

विकास आयुक्त का कार्यालय  
(सूक्ष्म, लघु और मध्यम उद्यम)  
सूक्ष्म लघु और मध्यम उद्यम मंत्रालय  
(भारत सरकार)



**By Speed Post**

OFFICE OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONER  
(MICRO, SMALL & MEDIUM ENTERPRISES)  
MINISTRY OF MICRO, SMALL & MEDIUM ENTERPRISES  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Nirman Bhawan, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Maulana Azad Road,  
New Delhi - 110 108

निर्माण भवन, सातवीं मंजिल, मौलाना आजाद रोड,  
नई दिल्ली-110 108

Ph.EPABX - 23063800, 23063802, 23063803 FAX - (91-11) 23062315, 23061726, 23061068, e-mail - dcmsmeHQ@nb.nic.in

**No. 15(35)/CDD/27<sup>th</sup> SCM/2011**

**Dated: 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2011**

**OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

**Subject :- Minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of Steering Committee of MSE-CDP held on 31.5.11 at 11:30 AM in Committee Room No. 152, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi.**

A copy of minutes of above mentioned meeting <sup>is</sup> are enclosed for information and necessary action please. This office may be informed about action taken on minutes.

  
(Sanjeev Chawla)  
Dy. Director (CD)

**Encl: as above.**

To,

1. All Members of the Committee
2. All participants of the meeting  
(As per list)

**Copy to:**

1. PSO to Secretary, MSME
2. PS to AS & DC, MSME

**MINUTES of 27<sup>th</sup> MEETING of STEERING COMMITTEE of MICRO and SMALL ENTERPRISES (MSEs) - CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (CDP) on 31.5.11**

27<sup>th</sup> meeting of Steering Committee of MSE – CDP was held under Chairmanship of Shri Uday Kumar Varma, Secretary, MSME on 31.5.11 at 11.30 a.m. in Committee Room No. 152, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi. List of participants is at Annexure-I.

**1. Agenda No. 27.1: Confirmation of minutes of 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Steering Committee**

Minutes of 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Steering Committee held on 25.2.11, were circulated on 14.3.11. No comments have been received so far. Chairman asked members if they have any observations. With offer of no comments, minutes were confirmed.

**2. Agenda No. 27.2: Review of decisions taken in 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Steering Committee**

In respect of observations, letters have been issued to concerned agencies. Actions, taken with issuing of administrative orders, etc., were noted.

**3. Agenda No. 27.3: Review of projects under MSE-CDP:**

3.1 Status of Cluster Development Initiatives was discussed. Data regarding present status (as on 31.3.11) is enclosed at Annexure-2. Salient features of same are as follows:

**(A) MSE-CDP**

- |       |   |                  |
|-------|---|------------------|
| (i)   | Soft Intervention (SI) sanctioned for   | 249 clusters     |
|       | with total outlay of  | Rs 3705.22 lakhs |
|       | Of above, SI completed in   | 184 clusters     |
|       | Funds released  | Rs 2498.23 lakhs |
|       | SI ongoing  | 65 clusters      |
| (ii)  | Of 249 clusters with SI, CFC approval in  | 52 clusters      |
|       | Total Project outlay  | Rs.153.05 cr     |
|       | Of above, CFC completed in  | 14 clusters      |
|       | Fund released so far  | Rs. 51.15 cr     |
| (iii) | Of special relevance is the following   |                  |
|       | (a) In AP, Rs.440.54 lakhs were sanctioned for SI in 17 projects, of which 15 are complete. However, CFC project has come up for one cluster only, with an outlay of Rs.61.43 lakhs only.                     |                  |
|       | (b) In TN, although SI is complete in only one cluster (out of 19 sanctioned with Rs. 192.85 lakhs), work on CFCs is ongoing in 15 projects (of which 6 stand completed), with an outlay of Rs.3698.75 lakhs. |                  |

- (iv) Above analysis clearly brings out that
  - (a) CFCs are only in 21% of cluster intervened.
  - (b) As in TN, SI is not necessarily a prerequisite to CFCs, the real objective.
  - (c) This calls for a review and decision as to continuation of SI in its present form. Need based SI can be covered under MDPs / EDPs / ESDPs / IMCs etc. to start with.
- (v) This outcome may be discussed with Directors, MSME-DIs during MSME Conference due on 1<sup>st</sup> - 2<sup>nd</sup> June 11.
- (vi) In all future meetings of Steering Committee, latest status as to MSE-CDP and ID Projects should be put up for review.
- (vii) Expenditure should also be reported regularly. Present data only indicates funds-release position. (Obviously expenditure would be less). Needless to add that, Utilization Certificates (UCs) are received project-wise only on project-completion. To that extent, expenditure (May be monthly or quarterly) can bring out clearly actual progress on-site.

3.2 Chairman emphasized completion of projects in time bound manner. Interventions must result in benefits to industry. Soft interventions should lead to final outcome in terms of hard interventions (HI) with zero failure. Representatives of Implementing Agencies should apprise Steering Committee about reasons for delay in completion of projects. Sanction of new projects will depend on performance of earlier sanctioned projects both for SI and HI. State Governments / Implementing Agencies need to examine reasons for delay in implementation and non-taking up HI / CFCs, once SI is through.

3.3 After discussion, following decisions were taken:-

- (1) Proforma for monitoring progress of CDP Scheme should be designed in consultation with IFW.
- (2) New projects should be approved on basis of an analysis of parameters like time taken, expenditure incurred for completion of projects sanctioned earlier in concerned State.
- (3) For preliminary and pre-operative expenses for CFCs, a percentage of project cost may be finalized.
- (4) One official each from Ministry of MSME and State Government should be represented in all SPVs for CFCs, to ensure smooth implementation and functioning of CFCs.

However, wherever State Govt. is not contributing with land or financial support, this can be relooked and an appropriate organizational structure may be put in place.

## **(B) Infrastructure Development**

3.4 Status of infrastructure development projects is as follow:

- |   |  |              |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1 | Sanctioned new Industrial estates with approved Gol assistance of                | 98           |
|   | Of which, sanctions issued, so far   | Rs.212.08 Cr |
|   | Of above   | Rs.156.25 Cr |
|   | (i) Completed  | 75           |
|   | (ii) Ongoing   | 23           |
| 2 | Sanctioned for Upgradation of Industrial estates with approved Gol assistance of | 32           |
|   | of which, sanctions issued, as on date   | Rs 26.75 Cr  |
|   | of above,  | Rs 10.87 Cr  |
|   | (i) Completed  | 25           |
|   | (ii) Ongoing   | 7            |
- 3.5 For approval and monitoring of Infrastructure Projects, details of number of plots
- (a) to be developed
- (b) actually developed, and
- (c) allotted along with no. of units set up should be mentioned.
- 3.6 To ensure fulfillment of objective of new MSME units, necessary policy interventions / changes should be deliberated in next MSME-DI Conference.

#### **4. Agenda No. 27. 4: Upgradation of ID centre at Athur, Karur**

4.1 Implementing agency made a presentation. Project salient features including expected outcomes are as under :-

- (i) There are 94 developed plots - allotted to MSEs and 90 units have started functioning.
- (ii) About 80% of units are manufacturing Mosquito Nets, 10% in Textile Made-ups and Readymade Garments, and 10% in General Engineering.
- (iii) Employment generated is for more than 3000 persons.
- (iv) Turnover is Rs.300 crores with export of Rs.200 crores.
- (v) Further, new 9 units will provide employment to about 1350 persons with turnover of Rs 20 crores.
- (vi) 40 units will expand and provide employment to 2000 persons with additional turnover of Rs. 40 crores.
- (vii) In total, turnover will increase by Rs.60 crores with employment to 3350 additional persons.
- (viii) Export units will promote 100 to 200 ancillary units.

4.2 **Steering Committee approved above proposal as under: -**

#### 4.2.1 Project Cost:-

Particulars	Amount (Rs. Lakh)
<b>1. Land Development and other overhead Infrastructure</b>	
i) Cost of land filling/leveling including boundary wall/fencing	14.00
ii) Cost of laying road	137.20
iii) Roadside greenery and social forestry	11.40
iv) Water supply including overhead tanks, pump-houses and machinery	121.65
v) Drainage	38.90
vi) Provision for street light arrangements	10.50
vii) Other expenses	9.35
<b>2. Administrative and other services complex</b> Building for administrative, canteen and cyber centre	44.49
<b>3. Contingencies and Pre -operative exp.</b>	9.89
<b>Total</b>	<b>397.38</b>

#### 4.2.2 Means of finance:-

Particulars	Recommended
1. Gol Grant (60% of project cost)	238.42 lakh
2. Contribution from GoTN (30%)	119.21 lakh
3. Contribution from allottees	39.75 lakh
<b>Total</b>	<b>397.38 lakh</b>

#### 5. Agenda No. 27.5: Setting up of CFC for Powerloom Cluster, Shirpur

**5.1** SPV made the presentation. Shri Abhay Bakre, JDC had visited cluster and discussed various issues including purpose of machines for CFC. SPV informed that CFC will be set up in one year. OSD, Govt. of Maharashtra confirmed that budget provision has been made for State contribution for CFC. SPV is to submit undertaking of regarding non-availing any financial support from other Government schemes for CFC.

**5.2** Steering Committee approved proposal as under: -

##### 5.2.1 Project cost:

Particulars	Amount (Rs.in lakh)
1. Land	16.00

2.	Buildings	153.87
3.	Plant and Machinery	1153.77
4.	Misc. Fixed Assets	10.00
5.	Preliminary Expenses	10.00
6.	Pre-op. expenses	15.00
7.	Contingencies (2% of Building & 5% on Plant and machinery)	60.75
8.	Margin for working capital	3.71
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1423.10</b>

### 5.2.2 Means of finance

<b>Source</b>		<b>Amount (Rs.in lakh)</b>
1.	Govt Assistance	996.17
2.	Contribution of Govt of Maharashtra	142.31
3.	Contribution of SPV	284.62
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1423.10</b>

## 6 Agenda No. 27.6: CFC for Silver Filigree Cluster, Magrahat, WB

6.1 Prof. S.K. Ghosh, Jadhavpur University (Technical Agency for project) made presentation. It was clarified that units would have sufficient quantity of silver for feeding job work to CFC. Chairman emphasized that SPV and technical agency should ensure that CFC does not become unviable because of cost of silver / working capital. Director, MSSE, GoWB will confirm that West Bengal State Export Promotion Society (WBSEPS), (under GoWB) would be the fund receiving and implementing agency for this and other CFCs, for which administrative approvals are still to be issued. He confirmed that GoWB will contribute for CFC.

### 6.2 Steering Committee approved proposal as under:-

#### 6.2.1 Project Cost:

<b>Particulars</b>		<b>Amount (Rs.in Lakh)</b>
1	Land and its development	4.80
2	Building & Other Civil Constructions	12.00
3	Plant & Machinery	96.11
4	Support Equipments and Misc. fixed assets	27.45
5	Preliminary & Pre-operative expenses	8.02
8	Margin money for Working Capital	1.17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>149.55</b>

#### 6.2.2 Means of Finance:

<b>Particulars</b>		<b>Amount (Rs.in lakh)</b>
1.	Share Capital of SPV (10.00%)	14.96
2.	Grant-in-aid under MSE-CDP (79.89%)	119.47

3. Grant-in-aid from GoWB (10.11%)

15.12  
**Total** 149.55

**7. Agenda No. 27.7. CFC in Casting Cluster, Jaipur**

State Government of Rajasthan will evaluate both the proposals (from Indian Metal Foundry Institute Pvt. Ltd, Jaipur & Jaipur Casting Research and Development Cluster (P) Ltd., (JCRDC), Jaipur) and submit clear recommendations for setting up of one CFC for casting cluster. Nodal officer, o/o DC, MSME for Rajasthan will coordinate with State Government to resolve this.

**8. Agenda No. 27.8: Soft interventions in Bamboo Craft Cluster, Baduria, and Mat Cluster, Basirhat, 24 North Parganas, West Bengal**

Steering Committee deliberated on proposals and it was opined that hard intervention directly would be more appropriate. Hence, the proposal for SI was not approved.

**9. Agenda No. 27.9: Diagnostic Studies in 3 clusters:**

Committee approved proposals for diagnostic studies as under:

Name of cluster	Amount (Rs in lakh)	Implementing agency
1. Bamboo Craft Cluster, Bornagaon & Chotonagaon, Darrang, Assam	1.00	MSME-DI, Guwahati
2. Artistic (handmade) Textile Cluster, Shoula, Kamrup	1.00	MSME-DI, Guwahati
3. Proposal for conducting Diagnostic Study in Auto/Tractor Parts Cluster, Panchkula, Haryana	1.75	Investment Promotion Centre Chandigarh, Govt of Haryana
<b>Total:</b>	<u><b>3.75</b></u>	

**10. Agenda No. 27.10: Extension of time for submission of final proposals for 2 CFCs in Pharma Cluster and Fan Cluster, Hyderabad**

Extension of time was approved for submission of Final proposals for CFCs in Fan Cluster, Hyderabad and Pharma Cluster Uppal Cherapally, till November 2011.

**Supplementary Agenda**

**11. Diagnostic Study in Honey Processing Cluster, Khatarshnong Laitkroh, East Khasi Hills and Cane & Bamboo Cluster, West Khasi, Hills**

Steering Committee deferred proposals. State Government of Meghalaya may be asked resubmit proposals with proper justification of proposed expenditure with details. Proposed honey cluster should preferably be taken under KVIC Schemes.

## **12. Setting up of CFC in Home Furnishing Cluster, Panipat, Haryana**

Director, Industries, Govt. of Haryana made presentation. Govt. of India support is required for international visit for technology identification at a cost of Rs. 5 lakhs. Steering Committee advised to send formal proposal in this regard as per guidelines of MSE-CDP.

Meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the chair.

\*\*\*\*\*



**List of participants in 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Steering Committee MSE-CDP, chaired by Secretary, MoMSME on 31.5.11**

	<b>Name &amp; Designation</b>	<b>Office</b>
	<b>S/ Shri</b>	
1.	Saurabh Chandra, AS&FA	Ministry of MSME
2.	Dr Shyam Agarwal, AS&DC, MSME	O/o DC(MSME)
3.	Sesh Kumar Pulipaka, Joint Secretary	Ministry of MSME
4.	R.K. Manchanda, Economic Adviser	Ministry of MSME
5.	Dr. T. S. Sridhar, Principal Secretary, MSME	Govt. of Tamilnadu
6.	Khalil Ahmed, Director, MSME	Govt. of West Bengal
7.	Satya Prakash, Director of Industries	Government of Haryana
8.	Chandan Saha, Joint Adviser	Planning Commission
9.	R.K. Das, Chief General Manager	SIDBI, New Delhi
10.	Niranjan Naik, Industrial Adviser	Office of DC (MSME)
11.	Abhay Bakre, Joint Development Commissioner	Office of DC (MSME)
12.	Prof. Sadhan K. Ghosh	Jadavpur University, Kolkata
13.	N.N. Debnath, Director	MSM-DI, Kolkata
14.	R.K. Rai, Director	Office of DC (MSME)
15.	Kalendra Sahai, Director	MSME-DI, Guwahati
16.	Sanjeev Saxena, Jt. Director of Industries	Govt. of Rajasthan
17.	Rashmi Kant Nagar, Industries Inspector	Govt. of Rajasthan
18.	Mohan Pyare, CMD, TANSIDCO	Govt. of Tamilnadu
19.	U. Muktieh, Dy. Director of Com & Industries	Govt. of Meghalaya
20.	Vikas Jain, OSD	Govt. of Maharashtra
21.	Mam Chand, Under Secretary	IF Wing, Udyog Bhawan
22.	A.K. Jha, Dy. Director, IFW	Ministry of MSME

	<b>Name &amp; Designation</b>	<b>Office</b>
23.	Ramesh Sarkar, Secretary	Jirakpur Sister Nivedita Seva Mission, 24 South Parganas
24.	Bharat Agarwal, Director	Powerloom Cluster, Shirpur, Dhule, Maharashtra
25.	Ashish Gujrathi, Director	SPV, Powerloom Cluster, Shirpur, Dhule, Maharashtra
26.	Uttam Halder, Secretary, SPV	Magrahat Silver Filigree Cluster
27.	Deepanshu	Handloom Cluster, Panipat

### Review of projects under MSE-CDP

Fifty five Common Facility Centres have been approved under Micro and Small Enterprises – Cluster Development Programme (MSE-CDP). Out of 55, 14 CFCs have been completed, 3 projects (1 in Kerala and 2 in AP) have been cancelled and 38 CFCs are at various stages of implementation. Apart from 5 Common Facility Centres, 130 Infrastructure Development Projects have also been approved. Out of 130, 30 infrastructure development projects are on-going and 100 have been completed. Soft interventions in 249 clusters have been approved. Out of 249, interventions in 184 clusters have been completed. The details are given below:-

#### STATUS OF SOFT INTERVENTIONS AND CFC UNDER MSE-CDP

(Rs in Lakh)

	State/ UT	Soft interventions			CFCs			
		Nos (Ongoing)	Gol Funding		No (Ongoing)	Gol Funding		Proposals Pending
			Approved	Released		Approved	Released	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	17 (2)	440.54	326.85	1 (1)	61.43	36.85	0
2.	Bihar	5 (0)	148.04	112.96	1 (0)	101.0	94.00	0
3.	Chattisgarh	2 (0)	33.69	28.28	0	0.00	0.00	0
4.	Gujarat	3 (0)	52.66	45.96	2 (1)	668.24	260.00	2
5.	Goa	2 (1)	28.00	23.94	0	0.00	0.00	0
6.	Haryana	4 (0)	68.11	66.06	0	0.00	0.00	0
7.	Himachal Pradesh	2 (0)	25.03	25.03	0	0.00	0.00	0
8.	Jharkhand	3 (2)	52.53	29.08	0	0.00	0.00	0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	2 (2)	87.30	64.50	1 (1)	246.0	246.00	0
10.	Karnataka	6 (1)	96.29	76.53	3 (3)	459.10	413.89	5
11.	Kerala	27 (0)	212.46	158.05	11 (7)	2855.74	1706.36	5
12.	Maharashtra	18 (0)	133.52	113.51	3 (3)	2528.76	708.00	5
13.	Madhya Pradesh	5 (1)	104.71	63.54	0	0.00	0.00	0
14.	Odisha	8 (5)	89.17	73.53	2 (2)	414.95	120.00	2
15.	Punjab	11 (2)	619.45	243.22	0	0.00	0.00	1
16.	Rajasthan	17 (7)	178.75	136.95	1 (1)	1050.00	0.00	1
17.	Tamilnadu	19 (18)	192.85	55.32	15 (9)	3698.75	726.35	7
18.	Uttar Pradesh	37 (11)	436.66	371.06	6 (5)	1333.08	235.60	0
19.	Uttarakhand	2 (0)	29.37	29.37	1 (0)	144.17	144.17	1
20.	West Bengal	35 (8)	383.99	220.25	4 (4)	1643.73	342.23	14
21.	Assam	9 (3)	101.25	81.12	1 (1)	100.0	81.66	0
22.	Arunachal Pradesh	2 (1)	18.0	15.51	0	0.00	0.00	0
23.	Manipur	3 (0)	26.10	24.46	0	0.00	0.00	0
24.	Meghalaya	2 (0)	14.40	9.47	0	0.00	0.00	0
25.	Mizoram	3 (0)	27.00	27.00	0	0.00	0.00	0
26.	Nagaland	2 (0)	54.00	50.29	0	0.00	0.00	0
27.	Tripura	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0
28.	Sikkim	1 (1)	13.50	9.71	0	0.00	0.00	0
29.	Andaman & Nicobar (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Chandigarh (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

31	Dadra and Nagar Haveli (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	Daman & Diu (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	Delhi (UT)	2 (0)	37.85	16.68	0	0.00	0.00	0
34	Lakshadweep (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	Puducherry (UT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>249 (65)</b>	<b>3705.22</b>	<b>2498.23</b>	<b>52 (38)</b>	<b>15304.95</b>	<b>5115.11</b>	<b>43</b>

### CFC Proposals under Consideration

(Rs. in lakh)

	State	Projects		Under correspondence	Balance in Agenda	
		Nos	Proposed Gol Funding		Nos	Gol
1.	Gujarat	2	325.28*	2	0	0
2.	Karnataka	5	3194.76	5	0	0
3.	Kerala	5	1491.34	5	0	0
4.	Maharashtra	5	5832.2	4	1	1002.73
5.	Orissa	2	1050.00	2	0	0
6.	Punjab	1	1176.58	1	0	0
7.	Rajasthan	1	1013.11	1	0	0
8.	Tamilnadu	7	2100.84	7	0	0
9.	Uttarakhand	1	852.50	1	0	0
10.	West Bengal	14	3694.10	13	1	119.47
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20730.71</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1122.20</b>

\*In one proposal, Gol contribution is not mentioned.

## Soft Interventions under Consideration

(Rs in Lakh)

	State	Soft Interventions		Under correspondence	Balance in Agenda
		Nos	Gol Funding Proposed		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3	48.33	3	0
2.	Gujarat	2	40.91	2	0
3.	Haryana	2	32.99	2	0
4.	Jharkhand	2	17.20	2	0
5.	Maharashtra	6	87.27	6	0
6.	Orissa	6	98.22	6	0
7.	Punjab	3	36.34	3	0
8.	Uttar Pradesh	7	109.77	7	0
9.	West Bengal	3	60.29	1	2
10.	Assam	1	21.65	1	0
11.	Delhi (UT)	1	27.90	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>580.87</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>2</b>

## Status of Infrastructure Development Projects

(Rs in Lakh)

	State	New Projects			Up gradation Projects		
		Nos (on going)	Gol Funding		Nos (on going)	Gol Funding	
			Approved	Released		Approved	Released
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4 (0)	579.87	441.43	0	0	0
2.	Bihar	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	Chattisgarh	4 (1)	653.72	360.75	0	0	0
4.	Gujarat	1 (1)	200.00	92.50	1 (1)	70.00	42.96
5.	Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	Haryana	3 (0)	518.34	498.11	18 (0)	779.79	534.39
7.	Himachal Pradesh	1 (1)	172.80	124.41	0	0	0
8.	Jharkhand	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	2 (1)	600.00	570.12	0	0	0
10.	Karnataka	4 (0)	800.00	718.41	0	0	0
11.	Kerala	8 (0)	1570.82	1522.48	0	0	0
12.	Maharashtra	4 (0)	617.07	608.71	0	0	0
13.	Madhya Pradesh	8 (1)	1436.62	656.21	0	0	0
14.	Orissa	3 (2)	414.22	332.41	0	0	0
15.	Punjab	3 (1)	515.00	333.00	0	0	0
16.	Rajasthan	11 (2)	2375.43	1377.24	2 (2)	568.80	89.99
17.	Tamilnadu	11 (5)	1634.03	938.35	10 (3)	896.92	359.91
18.	Uttar Pradesh	8 (0)	1579.60	1209.74	0	0	0
19.	Uttarakhand	3 (0)	1200.00	575.00	0	0	0
20.	West Bengal	4 (1)	691.33	159.12	1 (1)	359.78	60
21.	Assam	11 (5)	3872.40	3640.55	0	0	0
22.	Arunachal Pradesh	1 (1)	262.40	160.00	0	0	0
23.	Manipur	0	0	0	0	0	0
24.	Meghalaya	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.	Mizoram	2 (0)	750.10	750.10	0	0	0
26.	Nagaland	1 (0)	399.07	374.54	0	0	0
27.	Tripura	1 (1)	365.04	182.00	0	0	0

28.	Sikkim	0	0	0	0	0	0
29.	Andaman & Nicobar	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0	0	0	0	0	0
32.	Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0
33.	Delhi	0	0	0	0	0	0
34.	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0	0
35.	Puducherry	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>98 (23)</b>	<b>21207.86</b>	<b>15625.18</b>	<b>32 (7)</b>	<b>2675.29</b>	<b>1087.25</b>

### Infrastructure Development Proposals under Consideration

(Rs in Lakh)

S. No.	State	Description				
		Nos	Gol	Under correspondence	Balance in agenda	
					Nos	Proposed Gol Funding
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	753.91	1	0	0
2.	Assam	4	1323.60	4	0	0
3.	Chattisgarh	1	588.35	1	0	0
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	998.00	2	0	0
5.	Madhya Pradesh	1	435.00	1	0	0
6.	Rajasthan	2	676.00	2	0	0
7.	Tamilnadu	4	819.22	3	1	238.42
8.	Uttar Pradesh	5	1741.24	5	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7335.32</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>238.42</b>