File No. P-17025/37/2013-RC (FMS No 331916)
Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
(Rural Connectivity (RC) Division)

Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi
Dated the 2nd June, 2020

To,

All Additional Chief Secretaries/Principal Secretaries/Secretaries In-Charge of PMGSY of all the States/UTs

Subject: Role of Hon'ble Members of Parliament in planning and selection of road works under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III- reg.

Sir/ Madam,

I am directed to refer to the subject cited above and to say that the PMGSY has an inbuilt mechanism for consultation with public representatives at various stages of planning and implementation of the programme. Advisories have been issued and reiterated from time to time to the State Governments/State Rural Road Development Agencies, giving emphasis, *inter-alia*, on strict compliance of these provisions. In this regard, attention is invited again to various provisions of the PMGSY-III guidelines, which provide detailed procedure for consultation with the Members of Parliament during the process of planning and selection of roads. Some important guidelines in this respect are reproduced below:

Para 3.6: The suggestions given by the Members of Parliament are to be given full consideration while finalizing District Rural Roads Plan (DRRP).

Para 5.5: The Annual proposals will be based on the CUCPL following the Order of Priority (subject to PCI). However, it is possible that there are inadvertent errors or omissions, particularly in the selection of Through Routes. Accordingly, it is desirable to also associate public representatives while finalizing the selection of road works in the annual proposals. The proposals of the Members of Parliament are required to be given full consideration, for this purpose:

i. The CUCPL should be sent to concerned MPs with the request that their proposals on the selection of works out of the CUCPL should be sent to the District Panchayat. It is suggested that at least 15 clear days may be given for the purpose.

ii. In order to ensure that the prioritization has some reference to the funding available, the size of proposals expected may also be indicated to the Members of Parliament while forwarding the CUCPL list to them. District wise allocation may be indicated to enable choice with the requisite geographical spread. It would be ensured that such proposals of Members of Parliament which adhere to the Order of Priority would be invariably accepted subject to consideration of equitable allocation of funds and need for up gradation.

iii. The proposals received from the Members of Parliament by the stipulated date would be given full consideration in the District Panchayat which would record the reason in each case of non-inclusion. Such proposals that cannot be included would be communicated in writing to the Members of Parliament with reasons for non-inclusion of such proposals in each case. It would be preferable if the communication is issued from the Nodal Department at a senior level.

Para 7.1: After the approval by the District Panchayat, the proposals would be forwarded by the PIU to the SRRDA. The PIU will at that time prepare the details of proposals forwarded by the Members of Parliament and action taken thereon, in proforma MP-I and MP-II and sent it along with proposals. In all cases where the proposals of an MP has not been included, cogent reasons shall be given based on the reasons given by the District Panchayat.

Para 7.3: The State Level Standing Committee (SLSC) would scrutinize the proposals to see that they are in accordance with the Guidelines and that the proposals of the Member of Parliament have been given full consideration.

2. In view of this, all the State Governments are once again requested to follow the guidelines relating to consultation with the Members of Parliament in letter and spirit, and the following needs to be ensured:

(i) Hon'ble MPs may be briefed about the PMGSY-III planning process, overall allocation and inter-se Block/District allocation etc. at the beginning of the planning exercise.

(ii) Hence, it is reiterated that final list of proposals, in order of priority, would be communicated in writing to the Member of Parliament with reasons for non-inclusion of such proposals in each case. It would be preferable if this communication is made by a senior official and their recommendation/ consent be obtained in writing on the overall proposed list. It should be ensured that the Member of Parliament receives such communication and a reasonable time of 15 days is given to them to respond with their recommendation.

(iii) Such recommendation should also be included along with MP-I and MP-II formats. If such response/ recommendation is not received in 15 days, a clear note to this effect is recorded in the proposal. Proposal to the Ministry may be sent by SRRDA along with a note regarding the process adopted by the state in dealing with the recommendations of Members of Parliament.

Yours faithfully,

(K.M. Singh)
Deputy Secretary to the Government of India
Tel No: - 011- 2307 0308

Copy to: All CEOs/Chief Engineers of PMGSY implementing States/UTs