	9/23/2015	469
16	KARNATAKA	12/10/2011	1/13/2014	2/4/2014	1/11/2015	341
17	KERALA	4/17/2012	2/1/2014	5/31/2014	7/18/2015	413
18	LAKSHADWEEP	3/24/2012	5/21/2012	8/29/2013	7/5/2014	310
19	MADHYA PRADESH	12/27/2011	9/30/2014	11/17/2014	6/29/2015	224
20	MAHARASHTRA	12/7/2011	12/12/2014	2/12/2015	12/2/2015	293
21	MANIPUR	5/31/2012	11/15/2013	1/4/2014	4/3/2014	89
22	MEGHALAYA	11/28/2011	10/30/2013	2/22/2014	11/7/2014	258
23	MIZORAM	3/7/2012	2/14/2014	7/31/2014	9/18/2014	49
24	NAGALAND	2/2/2012	8/18/2014	11/22/2012	2/23/2013	93
25	NCT OF DELHI	1/25/2012	2/13/2015	1/1/2016	1/5/2016	4
26	ODISHA	12/15/2011	10/9/2015	3/17/2015	12/1/2015	259
27	PUDUCHERRY	8/10/2011	2/14/2014	3/28/2015	7/10/2015	104
28	PUNJAB	11/17/2011	11/24/2014	1/15/2014	7/31/2015	562
29	RAJASTHAN	11/28/2011	10/27/2015	12/31/2014	10/25/2015	298
30	SIKKIM	12/14/2011	11/26/2012	3/11/2014	3/11/2014	0
31	TAMILNADU	6/6/2012	12/13/2014	6/2/2015	7/24/2015	52
32	TRIPURA	7/26/2011	1/28/2014	3/21/2015	10/14/2015	207
33	UTTAR PRADESH	6/18/2012	8/5/2015	6/30/2014	11/18/2015	506
34	UTTARAKHAND	12/15/2011	1/31/2014	11/8/2014	4/22/2015	165
35	WEST BENGAL	2/9/2012	5/22/2014	11/19/2013	3/21/2015	487
Notes	NCT OF DELHI	Claims settled in 4 days				
	DADRA & N HAVELI	No Claims received				
	DAMAN AND DIU	No Claims received				

APPENDIX - IV

[Vide Introduction of Report]

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE SIXTEENTH REPORT
(16TH LOK SABHA) OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

I.	Total number of recommendations:	10
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government :	
	Serial Nos.1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9	
	Total:	8
	Percentage:	80 %
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies :	
	Serial No. - NIL -	
	Total:	00
	Percentage:	0.00 %
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:	
	Serial No. 5	
	Total:	01
	Percentage:	10 %
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited :	
	Serial Nos. 10	
	Total:	01
	Percentage:	10 %