

CHAPTER III MINISTRY OF TOURISM

Performance Audit of Product/infrastructure Development for Destination and Tourist Circuits

Highlights

- **Ministry of Tourism (MoT) released Rs. 1500 crore during 2002-03 to 2006-07 to State Governments for implementation of various projects relating to Destination Development and Tourist Circuits, but did not monitor utilisation of these funds in an effective manner to ensure timely implementation of the projects by the State Governments.**

(Paragraph 3.5.1 and 3.5.1.5)

- **Internal controls in the MoT were found lacking as excess central financial assistance (CFA) of Rs 2.96 crore was released in nine projects without restricting the assistance to 90 per cent of the project cost. Similarly, MoT also released excess CFA of Rs. 2.90 crore in eight projects by sanctioning funds to cover the cost of the project that was to be borne by the State Governments. Three projects costing Rs. 6.97 crore were also sanctioned without the approval of the competent authority.**

(Paragraphs 3.5.1.1 , 3.5.1.2 and 3.5.1.3)

- **Funds amounting to Rs. 86.27 crore released for tourism projects were lying unutilised with the State Governments/ executing agencies in Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Uttarakhand, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh.**

(Paragraphs 3.5.1.5)

- **Utilisation Certificates (UCs) were not submitted regularly by the State Governments. Some of the UCs furnished were found inaccurate and incomplete in test check.**

(Paragraphs 3.5.1.6)

- **Nearly 50 per cent of the 23 projects selected for detailed audit scrutiny in six states were found delayed due to delay in acquisition of land and issue of work orders, change of site, slow progress of work and short release of funds by the State Governments.**

(Paragraph 3.5.3)

- **In Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand no authenticated data was maintained for identification of most visited sites. In Kerala and**

Tamil Nadu, four projects costing Rs. 19.93 crore were selected without adhering to the scheme guidelines.

(Paragraph 3.5.2.2)

- **In some states, no forecast for increased tourist inflow was made in the detailed proposal/ project plan. In the absence of a forecast on tourist inflow, normal annual growth rate and additional growth rate envisaged as a result of the projected investment, there were no benchmarks to verify the actual achievement of objectives.**

(Paragraph 3.5.3.6)

- **The monitoring committee for overseeing the implementation of Destination and Circuit projects had not been constituted and the convergence committee for overseeing implementation of rural tourism projects had not been set up in four States.**

(Paragraphs 3.5.4.3 and 3.6.5)

Summary of recommendations

- *The sanction and approval processes at state level need to be adequately monitored and streamlined to ensure timely availability of funds to the executing agencies so as to complete the destination development and tourist circuits projects as per the approved time schedule.*
- *Ministry may effectively monitor physical and financial progress of all projects sanctioned under the scheme and maintain a reliable and accurate computerized data base of such projects in different states to provide latest status of their implementation.*
- *Timely submission of accurate utilisation certificates by the State Governments in respect of various projects may be closely monitored by the Ministry. The utilisation certificates should provide complete details of physical and financial progress achieved. Adequate penal action should be taken against defaulting state authorities and in cases where incorrect UCs are furnished merely to show utilisation of funds without actual execution of work.*
- *Ministry may ensure that the states collect authentic data on tourist inflow in respect of all major tourist destinations in a systematic manner to facilitate proper selection of projects for tourism development and assess impact of such projects after their implementation.*
- *Ministry may strictly observe its guidelines for selection of destinations and also ensure that the project sites are carefully selected so that the assets created are optimally utilised by the tourists.*
- *Ministry may ensure that the project monitoring cell receives regular feedback from the State Governments on the status of implementation of the projects and defaulting states may be advised to return the central*

financial assistance in cases of inordinate delays in completion of the projects.

- *Sanction of new projects in a state may be linked to its performance in completion of the earlier sanctioned projects.*
- *Ministry may ensure proper scrutiny of project proposals received from the State Governments to avoid delay/abandonment/deviations at the stage of execution due to non-availability of land or change of site on account of inappropriate location.*
- *Ministry may institute an appropriate mechanism to verify that the projects are executed at approved sites without any deviation for meeting the desired objectives. Deviations in the project specifications and site, if any, required at a later stage, should be made only with the prior approval of the Ministry.*
- *Impact assessment of the implemented projects may be carried out to verify whether intended objectives of the projects were achieved.*
- *Monitoring Committees at various levels should be set up for periodical verification of the progress of various tourism projects.*

3.1 Introduction

A large number of projects such as tourist bungalows, restaurants, wayside amenities, yatri niwas, tourist reception centers were sanctioned by the Ministry of Tourism (MoT) during the VII, VIII and IX five-year plans to promote domestic tourism and to attract overseas tourists in India. Most of these projects were small and scattered, thus spreading the resources very thin, and at times, not creating the desired impact. Many of the sanctioned projects were not started and had to be ultimately dropped. There was undue delay in starting many other projects, leading to cost overruns. In order to avoid spreading the resources very thin and also to adopt an integrated planning approach, the above schemes were merged into two schemes during 2002-03:

- (a) Product/Infrastructure and Destination Development including Rural Tourism
- (b) Integrated Development of Tourist Circuits.

These two schemes were subsequently merged in September 2006 into a single scheme “Product/Infrastructure Development for Destination and Circuits” with two components:

- a) Major Destinations and Circuits Development; and
- b) Rural Tourism Infrastructure Development.

The focus of this scheme was on improvement of existing tourism products and developing new products, as also on integrated infrastructure

development of tourist sites and destinations, which would be carefully selected based on tourism potential.

As per the scheme, a destination is a place of tourist interest falling under the ten most visited sites in the State, or a recognized heritage monument, while a tourist circuit is a route on which at least three major tourist destinations are located. The main aim of the scheme is to provide infrastructure facilities required by tourists within such destination and circuits.

There was clear delineation of activities for which the State/ UT Governments would be responsible, including making land available, implementation of rehabilitation package, operation and maintenance of assets, external infrastructure etc., while other activities/items directly related to tourism were identified under the central component. The MoT would bear 90 *per cent* of the project cost as Central Financial Assistance (CFA) for destination projects (100 *per cent* in the case of circuits). There was a ceiling of Rs. 5 crore and Rs. 8 crore for CFA for tourist destination and circuits respectively. Under the merged scheme from 2006, CFA ceiling of Rs. 25 crore and Rs 50 crore was set for development of major destinations and circuits respectively based on tourist traffic.

The thrust of rural tourism infrastructure development component was on promotion of village tourism as the primary tourism product to spread tourism and its socio-economic benefits to rural and new geographic regions. Rural tourism was envisaged as a multi faceted activity, showcasing rural life, art, culture and heritage, which would be experience-oriented and meshing with seasonality and local events. A maximum of Rs 50 lakh could be sanctioned as CFA, and implementation was done through a convergence committee headed by the District Collector.

3.2 Scope of audit

The Performance Audit was conducted with a view to assessing the extent of implementation of the schemes and achievement of the objectives set for the schemes, covering the period from 2002-03 to 2006-07. During this period, 738 projects costing Rs. 1500 crore were sanctioned in 32 States/UTs under the scheme, out of which a sample of 23 projects in six States/UT¹ viz. Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Uttarakhand costing Rs. 74.76 crore were selected for detailed audit scrutiny. A detailed list of the projects selected for audit scrutiny in each State is given in Annexures IA & IB.

3.3 Audit Objectives

The audit objectives were to verify whether:

- (a) The process for identification and approval of tourist destinations, circuits and rural tourism projects was adequate and effective, and was based on comprehensive and reliable data.

¹ In these six States / UT, 214 projects were sanctioned during the period.

- (b) The projects were properly planned, with the requisite infrastructure being made available by the State Governments.
- (c) Funds for the projects were released in accordance with the guidelines and were utilised for the specified purposes.
- (d) The projects were executed within the budgeted time and cost, and the envisaged objectives of the projects were achieved.
- (e) The monitoring mechanism for overseeing implementation of the projects was adequate and effective.

3.4 Audit Criteria

The following audit criteria were adopted in the Performance Audit:

- (i) Stipulations in the guidelines issued by the MoT regarding:
 - Selection of projects
 - Progress in implementation
 - Impact assessment
- (ii) Sanctions of projects issued by the MoT regarding:
 - Release of funds
 - Utilisation of funds
- (iii) Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) regarding:
 - Deviation from Approved Activities
 - Non-execution/delay in completion of projects
 - Schedule for completion of the projects

3.4.1 Audit Methodology

The performance audit of the scheme commenced with an entry conference with the MoT in August 2007, in which the audit methodology, scope, objectives and criteria were explained to the MoT. During the meeting, MoT also made a presentation on important aspects of the scheme. Field audit was conducted between June and October 2007. In addition to examination of records at the Ministry, State Governments and Implementing Agencies, Audit teams also visited few selected project sites to ascertain the position of implementation.

The audit findings were issued to the MoT in December 2007 and their response received in March 2008 has been considering in finalising this report. Also, an exit conference was held with the MoT in March 2008 to discuss the main audit findings.

Audit acknowledges the co-operation and assistance of the MoT as well as the State Governments during the course of the performance audit.

3.5 Audit Findings - Tourists Destinations and Circuits

3.5.1 Release and Utilisation of Funds

As per the scheme guidelines, the cost of the destination project was to be shared in the ratio of 90:10 between the Centre and the State, whereas in respect of projects related to tourist circuit, 100 per cent funding was to be provided by

the Centre. Also, the State/UT Governments were fully responsible for certain specified components of the projects as laid down in the guidelines. Under all the schemes, funds were to be released in three instalments up to 14 December 2004, and thereafter in two instalments as detailed below:

| Up to 14 December 2004 | After 14 December 2004 |
|---|--|
| 1 st instalment (30 per cent)- on sanction of the project | 80 per cent of the sanctioned amount on the basis of preliminary cost estimates; detailed estimates were to be submitted within three months of the sanction of the project. |
| 2 nd instalment (50 per cent) - on receipt of the utilization certificate of the first instalment. | 20 per cent on completion of the project |
| 3 rd instalment (20 per cent) - on completion of work. | |

The Ministry released a total Central Financial Assistance of Rs. 1,500 crore during the period 2002-03 to 2006-07 for various projects relating to Product/Infrastructure & Destination Development and Development of Tourist Circuits. The year-wise position of the funds released under the scheme is given in the table below:

| (Rupees in crore) | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Year | Funds Released |
| 2002-03 | 95.87 |
| 2003-04 | 199.81 |
| 2004-05 | 281.70 |
| 2005-06 | 464.18 |
| 2006-07 | 458.43 |
| Total | 1499.99 |

Audit examination of release and utilisation of funds disclosed several deficiencies as discussed in the succeeding paragraphs:

3.5.1.1 Excess release of Financial Assistance

Audit examination of 23 selected projects revealed that MoT did not restrict the Central Financial Assistance (CFA) for tourist destination to 90 per cent of the project cost, and released the entire cost to the selected States in nine projects as CFA, which was irregular. This resulted in excess CFA of Rs 2.96 crore in these nine projects as detailed in Annexure-II.

In reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that as part of their contribution, the State Government provided land, implemented rehabilitation package where shifting of dwellings or commercial units were required, and provided external infrastructure like water supply, electricity and roads etc. The reply is not tenable, since the scheme guidelines stipulated that MoT would bear only 90 *per cent* of the project cost, excluding above items which were the exclusive responsibility of

the State Governments. The State Governments were to bear ten *per cent* of the project cost in addition to providing the above listed items.

3.5.1.2 Irregular release of Financial Assistance

MoT did not adhere to its own guidelines and also sanctioned the cost of the State components viz. external infrastructure as CFA, despite the fact that the State Governments had given a written undertaking, while submitting the proposal, that the cost of State components would be borne by them. This resulted in irregular release of CFA to the extent of Rs 2.90 crore in eight projects in five states, as detailed in Annexure III.

Further audit scrutiny revealed that in Uttarakhand, a sum of Rs 0.18 crore was irregularly loaded on account of centage charges on two projects viz 'Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne Destination Development' and 'Development of Badrinath as tourist circuit'.

In their reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that:

- As per the guidelines, CFA was provided for some admissible components, which included improvement of surroundings, landscaping development of parks, compound walls, improvement of road connectivity (last-mile connectivity), wayside amenities, etc. Consequently, CFA was sanctioned for these components.
- Centage charges were allowed in the Uttarakhand project, since it was to be implemented by two State Government Undertakings.

The reply is not tenable for the following reasons:

- Certain components viz. the cost of land, construction of residential building external electrification, external water supply, supervision and execution charges etc. were State components, for which CFA was also sanctioned.
- In the prescribed Form 'C', the central component refers only to centage charges in respect of work executed by Central Public Works Division. Moreover, the Government of Uttarakhand had intimated that the centage charges claimed by the executing agency would be met by them.

The above instances of release of excess CFA indicate weak internal controls and poor financial management in the MoT.

3.5.1.3 Unauthorised release of funds

As per instructions issued by the Ministry of Finance, the Secretary of the administrative Ministry/Department had been delegated financial powers for appraising and approving the projects upto Rs 5 crore under Plan schemes.

Audit scrutiny revealed that the approval of the competent authority i.e. the Secretary of the Ministry was not obtained in respect of three projects, involving CFA of Rs. 6.97 crore as detailed in Annexure-IV.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that ex-post-facto approval of the Secretary was being obtained for two projects, and approval of Secretary (T) was being obtained for all such projects in the XI Plan.

3.5.1.4 Delay in transfer of funds

In Chhattisgarh, in respect of 'Development of Circuit (Keshkal Cafeteria)', balance funds amounting to Rs 0.48 crore payable to the executing agency, had not been transferred as of September 2007.

In Kerala, funds were released to the executing agency after delays ranging from 7 to 12 months in three works. In case of 'Thekkinkad Maidan' destination, out of a sanctioned CFA of Rs 4.89 crore, an amount of Rs 3.91 crore was released to the Tourism Department in December 2005, of which Rs 2.73 crore was transferred to the implementing agency in December 2006 after a lapse of one year. In respect of 'Vizhinjam' destination, out of CFA of Rs 5 crore, an amount of Rs 4 crore was released to the Tourism Department in January 2005, of which Rs 2 crore was transferred to the implementing agency (KITCO) in March 2006, after a lapse of more than one year. In another case viz. 'Alappuzha' circuit, out of Rs 8 crore of CFA, Rs. 6.40 crore was released to the Tourism Department in May 2005. However, the funds were transferred to the executing agency after a lapse of more than eight months.

In Tamil Nadu, the delay in release of funds amounting to Rs 10.26 crore by the State Government to the nodal agencies ranged from 2 to 12 months, and in turn by the nodal officers to the executing agencies ranged up to five months, as detailed in Annexure-V.

In response (February 2008), the MOT stated that:

- It released CFA directly to the State Governments, who were responsible for releasing funds to the implementing agency. However, the MoT had been monitoring such cases through regular meetings, and had instructed the State Governments to ensure immediate release so that the projects could be completed on time.
- As regards Chhattisgarh, response was awaited from the State Government.
- As regards Kerala, the facts had been confirmed by the State Government. However, there was no purposeful delay in transfer of funds, and the delay was due to the need for sanctions and approvals at various stages.
- As regards Tamil Nadu, the State Government indicated that at the initial stage, there was a delay in releasing funds. During 2005 and 2006, there was a delay due to elections for Parliament, State Assembly and local bodies.

Reply is not acceptable as despite holding of review meetings at the Ministry's level and issue of instructions to the State Governments, there were significant delays in release of the project funds to the executing agencies.

Recommendation

- *The sanction and approval processes at state level need to be adequately monitored and streamlined to ensure timely availability of funds to the executing agencies so as to complete the destination development and tourist circuits projects as per the approved time schedule.*

3.5.1.5 Non-monitoring of utilization of funds released

Though MoT released Rs 1500 crore during 2002-03 to 2006-07 to State Governments under these schemes, it could not provide State-wise details of actual utilization of funds released specifically under the scheme. In the absence of a mechanism for monitoring of expenditure incurred for individual projects under the scheme, the actual utilization of CFA released could not be verified in audit.

Further, audit scrutiny at the state level revealed the following deficiencies:

- In Kerala, Rs 2.00 crore remained unutilised with the implementation agency since February 2006 in respect of the 'Vizhinjam' project. In another case, viz. 'Alappuzha Tourist Circuit', an amount of Rs 1.44 crore received from the GOI in May 2005 for 'Development of Backwater Tourist Complex' had not been transferred to the implementing agency as of September 2007, and was still lying with the State Government.
- In Tamil Nadu, Rs 0.83 crore was lying unutilised under 'Development of Mamallapuram as Destination', as there was a problem in identification of land. In Eco-tourism Circuit (Pichavram, Muthupet and Point Calimere), funds to the extent of Rs 0.22 crore released to TTDC² for creation of tourism facilities in Pichawaram, remained unutilised as of September 2007, as these activities had already been included in another scheme viz. Rashtriya Swayam Vikas Yojna, implemented by the Forest Department. The alternative proposal for a revised amount (Rs. 0.30 crore) was yet to be approved. Also, Rs 0.70 crore paid as an advance was shown as expenditure, which was irregular.
- In Uttarakhand, CFA amounting to Rs 29.47 crore remained unutilised with the State Government/GMVNL³ (the executing agency) as on 31 March 2007, as detailed in Annexure-VI.
- Similarly, in Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh CFA amounting to Rs 18.77 crore and Rs 32.32 crore respectively remained unutilised with the implementing agencies as on 31 March 2007/ February 2008 as detailed in Annexure-VIA and VI B. In Chattisgarh, an amount of Rs

² Tamil Nadu Tourism Development Corporation

³ Garhwal Mandal Vikas Nigam Limited

0.52 crore paid as an advance in March/December 2006 had been shown as expenditure, which was irregular.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that:

- It was monitoring the implementation of projects on a regular basis through monthly review meetings, and there were sincere efforts on the part of the State Governments to complete them at the earliest. Further, the State Governments had been clearly told that no releases would be made unless all outstanding balances till the financial year 2005-06 were shown as utilised before March 2008.
- As regards the projects in Kerala, the delays were on account of delays in transfer/ acquisition of land, and the works were now in progress.
- As regards the project in Tamil Nadu, the State Government had indicated that the necessity of alternative work was under study. Further, the amount of Rs 0.70 crore was drawn and paid to the District Collector.

Reply is not acceptable as Ministry despite holding review meetings was not able to provide state-wise details of actual utilisation of funds to audit. This shows that the ministry is not fully aware of the exact physical and financial progress of each project for which funds had been released.

Recommendation

- *Ministry may effectively monitor physical and financial progress of all projects sanctioned under the scheme and maintain a reliable and accurate computerized data base of such projects in different states to provide latest status of their implementation.*

3.5.1.6 Outstanding/Defective Utilisation Certificates (UCs)

In Madhya Pradesh, the UCs were not supported by detailed Statements of Expenditure.

In Kerala, though Rs 4.67 crore of CFA was reported as utilised in the Alappuzha circuit, the actual amount utilised worked out to only Rs 3.41 crore. On being pointed out by Audit, the department stated that the GoI had not accepted the UC, and revised UC was under preparation.

In Tamil Nadu, UC for the total project of Rs 1.68 crore cost in respect of Vivekananda Tourist Circuit, Rameshwaram was furnished, despite the fact that only 55 *per cent* of the funds released had been utilised.

In Kerala, no utilisation had been reported by the State Government in respect of the two destination projects selected for audit scrutiny.

In Uttarakhand, most of the components of work had not been taken up for execution. Hence, UCs to the extent of Rs 7.04 crore in respect of selected projects were still outstanding as of June 2007, as detailed in Annexure- VII.

The Ministry in their reply stated that the State Governments had been clearly told that no releases would be made unless all outstanding balances till the financial year 2005-06 were shown as utilised before March 2008. With regard to the specific states, Ministry replied as follows:

- As regards Kerala, the State Government had confirmed the facts, but stated that the works were going on and the utilisation and completion certificates would be submitted, once the projects were over. Also, audit findings were noted for future guidance.
- As regards Uttarakhand, clarification was awaited from the State Government.
- As regards Tamil Nadu, the State Government has noted the audit finding, which would be corrected in future.

While Ministry has assured that no funds would be released to states where utilisation of already released funds is pending, it has not taken any effective measures to ensure that the State Governments do not furnish incorrect utilisation certificates.

Recommendation

- *Timely submission of accurate utilisation certificates by the State Governments in respect of various projects may be closely monitored by the Ministry. The utilisation certificates should provide complete details of physical and financial progress achieved. Adequate penal action should be taken against defaulting state authorities and in cases where incorrect UCs are furnished merely to show utilisation of funds without actual execution of work.*

3.5.2 Identification and Selection of Projects

As per the scheme guidelines, for being eligible under this scheme, the tourist destination must be among the top ten most visited sites in the State, or alternatively a recognised heritage monument declared as such by the Archeological Survey of India (ASI). The State/UT Governments were to furnish a list of three destinations each year to be taken up for development. From this panel, one site would be identified each year in every state in consultation with the State/UT Govt.

As per the guidelines, a tourist circuit is defined as a route on which at least three major tourist destinations are located such that none of these are in the same town, village or city. At the same time, these should not be separated by long distances, such that a tourist would not like to cover them in a sequence and a tourist who enters at the entry point, should be motivated to visit all the places identified on the circuit.

Audit examination in selected states revealed the following deficiencies in identification:

3.5.2.1 Insufficient data on tourist sites

Out of the selected six States, Chattisgarh and Uttarakhand had neither authenticated data on the ten most visited sites, nor on recognized heritage monuments. In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that basic data on the ten most visited sites was not available in the newly created states of Chattisgarh and Uttarakhand, and the Tourism Secretaries had been impressed upon to put systems in place for collection of reliable data.

Recommendation

- *Ministry may ensure that the states collect authentic data on tourist inflow in respect of all major tourist destinations in a systematic manner to facilitate proper selection of projects for tourism development and assess impact of such projects after their implementation.*

3.5.2.2 Improper Selection

In Kerala, four destinations were proposed during 2005-06, and all four were sanctioned, though two of these destinations were not among the ten most visited sites in the State. Another project titled 'Integrated development of Alappuzha heritage town', was sanctioned at a cost of Rs 8.00 crore as a circuit, though it is not a route on which three major destinations are located.

In Tamil Nadu, a small hill resort, Yercaud, was sanctioned as a destination project during December 2004 at a cost of Rs 4.48 crore, even though it did not fall under the ten most visited sites.

In Uttarakhand, a work 'Upgradation of Tourist Rest House at Kanavashram' under the project 'Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne' was sanctioned at a cost of Rs. 0.22 crore, despite the fact that the guesthouse was neither located at a prominent place nor had sufficient occupancy, which ranged from 1.07 to 6.47 per cent during the years 2001-02 to 2005-06.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that during the course of the year some proactive states sent more proposals and some states did not send proposals; consequently, proactive states get more projects sanctioned. As regards the projects in Kerala, tourism projects were also sanctioned at lesser known destinations and circuits with good tourism potential and the project for integrated development of Alappuzha heritage town was one such project. As regards the project in Uttarakhand, the Ministry replied that the work was sanctioned on the basis of the recommendation of the States Govt.

Reply of the Ministry is to be viewed in the light of the fact that it first issued guidelines for selection of projects and later sanctioned projects which were not covered under the approved guidelines.

Recommendations

- *Ministry may strictly observe its guidelines for selection of destinations and also ensure that the project sites are carefully selected so that the assets created are optimally utilised by the tourists.*

3.5.3 Project implementation

Normally, the projects under the schemes were required to be completed within two to three years. Out of 23 projects selected in six states for performance audit, it was observed that only seven were reported as completed, 12 were delayed, three were ongoing⁴, and one project short closed, as detailed in (Annexure-VIII). The delay ranged from 8 to 41 months (Annexure I B).

Audit scrutiny revealed various cases of non-execution/delay in completion/short closure/abandoned projects, as detailed below:

3.5.3.1 Non-execution /Delay in completion

(i) In Chattisgarh, none of the three selected projects was started on time. The completion of projects titled “Development of Jagdalpur as tourist destination”, sanctioned in March 2003 for completion by March 2005, and “Development of Kawardha-Nagarnar project’ under Tourist Circuit sanctioned in March 2004 for completion by March 2006, was delayed due to delay in acquisition of land for motels, floating of tenders and issue of work orders, change of site, slow progress of work and short release of funds by the State Government.

(ii) In Kerala, under destination development projects viz., Vizhinjam, the CFA for the project was released in January 2005 and the project was to be completed in December 2006, but the project had not been started as of December 2007. Similarly, in the project titled ‘Development of Alappuzha Town as a Tourist Circuit’, the CFA was released in May 2005 and the project was to be completed in 24 months i.e. by April 2007. It was observed that out of six items of this project, only two items had been completed, one item had not commenced, and the remaining items were stated to be under completion.

(iii) In Tamil Nadu out of five selected projects under Tourist Destination project ‘Mamallapuram’, the mid course change of executing agency from CPWD to State PWD after preparation of project proposal and preparation of revised estimate for the work, and proposing the project without actually having possession of the land, resulted in non-commencement, abnormal delay in execution and non-achievement of the objectives of providing infrastructure facilities to the tourists at Mamallapuram.

In another project viz., Development of Yercaud Hill Resort, under Tourist Destination, one item of work ‘Improvement to Boat House’ at a cost of Rs. 0.25 crore, was scheduled to be completed by December 2005, but was started only in May 2006, and was not completed as of September 2007.

‘Hi-Tech Tourist Reception Centre’ was included as one of the components in the Vivekananda Circuit at a cost of Rs 0.30 crore in Rameshwaram. Due to indecision in fixing the executing agency and non-

⁴ As of December 2007

finalization of location and non-identification of land for construction of the centre, the work could not be taken up even after a delay of three years.

(iv) In Uttarakhand, the project titled “Development of Kedarnath Dham as Destination” was to be completed by December 2007. It was observed that out of eight items of work, six items were not executed till June 2007. In Uttarakhand, most of the projects were delayed, but hindrance register was not maintained by the executing agency, in the absence of which reasons for the delay could not be verified.

Another project viz. “Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne” under Tourist Destination was to be completed by December 2005 but was, however, not completed as of June 2007. The reasons attributed for the delay were shifting of location, delay in execution etc.

In the case of ‘Development of Badrinath Dham’ under circuit, out of nine items of work, three items were stated to be completed, and the remaining were incomplete. Out of the three completed works, one work viz. ‘Construction of Parking and Extension of Tourist Lodge at Joshimath’, though completed, was still not commissioned. In another work ‘Installation of Retro-reflective Signages at Badrinath’, 100 retro-reflective signages were to be installed. It was observed during field visit, that only 26 signages of different sizes were installed. Due to less number of signages installed, the full benefit of such signages may not be available to the tourists. Similarly, in another item of work viz. ‘Construction of parking prefab huts and upgradation of kitchen and dining hall at Auli’, the project was still not commissioned as of June 2007.

(v) In Madhya Pradesh, with a view to developing, refurbishing and enhancing the facilities at the Simastha Kumbh Mela, held at Ujjain from 7 April 2004 to 7 May 2004, a proposal for Rs. 1.11 crore was approved by the Department of Tourism. The first instalment of Rs.0.33 crore was released on 30 April 2004 when the mela was half-way through, and subsequent instalments were released in September 2005 and December 2006. The project was completed in December 2006 i.e, 19 months after the mela. Thus, the objective of providing better facilities to visitors/pilgrimages during the mela could not be achieved.

MoT stated as follows:

- As regards Uttarakhand, the working season was only 3-4 months in the hilly states. Hence, there was delay in implementation of the projects sanctioned in these states. Further, the State Government would be advised to maintain hindrance register.
- As regards Kerala, the Government had stated that the Thekkinkad Maidan project would be completed by April 2008, and the Vizhinjam works were ready for awarding.
- As regards Tamil Nadu, it was monitoring the execution of the projects on a regular basis through Regional Directors/specially designated nodal officer and review meetings. Further, the State Government had been

advised to ensure that all the projects sanctioned were completed by March 2007.

- As regards Chhattisgarh & Madhya Pradesh, clarification/report was awaited from the State Government.

MoT also informed audit in March 2008 that a project monitoring cell headed by an officer of the rank of Joint Secretary has been created in the Ministry to monitor all projects sanctioned by the Ministry on a regular basis. State-wise nodal officers have been appointed to inspect the project sites and submit reports on physical and financial progress of the projects. Review meetings with representatives of State Governments/UT Administrations and different implementing agencies were held at the level of Joint Secretary (Tourism) and Secretary (Tourism) from time to time to take stock of implementation of and to remove bottlenecks in implementations of the projects. State Governments have also been advised to complete all projects sanctioned during the first three years of the Tenth Plan, by March 2008 and send utilisation certificates expeditiously.

Recommendation

- *Ministry may ensure that the project monitoring cell receives regular feedback from the State Governments on the status of implementation of the projects and defaulting states may be advised to return the central financial assistance in cases of inordinate delays in completion of the projects.*
- *Sanction of new projects in a state may be linked to its performance in completion of the earlier sanctioned projects.*

3.5.3.2 Failure of State Government to ensure availability of land/site

As per the scheme guidelines, the State/UT Governments are responsible for making land available for the projects. The State Governments are required to furnish a certificate at the time of submitting the project proposal confirming that the land for the project is readily available/ is in the possession of state government and will be transferred to the MoT free of charge. However, audit scrutiny revealed that the above instructions were not adhered to and there were delays and deviations from the approved project proposals mainly due to non-availability of the site for execution of work, as detailed below:

- In Kerala, a Destination Development project (Vizhinjam) was proposed to be implemented in an area of 7.58 ha⁵. Owing to disputes between the Harbour Engineering Department and the Fisheries Department on the ownership of the identified land, alternate land measuring 3.68 ha was made available by the Harbour Engineering Department. This was done only in February 2007 i.e., after a lapse of two years from the date of sanction of the project.

⁵ ha: hectare

Another project 'Alappuzha' included a component viz. 'Backwater front walkway at Punnamada' having 1.21 Km length, for which administrative sanction was given in September 2005. However, the work was held up due to objection of the owner of a stretch of land in the proposed walkway.

(ii) In Tamil Nadu, for the Mamallapuram destination sanctioned in February 2005 consisting of ten works, land for two works viz. 'Area Development in front of Arjunas' Penance' and 'Construction of Primary School, Balvadi' was not made available for the project, while in another work, 'Bus stand/modal inter change node' for the same destination, the land identified was found to be marshy, and alternate land was not identified as of October 2007. In case of yet another work viz. 'Landscape development in front of ASI office' under the same destination, the land was belatedly handed over to the executing agency (TTDC) only in April/May 2007 i.e., after a delay of 25 months.

In another project 'Development of Rameshwaram under Vivekananda Travel Circuit', in two works viz. Vivekananda Baskaram' and 'Vivekananda Memorial Hall', there were delays of 5 and 23 months in handing over the land to the executing agencies, while in another work, viz. 'Hi-Tech Tourist Reception Centre', land was yet to be identified. In the work, viz. Installation of Telescope at Gandhamanaparvatham', the site is under dispute with a private party.

(iii) In Uttarakhand, the work titled 'Internal path alongwith the river to facilitate pilgrims movements' sanctioned at cost of Rs. 0.59 crore lakh under the "Badrinath Travel Circuit", could not be started, as the land was not made available by the District Administration. In response to an audit query, the executing agency stated that the work would be started after availability of land.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated as follows:

- Projects were selected based on the availability of land/ site for executing the works. However, in some cases, due to interim stay obtained by local persons, there was delay in commencing work, which could not be anticipated. However, adequate care would be taken in identification of the site in future.
- As regards the Vizhinjam project in Kerala, the Harbour Engineering Department had agreed to the transfer of land to the Department of Tourism. However, the transfer could not take place, as the Fisheries Department also claimed a portion of the land. Subsequently, another site was identified, and the project was redesigned. Works had been tendered, and tenders were opened in August 2007. As regards the Alappuzha project, the work on "Backwater front walkway at Punnamada" was going on, and was nearing completion.
- As regards the Mamallapuram destination project in Tamil Nadu, Phase-II works were recommended based on the availability of land. However, due to a legal case filed by a third party, there was delay in commencing the work. The judgement was given in favour of the Tourism Department, and the work had now commenced. As regards the work on "Landscape

development in front of ASI office”, there was a delay in the site being handed over by the Sculpture College, but the District Collector had issued a subsequent clarification; the site had been handed over, and the work was under progress. As regards the other three projects, while response was awaited from the State Government, sanctions were issued by the MoT only after receiving an undertaking from the State Government that land was available and in their possession.

- As regards the Uttarakhand project, while generally land was available for development and improvement, in a few cases, the availability and handing over of land was delayed because of unforeseen circumstances.

The reply clearly indicates that the land was not readily available for implementation of the projects and the State Governments had incorrectly certified the availability of land in order to expedite sanctions from the MoT.

Recommendation

- *Ministry may ensure proper scrutiny of project proposals received from the State Governments to avoid delay/abandonment/deviations at the stage of execution due to non-availability of land or change of site on account of inappropriate location.*

3.5.3.3 Deviation from Approved Activities

While according sanctions to the projects, MoT stipulated that the projects should be executed by the State Governments as per the original plan, drawing etc approved by the Central Government. The State Governments were also required to follow all codal formalities in execution of the projects. Audit scrutiny, however, revealed deviations from the approved projects as discussed below:

(i) In Uttarakhand, the work ‘Construction of Platform over Rawal⁶ Niwas’, under the project ‘Integrated Development of Badrinath Dham as a travel circuit’ was sanctioned, but the executing agency had actually started the construction of the entire Rawal Niwas, instead of the platform over the Rawal Niwas, which was outside the scope of the MoT sanction.

Similarly, in another work ‘Construction of Tree Top Houses’ under development of Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne as tourist destination, the location was shifted from Kanavasharam to Lansdowne. However, no approval for this change in the sanctioned project was taken from the MoT.

In reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that as per the utilisation certificate, the amount of Rs. 19.40 lakh was utilised for the approved item viz., construction of platform over Rawal Niwas. If any deviation is found, the State Government would be advised to obtain the approval of MoT. With regard to shifting of location of tree top houses, the MoT stated that it was not aware of any change in the location of the project. The Ministry assured that if the State Government has actually changed the location, they would be asked to seek the necessary approval.

⁶ Head Priest at Badrinath Temple at Uttarakhand

(ii) In Chhattisgarh, under destination development project 'Development of Jagdalpur', Tourist Reception Centre(TRC) was proposed on the main road from Raipur entering and exiting the destination-Bastar(Asna). However, an amount of Rs. 19.20 lakh was incurred on wayside amenities at Nagarnar which is not situated on the Raipur-Jagdalpur route.

In reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that under the project 'Destination development of Jagdalpur', Rs.100.00 lakh was sanctioned for development of wayside amenities (Tourists Reception Centres). The reply does not address the specific audit finding.

Recommendation

- *Ministry may institute an appropriate mechanism to verify that the projects are executed at approved sites without any deviation for meeting the desired objectives. Deviations in the project specifications and site, if any, required at a later stage, should be made only with the prior approval of the Ministry.*

3.5.3.4 Idle Assets

In Tamil Nadu, an aquarium under the destination project (Yercaud) was got constructed at a cost of Rs. 0.26 crore through the Panchayat Union, Yercaud, though it did not have any expertise in construction and management of aquariums. The aquarium did not attract tourists in large numbers. Similarly, in Rameshwaram under the 'Vivekananda Travel Circuit', a park developed at a cost of Rs.7 lakh had not attracted many tourists, due to poor maintenance.

The MOT stated that the District Collectors have been directed by the State Governments to ensure proper maintenance of the created assets for the benefit of the tourists.

3.5.3.5 Project milestone charts not prepared

In Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Uttarakhand, no milestone charts were drawn up for execution of projects. Further, in Uttarakhand, PERT charts, as envisaged in the State Government's order, were also not prepared.

Ministry in their reply stated that the Governments of Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh would be advised to prepare milestone charts. The Government of Tamil Nadu had confirmed that milestone charts would be drawn up. The Government of Kerala had clear target dates for completion and execution of projects.

3.5.3.6 No forecast for increased tourist inflow

In Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, no forecast for increased tourist inflow was made in the detailed proposal/project plan. In the absence of details specifying current tourist inflow, normal annual growth rate and forecast for additional growth rate envisaged as a result of the project investment, there were no benchmarks to verify the actual achievement of objectives.

MoT stated that in future, such projections would be given by Tamil Nadu Government, as per reply received from them. As regards Kerala, the State had been experiencing a steady growth of tourist arrivals, and the average annual growth rate for international and domestic tourists, based on past trends, was 25 per cent and 5 per cent respectively.

The response of the MoT is not tenable, as its instructions for submissions of projects proposals require State Governments to furnish details of tourist attraction of the place with existing tourist traffic and traffic likely to be generated in future.

3.5.3.7 Inadequate External Infrastructure

In Uttarakhand, field visit by Audit revealed poor facilities for drinking water at Badrinath and electricity at Joshimath. In reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that the State Government would be advised to address the issue of poor facilities at Badrinath and electricity at Joshimath.

3.5.4 Other Deficiencies

Audit examination revealed the following:

3.5.4.1 Impact assessment

No impact assessment of the projects was done by the State Government to ascertain whether intended objectives were achieved. In response (February 2008), the MOT stated that the observations have been noted by the State Governments.

3.5.4.2 Mechanism for redressal of grievances

An effective mechanism for redressal of grievances of tourists is essential to maximise tourist satisfaction. This would require that the grievances of tourists are registered promptly at convenient locations near tourist sites and immediate action taken. It was observed that in Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand and Kerala, no such mechanism had been devised. In Uttarakhand, complaints were being attended through the helpline at the Reception of the Uttarakhand Tourism Office.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that the State Governments would be advised to have a mechanism for grievance redressal and monitoring of projects in place.

Recommendation

- *Impact assessment of the implemented projects may be carried out to verify whether intended objectives of the projects were achieved.*

3.5.4.3 State Level Monitoring

In case of Destination and Circuits projects, a monitoring committee was to be set up by the State Government to oversee the implementation of the scheme. Audit examination revealed that in Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, no such committee was formed, while in Uttarakhand,

though the committee was formed, it did not have a representative from the MoT as envisaged in the guidelines.

MoT stated that the State Governments would be advised to form monitoring committees to oversee implementation of projects.

3.5.4.4 Other Irregularities

During joint field visit to the project site 'Beautification of Mall Road and Construction of two View Points' at Pauri, the name of the Nagar Palika Parishad, Pauri alongwith the name of the Adhyaksh Nagar Palika Parishad was indicated, giving the impression that the work had been executed by the Nagar Palika Parishad, Pauri; Yash Pal Benam, Adhyaksh Nagar Palika Parishad, though the entire funds were provided by the MoT.

During joint field visit of the work 'Construction of parking, prefab huts and upgradation of Kitchen and Dinning Hall at Auli', it was noticed that a private canteen was functioning in the parking area of the Tourist Rest House(TRH), Auli. On enquiry, it was found that the canteen was run by a private person who had encroached upon the land of the TRH, Auli.

During joint field visit of the project site at Auli (Uttarakhand) in respect of the project 'Construction of parking, prefab huts, and upgradation of kitchen and dining hall', it was noticed that the parking area was not maintained properly and not utilised for the purpose for which it was constructed.

In response, the MoT stated that the State Government of Uttarakhand would be advised to address the issue of encroachment of Government property.

3.6 Rural Tourism

Under this scheme, the thrust would be to promote village tourism as a primary tourism product to spread tourism and its socio-economic benefits to rural and its new geographic regions. A maximum of Rs 50 lakh would be sanctioned to the State Governments.

3.6.1 Selection of Projects

As per the scheme, any form of tourism that showcases rural life, art, culture and heritage at rural locations, thereby benefiting the local community economically and socially as well as enabling interaction between the tourists and the locals for a more enriching tourism experience, can be termed as rural tourism. Each State/UT Government was to furnish one proposal for promotion of rural tourism. Based on the merits and after joint inspection by the MoT and the State/UT Government, ten proposals were to be identified for implementation in the country every year.

Audit examination revealed that in Chattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, the projects were selected without joint inspection by the MoT and the State Government.

In reply (February 2008), the MoT stated that the proposals received were examined and sanctioned in consultation with the respective State Governments,

and were implemented under the supervision of the Project Standing Committee, Project Management Board and the Secretary (T) of the respective State. However, the fact remains that the projects were sanctioned without joint inspection by the MOT and the State Government.

3.6.2 Planning

After shortlisting of proposals, the State/UT Governments were to draw up a detailed plan of action, the thrust being to achieve convergence between the different schemes of the Government of India and the State Governments.

Audit examination revealed that in Kerala, the Project Report for “Development of Kumbalangi” under Rural Tourism was not available as it was stated to be missing. Audit scrutiny revealed that the components viz. (a) Restaurant and (b) Resorts consisting of cottages, included in the project report were not implemented. However, new components viz. sanitation, waste management, dredging, mangrove cultivation were included. These changes were, however, not communicated to the MoT.

MoT stated that the status report from the State Government on this project was awaited.

3.6.3 Utilisation of Funds

Audit examination revealed that in Tamil Nadu, a delay of 6 months was noticed in release of funds by the State Govt. to the nodal agencies, and in turn there was further delay of five months in transfer of funds by the nodal officers to the executing agencies. It was also observed that a UC for the total project cost of Rs 0.76 crore in respect of Rural Tourism project at Devipattinam (Navabhasanam) was furnished, despite the fact that only 49 per cent of the funds released had been utilised.

In reply, MoT stated that funds were released on the basis of the UC furnished by the State Government, which had been requested to furnish a status report on the project.

3.6.4 Project Implementation

- In Chattisgarh, the project ‘Chitrakote’ was sanctioned in May 2003 and was to be completed in July 2004. However, due to delay in acquisition of land and late issue of work order, the completion report was still awaited.
- In Kerala, the project “Development of Kumbalangi” was to be completed by August 2004. However, while the components with CFA were completed, the execution of the project as a whole was delayed by 15 months due to change in implementing agency.
- In Madhya Pradesh, a sum of Rs. 0.26 crore was incurred against the approved cost of Rs. 0.04 crore in respect of a component ‘Restoration and conversion of heritage building to tourist accommodation at Betwa Cottage Complex under ‘Orchha Village Project’ and under Camping Equipment Section.

Against the approved cost for 18 tents of Rs 0.22 crore, not even a single tent was procured.

- In Tamil Nadu, in Ramanathapuram, one guest house was built and improvement to one sangalpamadam was done under the scheme of “Development of Devipattinam-Navabhsanam”, which were not included in the original proposal.

In response (February 2008), the MoT stated that the State Governments had been requested to furnish status reports on the projects, which were awaited.

3.6.5 Monitoring

In the case of Rural Tourism, a convergence committee was to be set up at the State level to oversee the implementation of the projects. Audit scrutiny revealed that in Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, no convergence committee was set up. In the absence of such committees, effective monitoring for convergence of different schemes could not be ensured.

In response the MoT stated that the District Collector was the focal point of the rural tourism site, and Secretary (Tourism) of the State Government was the nodal officer for all rural tourism projects in the State. However, the State Governments had been requested to report on the setting up of convergence committees, which was awaited.

Recommendation

- *Monitoring Committees at various levels should be set up for periodical verification of the progress of various tourism projects.*

Annexure-IA
(Referred to in paragraph 3.2)
Statement showing number of projects test- checked

| States | Sanctioned projects | Sample Size (%) | Number of Projects |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Kerala | 42 | 10 | 4 |
| Uttaranchal | 27 | 10 | 3 |
| Tamil Nadu | 46 | 10 | 5 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 48 | 10 | 5 |
| Chattisgarh | 25 | 10 | 3 |
| Delhi | 26 | 10 | 3 |
| Total | 214 | | 23 |

Annexure-IB
(Referred to in paragraph 3.2 and 3.5.3)
List of selected projects

| Sl.No | Name of the State. | Name of the projects. | Category | Sanction No.& date. | Amount sanctioned (Rs in lakh) | Amount released (Rs in lakh) | Scheduled date of completion. | Status | Period of delay in months) |
|-------|--------------------|--|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| | Delhi. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | Dev. of Delhi Haat at Pitampura. | Des. | 5-PNE/107/03 dt.22.12.04 | 500.00 | 400.00 | 12/07 | Ongoing | - |
| 2 | | Integrated Dev. Of Important Monuments of Delhi. | Circuit | 8-PNE/15/04 dt.25.3.04 | 636.44 | 636.44 | 4/05 | Incomplete | 32 |
| 3 | | Rural Tourism in Village Rajapur Nagli.(Short-closed) | Rural | | 36.30 | 36.30 | | Short-closed | - |
| | Chattisgarh | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | Development of Jagdalpur as Tourist Destination | Des. | 5-PSW/73/02 dt.31.3.03 | 277.50 | 221.75 | 3/05 | Incomplete | 33 |
| 5 | | Integrated Development of Kawardha-Nagarnar as Tourist Circuit | Circuit | 5-PSW/53/03 dt. 15.3.04 | 670.75 | 536.60 | 3/06 | -do- | 21 |
| 6 | | Development of Rural Tourism in Village Chitrakote. | Rural | 5-PSW/74/02 dt.12.5.03 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 7/04 | -do- | 41 |
| | Kerala | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | Destination Development of Thekkinkad Maidan, Thrissur | Des. | 5-PSW/36/05 dt. 5.12.05 | 489.00 | 391.20 | 12/07 | Ongoing | - |
| 8 | | Art and Craft Village, Vizhinjam | Des. | 5-PSW/47/04 dt.7.12.04 | 500.00 | 400.00 | 12/06 | Incomplete | 12 |
| 9 | | Integrated Development of Alpuzha Heritage Town as Tourist Circuit | Circuit | 5-PSW/74/04 dt.25.04.05 | 800.00 | 640.00 | 4/07 | Incomplete | 8 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|--|---------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|------------|----|
| 10 | | Development of Kumbalangi as Rural Tourism | Rural | 5-PSW/61/02 dt.18.8.03 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 8/04 | Completed | - |
| | Madhya Pradesh | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | Development of Simhastha at Ujjain | Des. | 5-PSW/(03)/04 dt. 30.04.04 | 110.66 | 110.66 | 6/05 | -do- | - |
| 12 | | Expansion of Travellers' Lodge at Sanchi. | Des. | 5-PSW/9/02(1) dt.17.7.02 | 73.45 | 73.45 | 1/04 | -d0- | - |
| 13 | | Upgradation of Highway Treat at Biora | Circuit | 5-PSW/48/02dt.24.12.02 | 53.67 | 53.67 | 12/04 | -do- | - |
| 14 | | Water Sports Complex at Bargi, Jabalpur | Circuit | 5-PSW/103/03 dt. 18.8.03 | 98.60 | 98.60 | 8/05 | -do- | - |
| 15 | | Rural Tourism at Orcha. | Rural | 4-A&RT(1)05 dt.1.7.05 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 7/06 | -do- | - |
| | Tamil Nadu | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | Destination Development of Yercaud Hill Resort, Salem. | Des. | 5-PSW/59/04/ dt. 28-12-04 | 448.00 | 358.40 | 12/05 | Incomplete | 24 |
| 17 | | Infrastructure and Destination Development of Mahabalipuram-Phase-II. | Des. | 5-PSW/76/04 dt. 23.02/05 & 11.07.05 | 432.00 | 345.00 | 7/06 | Incomplete | 17 |
| 18 | | Integrated Development of Eco-Tourism at Point Calimere Wild Life Sanctuary, Muthupet. | Circuit | 5-PSW/57/04 dt.27.12.04 | 368.00 | 294.40 | 6/06 | Incomplete | 18 |
| 19 | | Development of Rameshwaram under Vivekanand Travel Circuit | Circuit | 5-PSW/24/04 dt. 29.03.04 | 168.24 | 138.59 | 3/05 | Incomplete | 33 |
| 20 | | Development of Devipattinam-Navabhasanam in Ramanathapuram District | Rural | 4-A&RT(82)/04 dt. 27.04.05 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 5/06 | Completed | - |
| | Uttrakhand | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | Development of | Des. | 5-PNE/33/05 dt.23.12.05 | 453.13 | 362.50 | 12/07 | Ongoing | - |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------|------------|----|
| | | Kedarnath as a Tourist Destination. | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | Integrated Development of Badrinath Travel Circuit | Circuit | 5-PNE/61/04 dt. 22.02.05 | 702.09 | 561.67 | 2/07 | Incomplete | 10 |
| 23 | | Development of Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne as a Tourist Destination. | Des. | 5-PNE/70/04 dt.21.12.04 | 457.93 | 361.60 | 12/05 | Incomplete | 24 |
| | | | | | 7475.76 | 6180.83 | | | |

Annexure-II
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.1)
Statement showing details of CFA released in excess

| (Rs. in Lakhs) | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| S.No. | State | Name of the Project | CFA Sanctioned | Excess Sanctioned | Excess released |
| 1. | Delhi | Development of Delhi Haat at Pitampura (Delhi) 2004-05 | 500.00 | 50.00 | 40.00 |
| 2 | Chhattisgarh | Development of Jagdalpur as Tourist Destination (Chhattisgarh) 2002-03 | 277.50 | 27.75 | 22.20 |
| 3 | Kerala | Development of Thekkinkad Maidan Thrissur (Kerala) 2005-06 | 489.00 | 48.90 | 39.12 |
| 4 | Kerala | Art & Craft Village Vizhinjam (Kerala) 2004-05 | 500.00 | 50.00 | 40.00 |
| 5. | Madhya Pradesh | Development of Simhashta at Ujjain in Madhya Pradesh (M.P) 2004-05 | 110.66 | 11.06 | 11.06 |
| 6 | Tamil Nadu | Infrastructure & Destination Development at Mahablipuram-Phase II (T.N) | 432.00 | 43.20 | 34.50 |
| 7. | Tamil Nadu | Infrastructure and Destination Development of Yercaud Hill Resort, Salem (Tamil Nadu) | 448.00 | 44.80 | 35.84 |
| 8. | Uttarakhand | Development of Kedarnath as Destination (Uttarkahand) | 453.13 | 45.31 | 36.25 |
| 9 | Uttarakhand | Development of Pauri Khirshu Lansdown as a Tourist Destination (Uttarkhand) | 457.13 | 45.71 | 36.57 |
| | Total | | | | 295.54 |

Annexure –III
(Referred to in para 3.5.1.2)
Statement showing details of Irregular release of financial assistance

| | | | | | | | | | (Rs in lakh) |
|--------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| Sl.No. | Item of work | External Electrification | External Water Supply | Centage charges | Contingent charges | Other provisions | Amount sanctioned | Amount release | Supervision & Architects fee |
| | Name of the project: Development of Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne as Tourist Destination | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Extension and upgradation of Tourist Rest House (TRH) at Pauri. Uttrakhand. | 2.00 | 1.54 | 7.35 | 5.92 | -- | 16.81 | -- | -- |
| 2 | C/o Prefabricated huts at TRH, Khirsu. | 2.25 | 2.50 | 11.59 | 8.29 | 10.61 | 35.24 | -- | -- |
| 3 | Extension & Upgradation of TRH at Khirshu. | 0.50 | 1.13 | 3.44 | 2.30 | 4.50 | 11.87 | -- | -- |
| 4 | Upgradation of TRH at Lansdowne. | -- | -- | 1.34 | 1.15 | -- | 2.42 | -- | -- |
| 5 | C/o Tree Top Houses and other works at Kanvashram. | -- | -- | 2.56 | 0.95 | 2.00 | 5.51 | -- | -- |
| 6 | Beautification of Mall Road at Pauri. | -- | -- | 6.01 | 5.37 | -- | 11.38 | -- | -- |
| 7 | Upgradation of existing TRH at Kanvashram. | -- | -- | 2.45 | 0.94 | -- | 3.39 | -- | -- |
| 8 | C/o Tourist Convenience/cum/information Centre at Kanvashram. | -- | -- | 1.57 | 0.47 | 0.52 2.82 | 5.36 | -- | -- |
| 9 | C/o 60 bedded Yatri Niwas at Deriakhal, Distt. Pauri. | 2.00 (***) | -- | 13.60 | 10.15 | 5.00(*) 7.77(**) 12.00(***) | 50.52 | -- | -- |
| | Total | 6.75 | 5.17 | 49.91 | 35.54 | 45.20 | 142.50 | 114.00 | -- |
| | Name of the Project: Integrated development of | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|------|
| | Kawardha-Nagarnar-Tourist circuit. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | P.E for improvement of surroundings of the Destination. | - | - | - | - | (20% for electrification consultancy including supervision & execution charges Rs 7,00,000 per park for 5 parks.) | 35.00 | -- | -- |
| 2 | Development of Infrastructure & Tourist destination. | - | - | - | - | (20% for electrification consultancy including supervision & execution charges Rs 12,10,480 for 4 Tourist Centre). | 24.00 | -- | -- |
| 3 | Illumination of Tourist destination. | - | - | - | - | 5% | 3.10 | -- | -- |
| 4 | Wayside & amenities. | - | - | - | - | 20% | 46.35 Total col.1 to 4 = 108.45 | 86.76(total 1 to 4) | -- |
| | Name of the project: Development of Simhastha at Ujjain (M.P.) | - | - | - | - | | | -- | -- |
| 1 | Enhancing existing facilities for tourists and pilgrims at Hotel Shipra, Ujjain. | - | - | - | - | - | | -- | 6.41 |
| 2 | Beautification of Narmada Ghat at Onkareshwar Tourist Complex. | - | - | - | - | - | | -- | 0.90 |
| 3 | Providing better access and enhancing facilities Narmada | 1.25 | - | - | - | - | 13.02 (total 1 to 3) | 13.02 (total 1 to 3) | 4.45 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|---|------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Cottages Maheshwar. | | | | | | | | |
| | Name of the project: Water Sports Complex at Bargi, Jabalpur M.P. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | External Electrification & light fixtures etc. | - | - | - | - | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | -- |
| 2 | Architects fee | - | - | - | - | - | 1.22 | 1.22 | -- |
| 3 | Supervision charges. | - | - | - | - | - | 5.25 | 5.25 | -- |
| | Total | | | | | | 7.47 | 7.47 | -- |
| | Name of the project: Integrated Development Eco-tourism, at Point Calimere & Pichavaram in Tamil Nadu. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Providing approach road to the Sanctuary | - | - | - | - | - | 10.00 | 08.00 | -- |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Name of the project: Development of Vivekanand Tourist Circuit at Rameshwaram Tamil Nadu. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Provision of Infrastructure feasibilities at Pambam. | 4.42 (Elect.& Water supply) | - | - | 1.30 | 1.13 ***** & 2.00 **** | 8.85 | 7.08 | -- |
| | Name of the project: Development of Delhi Haat at Pitampura Delhi. | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | External Service connection/Sewer/Water Treatment plant/Rainwater Harvesting. | - | - | - | - | 26.74*** | | 21.39 | -- |
| | Name of the project: Infrastructure & Destination | | | | | | | | |

| | Development at Mahablipuram-Phase-II Tamil Nadu. | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|---------------|----|
| 1 | Development of Road & Development of approach road to Shore Temple. | - | - | - | - | - | 36.00 & 4.40 = 40.40 | 32.32 | -- |
| | Total | | | | | | | 290.03 | -- |

(*) Cost of land

(**) C/o residential building.

(***) Cost of other provision

(****) Cost of provision for Computer arrangements

(*****) Cost of provision for unforeseen items.

Annexure IV
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.3)
Statement showing details of cases of unauthorized release of funds

(Rs in lakh)

| Sl No. | Name of the Project | Sanction No. & Date | Amount sanctioned | Amount Released |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Development of Rural Tourism in Orcha | 4-A&RT (1)/2005 dt. 1.7.05 | 50.00 | 40.00 |
| 2 | Integrated Development of Eco-Tourism at Point Calimere Wildlife Muthupet Mangroves, Muthupet and Pichavaran in Tamil Nadu Circuit | 5-PSW/57/2004 dt. 27.12.04 | 368.00 | 294.40 |
| 3 | Development of Kedarnath as a Tourist Destination | 5-PNE(33)/2005 dt. 23.12.05 | 453.13 | 362.50 |
| | | | 871.13 | 696.90 |

Annexure – V
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.4)

Statement showing delay in transfer of funds by the State Govt. down to the implementing agency

(Rs in lakh)

| Sl. No. | Name of Projects | Name of Executing agency | GOI Sanction No. and Date | Amount sanctioned by GOI | Amount and Date of release by GOI to the State Govt. | Release by State Govt. to nodal agency @** | Delay (in months) | Release to the executing agency | Delay (in months) | |
|---------|---|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Development of Yercaud Hill Resort | Panchayat Union Yercaud, TTDC, PWD and Forest | No.5-PSW/59/2004 dt. 28-12-2004 | 448.00 | 358.40 | Dec. 2004 | 25-4-2005 | 2 | June 2005 to January 2006 | - |
| 2. | Integrated Development of Mamallapuram Phase II | State PWD | No.5-PSW/76/2004 dt. 23-2-2005 | 432.00 | 328.90* | July 2005 | 26-7-2006 | 10 | July 2006 | - |
| 3. | Development of Swami Vivekananda Tourist Circuit | State PWD, HR & CE, Forest Department and Katida mayyam and BDO, Mandapam | No.5-PSW/24/2004 dt. 29-3-2004 No.5-PSW/24/2004 dt. 14-7-2005 | 168.24 | 54.47 84.12 | March 2004 July 2005 | 16-10-2004 18-9-2006 | 5 12 | November 2004 to September 2005 October 2006 to March 2007 | - |
| 4. | Development of Point Calimere, Muthupet and Pitchavaram | TTDC, Town Panchayat, Parangipettai and Forest department | No.5-PSW/57/2004 dt. 27-12-2004 | 368.00 | 93.20 75.60 31.60 | (Dec. 2004) (Dec. 2004) (Dec. 2004) | 12-4-2005 5-2-2005 11-4-2005 | 2 - 2 | October 2005 to December 2006 | 4 |
| 5. | Development of Navbhasanam | BDO, Ramanathapuram | No.4A&RT(82)/2004 dt. 27-4-05 | 75.60 | 40.00 | May 2005 | 6-1-2006 | 6 | July 2006 to July 2007 | 5 |
| | | | | | 1026.29 | | | | | |

*GOI adjusted amount in respect of old dropped projects amounting to Rs. 17.55 lakh while releasing the funds

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Amount released | 327.34 |
| Adjusted | 17.55 |
| Total | 344.89 |
| already released (March 2005) | 0.11 |
| being 80% of Rs. 432 lakh | 345.00 |

** District Collector is the nodal agency. Tamil Nadu Tourism Development Corporation is the only executing agency to whom funds were released directly by the Government

Annexure-VI
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.5)
Statement showing non-utilisation of funds-Uttarakhand

(Rs in lakh)

| S.N. (1) | Name of the project. (2) | Category (3) | Year of sanction | Amount sanctioned (4) | Amount released by GOI (5) | Amounts released by State (6) | Amounts utilised by Implementing (7) | Amounts outstanding by implementing agency (8) |
|-------------|--|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Mounting of Sound and Light Show at Haridwar on the bank of Ganges (Uttarakhand) | Dest. (D) | 2003-04 | 192 | 173 | 173 | - | 173 |
| 2. | Badrinath Dham Tourist Circuit | Circuit (C) | 2004-05 | 702.09 | 561.67 | 561.67 | 350.98 | 210.69 |
| 3. | Pauri-Khirsu-Lansdowne Tourist Destination | D | 2004-05 | 457.93 | 361.60 | 361.60 | 221.13 | 140.47 |
| 4. | Dayara Bugyal Tourist Circuit. | C | 2004-05 | 536.37 | 429.09 | 429.09 | 289.85 | 139.24 |
| 5. | Tourism Networking with INTERNET (Wide Area Network) in 30 Tourist Rest Houses and 10 Regional Offices (Kumaon Mandal) | Tourist (T) | 2004-05 | 50 | 40 | 40 | 40 | - |
| 6. | Pithoragarh-Munsiyar-Berinag Kumaon Tourist Destination | D | 2004-05 | 418.6 | 334.88 | 334.88 | 235.38 | 99.50 |
| 7. | Purchase of Water Sports Equipment for Development of Winter Tourism in Uttarakhand | D | 2004-05 | 134.41 | 107.52 | 107.52 | 107.52 | - |
| 8. | GOI-UNDP endogenous Project at Village Mana, as a Rural Tourism (SW Project). | Rural (R) | 2004-05 | 20 | 16 | 16 | 5.87 | 10.13 |
| 9. | Rural Tourism Project-Koti, Indroli & Patyur Village | T | 2005-06 | 47.1 | 37.68 | 37.68 | 24.50 | 13.18 |
| 10. | Development of Village Sari, Devriyatal as a Rural Tourism (Eco Tourism) (Hardware Project) | T | 2005-06 | 45.14 | 36.11 | 36.11 | 36.00 | 0.11 |
| 11. | Kedarnath Dham Tourist Destination | D | 2005-06 | 453.13 | 362.50 | 362.50 | - | 362.50 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 12. | Gangotri Dham Tourist Destination | D | 2005-06 | 481.42 | 385.13 | 385.13 | 59.09 | 326.04 |
| 13. | Nainital-Almora-Ranikhet Tourist Circuit | C | 2005-06 | 697.51 | 557.99 | 557.99 | 551.30 | 6.69 |
| 14. | Development of Rural Tourism Project in Agora Village (Dodital) (HW Project). | T | 2005-06 | 48.5 | 38.80 | 38.80 | 14.36 | 24.44 |
| 15. | Tourist Development of Hub Village at Mottad and its satellite station at Kharsali Bhutotra (Thali)-Khunigad and Development of different infrastructure at Sandras, Jarmola under Rural Tourism Scheme (HW Project). | T | 2005-06 | 48.05 | 38.44 | 38.44 | 38.44 | - |
| 16. | Development of Hemkund Sahib-Ghangariya-Valley of Flower Tourist Circuit | C | 2005-06 | 653.54 | 522.83 | 522.83 | 233.72 | 289.11 |
| 17. | Development of Rural Tourism at Mana Village (Hardware Project) | T | 2005-06 | 50 | 40 | 40 | - | 40 |
| 18. | Development of Rural Tourism (Hardware Project) in village Chekhoni Bora, Distt. Champawat | T | 2005-06 | 44.2 | 35.28 | 35.28 | 21.28 | 14.00 |
| 19. | Development of Rural Tourism Project Jageshwar Village (Software Project) | R | 2005-06 | 20 | 16 | 16 | 8.54 | 7.46 |
| 20. | Development of Binsar-Bajjnath-Bageshwar Tourist Circuit in Uttarakhand | C | 2006-07 | 728.54 | 582.83 | 582.83 | 10.00 | 572.83 |
| 21. | Development of Rural Tourism in Adi Kailash (Distt. Nainital) (Hardware Project) | T | 2006-07 | 50 | 40 | 40 | - | 40 |
| 22. | Development of Rural Tourism in Padampuri (Distt. Nainital) (Hardware Project) | T | 2006-07 | 50 | 40 | 40 | - | 40 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|---|----------------|
| 23. | Development of Rural Tourism in Triyuginarayan (Distt. Rudraparyag) (Hardware Project). | T | 2006-07 | 50 | 40 | 40 | - | 40 |
| 24. | Development of Rural Tourism in Nanakmatta (Distt.Udhamsingh Nagar) (Hardware Project) | T | 2006-07 | 48.82 | 39 | 39 | - | 39 |
| 25. | Development of Yamunotri Dham as a Tourist Destination in Uttarakhand. | D | 2006-07 | 448.99 | 359.19 | 359.19 | - | 359.19 |
| | Total | | | | | | | 2947.58 |

Annexure VI A
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.5)
Statement showing non- utilization of funds-Madhya Pradesh

| (Rs in lakh) | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| S. No. | Name of the Project | Category | Year of Sanction | Amount Sanctioned | Amount released by GOI | Amount released by the State | Amount utilised by implementing Agency | Amount outstanding with implementing Agency |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Expansion of Traveller's Lodge, Sanchi | Destination | 2002 | 99.82 | 73.45 | 26.37 | 112.00 | -11.18 |
| 2. | Up gradation of Traveller's Lodge at Sanchi | Circuit | 2002 | 33.20 | 16.60 | 16.60 | 33.20 | Nil |
| 3. | National Folk festival Khajuraho | Sports & Festival | 2002 | 35.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 35.00 | Nil |
| 4. | Painting Competition | Sports & Festival | 2002 | 0.38 | 0.38 | Nil | 0.38 | Nil |
| 5. | Development at korighat at Hoshangabad | Circuit | 2002 | 47.15 | 47.15 | Nil | Nil | 47.15 |
| 6. | Signages | Circuit | 2002 | 20.00 | 20.00 | Nil | 20.00 | Nil |
| 7. | Up gradation of highway Resort, Biora | Circuit | 2002 | 53.67 | 53.67 | Nil | 53.67 | Nil |
| 8. | Up gradation of Sanchi Cafeteria | Circuit | 2002 | 11.50 | 11.50 | Nil | 11.50 | Nil |
| 9. | Up gradation of tank at Sanchi | Circuit | 2002 | 21.00 | 21.00 | Nil | 21.00 | Nil |
| 10. | Construction of conference hall at Shivpuri | Destination | 2002 | 48.28 | 35.24 | 13.00 | 48.24 | Nil |
| 11. | Development of Bhurakoh near Shivpuri under central circuit. | Circuit | 2003 | 1.74 | 1.74 | Nil | 1.44 | 0.30 |
| 12. | Rural tourism in Hatwa village District- Sidhi | Rural tourism | 2003 | 44.00 | 13.20 | Nil | 13.20 | Nil |
| 13. | Development of tourist facilities at Udaygiri | Circuit | 2002 | 16.00 | 16.00 | Nil | Nil | ASI |
| 14. | Information cum | Circuit | 2002 | 100.00 | 100.00 | Nil | Nil | ASI |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|-------------------|------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-----------|
| | interpretation at Bhimbethka | | | | | | | |
| 15. | Providing tourist facilities at Sanchi monuments | Circuit | 2002 | 10.00 | 10.00 | Nil | Nil | ASI |
| 16. | Providing tourist facilities at Satdhara | Circuit | 2002 | 13.50 | 13.50 | Nil | Nil | ASI |
| 17. | Tourist facilities at Shivmandir, Bhojpur | Circuit | 2002 | 23.00 | 23.00 | Nil | Nil | ASI |
| 18. | Up gradation of John Marshall house at Sanchi | Circuit | 2002 | 10.00 | 10.00 | Nil | 1.00 | ASI |
| 19. | Up gradation of museum building at Sanchi | Circuit | 2002 | 183.00 | 183.00 | Nil | Nil | ASI |
| 20. | Chanderi as a destination | Destination | | 111.00 | 53.30 | Nil | Nil | CPWD |
| 2003-04 | | | | | | | | |
| 21. | Redevelopment around western group of temples, Khajuraho circuit | Circuit | | 190.80 | 100.00 | Nil | Nil | CPWD |
| 22. | Development of Bhadaiya kund near Shivpuri (M.P.) circuit 2003-04 | Circuit | 2003 | 8.89 | 8.89 | Nil | 8.89 | Nil |
| 23. | National kayaking and canoeing Championships- Purchase of equipment (M.P.) Circuit 2002-03 | Sports & festival | 2003 | 49.76 | 45.80 | Nil | 85.80 | -40.00 |
| 24. | Up gradation of Highways treat at dodi. | Circuit | 2003 | 54.00 | 54.00 | Nil | 54.00 | Nil |
| 25. | Water sport complex Bargi, Jabalpur | Circuit | 2003 | 101.00 | 98.60 | Nil | 82.72 | 15.88 |
| 26. | Rural tourism project Chaugan mandla | Rural tourism | | 50.00 | 40.00 | Nil | Nil | Collector |
| 27. | Rural tourism project Pranpur district, Ashok Nagar. | Rural tourism | | 48.00 | 48.00 | Nil | Nil | Collector |
| 28. | Water sport complex Tigra Dam | Destination | 2004 | 121.70 | 30.00 | 25.00 | 6.80 | 48.20 |
| 29. | Canoeing Championship at Bhopal | Sports & festival | 2003 | 15.00 | 12.00 | Nil | 15.00 | -3.00 |
| 30. | National folk festival lokranjan, khajuraho | Sports & festival | 2003 | 25.00 | 10.00 | Nil | 35.00 | -25.00 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-------------------|------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| 31. | Computerization and integration of offices of M.P. | Circuit | 2004 | 96.40 | 43.38 | 46.10 | 94.30 | -4.82 |
| 32. | Capacity building | Capacity building | | 2.00 | 2.00 | Nil | 2.00 | Nil |
| 2004-05 | | | | | | | | |
| 33. | Sound & light show at Orcha. | Circuit | 2005 | 149.07 | 99.30 | Nil | 99.30 | Nil |
| 34. | Destination development of Amarkantak District Anoopur | Destination | 2004 | 489.60 | 483.30 | 17.64 | 489.60 | 11.34 |
| 35. | Development of holding simhasta at Ujjain. | Destination | 2004 | 123.93 | 110.66 | 13.27 | 124.12 | -0.19 |
| 36. | Development of Maheshwar | Destination | 2004 | 166.84 | 132.22 | 30.85 | 166.84 | -3.77 |
| 37. | Development of Omkareshwar | Destination | 2004 | 327.79 | 262.23 | Nil | 73.13 | 189.10 |
| 38. | Introduction of cruise on the upper lake, Bhopal | Destination | 2004 | 234.07 | 187.00 | Nil | 135.39 | 51.61 |
| 39. | Celebration of national folk festival lokranjan khajuraho | Sports & festival | 2004 | 40.00 | 10.00 | Nil | 35.00 | -25.00 |
| 40. | IT Schemes for Dept. of tourism, M.P. | I.T | 2005 | 100.00 | 25.00 | Nil | 25.00 | Nil |
| 41. | Rafting at Orcha | Sports & festival | 2006 | 9.78 | 9.78 | Nil | 9.78 | Nil |
| 2005-06 | | | | | | | | |
| 42. | Rural tourism, Orcha | Rural tourism | 2005 | 64.12 | 40.00 | 14.12 | 64.12 | Nil |
| 43. | Construction of cottage at Mukki | Destination | 2005 | 57.22 | 34.16 | 23.06 | 57.22 | Nil |
| 44. | Integrated development of tourist circuit on the Sector Gwalior-Orcha-Khajuraho | Circuit | 2005 | 572.39 | 368.87 | 37.13 | 50.00 | 356.00 |
| 45. | Destination Development, Burahanpur | Destination | 2005 | 510.00 | 359.20 | Nil | Nil | 359.20 |
| 46. | Destination Development, Indore | Destination | 2005 | 530.95 | 386.15 | Nil | 2.80 | 383.35 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|-------------------|------|--------|--------|-----|--------|--------------------------|
| 47. | Celebration of national folk festival | Sports & festival | 2005 | 40.00 | 8.28 | Nil | 8.28 | Nil |
| 48. | Development of tourism circuit Sanchi-Bhopal-Bhojpur- Bhimbetka-Pachmari | Circuit | 2005 | 800.00 | 572.00 | Nil | 105.57 | 466.43 |
| 49. | CFA for integrated of tourism circuit Gwalior – Shivpuri-Chandari | Circuit | 2005 | 800.00 | 58.32 | Nil | 25.00 | 33.32 |
| 50. | YAI National Sailing Championship at upper lake, Bhopal | Sports & festival | 2006 | 34.50 | 12.00 | Nil | Nil | 12.00 |
| 2006-07 | | | | | | | | |
| 51. | Destination Development-Mandu | Destination | 2006 | 471.74 | 377.40 | Nil | | |
| 52. | Destination Development-Panna | Destination | 2006 | 421.36 | 337.00 | Nil | | |
| 53. | CKT Narmada Pt.-1 | Circuit | 2006 | 727.00 | 532.00 | Nil | | |
| 54. | CKT Narmada Pt. -2 | Circuit | 2006 | 774.99 | 620.00 | Nil | | |
| 55. | Destination Development –Jabalpur | Destination | 2006 | 477.43 | 230.00 | Nil | | |
| 56. | Destination Development – Maihar | Destination | 2006 | 317.79 | 237.40 | Nil | | |
| 57. | Major Destination development Bhopal | Destination | 2006 | 499.47 | 400.00 | Nil | | |
| 58. | Rural tourism Amla | Rural tourism | 2006 | 68.69 | 39.95 | Nil | | 16.00 given to collector |
| 59. | Fares & Festival | Sports & festival | 2006 | 60.00 | 8.00 | Nil | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1876.92 |

Annexure- VIB

(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.5)
Statement showing non-utilisation of funds-Chhattisgarh
(Status as of February 2008)

(Rs in lakh)

| Sl. No. | Name of the project | Category | Year of sanction | Amount sanction | Amount released by GOI | Amount released by State | Amount utilised by Implementing Agency | Amount outstanding with the Implementing agency | Date on which UC sent | Amount of UC | Status |
|---------|---|---------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] | [7] | [8] | [9] | [10] | [11] | [12] |
| 1 | Product/Infrastructure & destination development of Jagdalpur (Bastar) | Destination | 2002-03 | 277.50 | 221.75 | 137.65 | 285.98 | 73.42 | 7-Jul-07 | 221.75 | Incomplete |
| 2 | Development of Chitrakote, District Bastar as a Rural Tourism destination | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 7-Jul-07 | 40.00 | Incomplete |
| 3 | Development of Champaran, District Raipur as a Rural tourism destination | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 50.00 | 15.00 | 5.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 7-Jul-07 | 20.00 | Incomplete |
| 4 | Integrated development of tourism circuit (Kawardha-Nagarnar) | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 800.00 | 536.60 | 309.92 | 846.52 | 0.00 | 1-Jun-07 | 1189.00 | Incomplete |
| 5 | Development of Tourist Village- Raipura in celebration of birth centenary of Chaudhary Charan Singh | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 40.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 30-Mar-07 | 20.00 | Incomplete |
| 6 | Development of Chitrakote, District Bastar as a Rural Tourism destination (UNDP)-Hardware project | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 39.46 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 7 | Development of Nagarnar, District Bastar as a Rural Tourism destination (UNDP)-Hardware project | Rural Tourism | 2003-04 | 48.00 | 38.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 38.40 | NA | NA | Incomplete |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|---------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------|--------|-------------|
| 8 | GOI-UNDP Endogenous Rural project at village Chitrakote, District Bastar (Software Plan) | Rural Tourism | 2004-05 | 20.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 5.70 | 10.30 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 9 | GOI-UNDP Endogenous Rural project at village Nagarnar, District Bastar (Software Plan) | Rural Tourism | 2004-05 | 20.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 13.20 | 2.80 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 10 | Integrated development of eco tourism circuit (Amarkantak-Jashpur) | Rural Tourism | 2004-05 | 648.35 | 518.68 | 23.03 | 407.42 | 134.29 | 7-Sep-07 | 518.68 | Incomplete |
| 11 | Integrated development of Sirpur under destination development | Destination | 2004-05 | 397.91 | 318.33 | 0.00 | 161.18 | 157.15 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 12 | Infrastructure & destination development Mainpat (District Surguja) | Destination | 2005-06 | 468.41 | 375.00 | 0.00 | 283.64 | 91.36 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 13 | Development of Kondagaon (District Bastar) as Rural tourism destination | Rural Tourism | 2005-06 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 30.00 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 14 | Integrated development of tourist circuit (Raipur-Tala) | Circuit | 2005-06 | 714.46 | 571.56 | 2.91 | 218.02 | 356.45 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 15 | Tourist Circuit (Raipur-Nagpura-Bhoramdeo) | Circuit | 2005-06 | 447.72 | 366.48 | 0.00 | 168.13 | 198.35 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 16 | Infrastructure & destination development Rajmergarh (District Bilaspur) | Destination | 2006-07 | 275.73 | 220.58 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 120.58 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 17 | Destination development -Rajim | Destination | 2006-07 | 295.95 | 236.76 | 0.00 | 120.00 | 116.76 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 18 | Rural Tourism-Manatuta (Hardware project) | Rural Tourism | 2006-07 | 50.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.00 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 19 | Rural Tourism-Manatuta (Software project) | Rural Tourism | 2006-07 | 20.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.00 | NA | NA | Not started |
| 20 | Destination development -Chitrakote | Destination | 2006-07 | 278.45 | 222.76 | 0.00 | 50.30 | 172.46 | NA | NA | Incomplete |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----|----|-------------|
| 21 | Tourist circuit (Jagdalpur-Koleng) Dhurva circuit | Circuit | 2006-07 | 730.20 | 584.16 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 484.16 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 22 | Rural Tourism Chilpi (Hardware) | Rural Tourism | 2006-07 | 48.75 | 39.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.00 | NA | NA | Not started |
| 23 | Rural Tourism Chilpi (Software project) | Rural Tourism | 2006-07 | 20.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.00 | NA | NA | Not started |
| 24 | Destination development -Malhar | Destination | 2006-07 | 216.21 | 172.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 172.96 | NA | NA | Not started |
| 25 | Baiga Circuit (Rengakar- Jaleshwardam) | Circuit | 2006-07 | 683.80 | 487.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 487.54 | NA | NA | Incomplete |
| 26 | Kamar circuit | Circuit | 2006-07 | 562.86 | 168.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 168.86 | NA | NA | Not started |
| 27 | Destination development -Bhoramdeo | Destination | 2006-07 | 331.97 | 265.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 265.50 | NA | NA | Not started |
| | TOTAL: | | | 7596.27 | 5603.92 | 478.51 | 2850.63 | 3231.80 | | | |

Note: Amount shown in column no.8 includes advances provided to implementing agencies.

Annexure – VII
(Referred to in paragraph 3.5.1.6)

Statement showing details of Utilisation Certificates pending in respect of selected project in Uttarakhand

(Rs. in lakh)

| Sl.no. | Name of the project | Amount Sanctioned | Amount released by the Govt. of India | Amount transferred to the Executing Agency | Amount utilised by the Executing Agency | Amount lying unutilised with Executing Agency |
|---------------|---|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Integrated Development of Badrinath Dham Travel Circuit | 702.09 | 561.67 | 561.67 | 350.98 | 210.69 |
| 2 | Development of Pauri-Khirshu – Lansdowne as Tourist Destination | 457.93 | 361.60 | 361.60 | 230.63 | 130.97 |
| 3 | Development of Kedarnath as Tourist Destination | 453.13 | 362.50 | 362.50 | - | 362.50 |
| | | | | | | 704.16 |

Annexure – VIII**(Referred to in para 5.3)****Statement showing No. of projects (category wise) selected, completed, ongoing and short closed**

| Sl. no | Category | No. of projects selected | No. of projects completed | No. of projects delayed | No. of projects ongoing | No. of projects short closed |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Destination | 10 | 2 | 5 | 3 | - |
| 2. | Circuit | 8 | 2 | 6 | - | - |
| 3. | Rural Tourism | 5 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 |
| | Total | 23 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 1 |