

No.P-17024/21/2020-RC (FMS No. 372039)

**Government of India  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Department of Rural Development  
Rural Connectivity Division**


Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi  
Dated the 6<sup>th</sup> of February, 2024

**MINUTES**

**Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2023 to consider the Project Proposals submitted by the Government of Punjab under PMGSY III for the year 2023-24 (Batch- II)-reg.**

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2023 through Video Conferencing to consider the Project Proposals under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of the EC on priority.

**Encl: As above.**

  
(Devinder Kumar)  
Director (RC)  
Tel. No. 23070129

**Distribution:**

- i. The Secretary (PWD B&R), Public Works (Building & Roads) Department, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh - 143001, Punjab.
- ii. The Chief Engineer cum Empowered Officer, Punjab Roads & Bridges Development Board, Mohali (Chandigarh), Punjab
- iii. The Adviser (RD), NITI Aayog, NITI Aayog Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
- iv. The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- v. The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector-6, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110037.
- vi. The Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Parivahan Bhavan, New Delhi
- vii. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Bhikaji Kama Place, New Delhi- 110001

**Copy for information to:-**

- PSO to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to JS (RC)/ PPS to JS & FA

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2023 to consider the Project Proposals submitted by the Government of Punjab under PMGSY III (Batch- II) for the year 2023-24.**

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2023 under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Rural Development to consider the Project Proposals submitted by the State of Punjab under PMGSY-III (Batch-II) of 2023-24. The following officers were present in the meeting:

<b>Government of India Representatives</b>	
Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary, Department of Rural Development
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA
Ms Tanuja Thakur Khalkho	Joint Secretary & Financial Advisor, MoRD
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director, MoRD & Director (P-II), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri I.K.Pateriya	Consultant Director (P.III), NRIDA
Smt Shalini Das	Joint Director (Technical), NRIDA
Shri Vijay Pal Guriyan	Under Secretary (RC), MoRD
<b>State Government Representatives</b>	
Shri Priyank Bharti	Secretary, Public Works, Punjab
Shri Paramjyoti Arora	Chief Engineer, SRRDA Punjab
Shri Arshdeep Singh	Superintendent Engineer cum SQC, SRRDA Punjab
Shri Mohit Batra	Superintendent Engineer, Punjab Mandi Board
Shri Inderjit Gulati	Executive Engineer cum Nodal Maintenance Officer SRRDA Punjab
Ms. Tanupreet Kaur	Executive Engineer, SRRDA Punjab
Shri Rajat Mittal	Executive Engineer, Punjab PWD (B & R), Patiala
Shri Santokh Singh	Executive Engineer, AE cum ITNO, SRRDA Punjab
Shri Deep Chand	Manager, Accounts, SRRDA Punjab

**2. Details of Current Proposal by the State (PMGSY-III):**

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Punjab under Batch-II of the year 2023-24 was made by Joint Secretary (Rural Connectivity), Ministry of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA before the Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:

Item	As per Pre EC (12.06.23)				As per OMMAS as on 20.12.2023			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
<b>Upgradation Roads</b>	127	1248.762	1297.81	103.93	129	1253.64	1247.08*	99.47
* Central Share- Rs. 744.82crore, State Share- Rs. 502.26 crore								



- I. The State of Punjab has been allocated target length of 3,362.5 Km under PMGSY-III, out of which State has already been sanctioned 2,083.99 km and 1,278.51 Km remains to be sanctioned. The current proposal is for 129 roads of 1,253.64 Km.
- II. Out of 129 roads, 1 road of 8.9 Km is in 7 m carriageway width category with average cost of Rs. 89.27 lakh/km, 106 roads of 1038.53 km are in 5.5 m carriageway width category with average cost of Rs. 103.15 lakh/Km and 22 roads of 206.21 Km are in 3.75 m carriageway width category with average cost of Rs. 81.41 lakh/Km.
- III. All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA has scrutinized 3 (2.32%) proposals. ***The State was requested to get scrutinized at least 10% of the proposals by PTA on OMMAS.***

### 3. Trace Map rank:

Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	Percentage
1 to 15	75	58
16 to 50	42	33
51 to 100	11	9
>100	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>129</b>	

**The State Government informed that 12 roads which are having trace map rank above 50 are near the block boundary as verified on GeoSadak. NRIDA confirmed it.**

### 4. Planning Audit (Proposals):

- I. All road proposals had been uploaded on GeoSadak.
- II. The following three road proposals of Sangrur District were having more than 25% Non BT Surface.

**(i) T08-NH 71 to Khetla to Ladbanjara Kalan via Rampur Gujran:** The road is of 8.3 km road length having 55% Non BT/CC length and lies in Sunam block of Sangrur district. At the time of Pre-EC discussion, the State was asked to re-examine the proposal. The State informed that non BT is required to be taken up for balancing the traffic requirements and the Non BT portion has trace map rank of 2 and leads to college, Govt. offices, Grain Market, etc. **The State was requested to re-examine if the proposal meets the requirement of a road upgradation project as per PMGSY III.**

**(ii) T17-Safipur Kalan Tilla to Samuran via Shihal:** The road is of 5.85 km road length having 42% Non BT/CC length and lies in Sunam block of Sangrur District. At the time of Pre-EC discussion, the State was asked to re-examine the proposal having large non-BT part. The State informed that Non BT portion is required to be taken up so as to connect two districts (Patiala and Sangrur). Traffic movement has been affected due to the construction of wall along

*D*

the Jammu-Katra Expressway. Taking up the non-BT surface will ease the traffic movements of agricultural vehicle.

(iii) **T27- Kauhrian to Shadihri via Harigar:** The road is of 7.83 km road length having 34% Non BT/CC length and lies in Lehragaga block of Sangrur district. At the time of Pre-EC discussion, the State was asked to re-examine the proposal having large Non-BT part. The State informed that Non BT is required to be taken up as this connects Dirba with Partan and provide seamless connectivity to people moving from Patran to Dirba.

**The State was asked to furnish justification as to whether these 3 roads are meeting objectives of PMGSY-III.**

## 5. Existing Surface Details:

The approximate length of the existing surface of the roads proposed in the current batch are as under:-

Brick soling	Track	Gravel/ Moorum	WBM	BT	CC	Total
0	9.65	0	0	1,223.3	20.71	1253.65

Out of 129 roads proposed in the current batch, in 126 roads 95% of the existing surface is BT or CC, in 2 road works 50-75% of the existing surface is BT or CC, in 1 road work 25-50% of the existing surface is BT or CC.

## 6. High Priority Roads skipped in CUCPL

24 roads as they are under State Scheme DLP, 24 roads sanctioned under State scheme, 13 roads have less than eligible length, 10 roads due to State not interested in riding surface improvement, 4 roads as these are under PMGSY DLP and 1 due to forest issues. **The State was asked to submit proper justification for high priority road works skipped.**

## 7. Length wise proposal details

Length-wise details of 129 road proposals are as follows:

Sl No	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Pavement cost	Cost/km	Total cost in Crores	Average cost/km
1	3 to 5 km	5	19.57	1534.84	78.40	20.42	104.34
2	5 km and above	124	1234.07	93219.26	75.53	1226.66	99.40
<b>Total</b>		<b>129</b>	<b>1253.64</b>	<b>94754.10</b>	<b>75.58</b>	<b>1247.08</b>	<b>99.47</b>

The average candidate road length is 10.57 km and average proposed road length is 9.72 km.



## 8. Traffic category wise details of road:

### Roads in 3.75 m carriageway width

- (i) 3 roads of length 31.98 km are in T6 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 40.51 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 64.40 lakh/Km.
- (ii) 6 roads of length 40.77 km are in T7 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs.47.87 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 84.69 lakh/Km.
- (iii) 2 roads of length 12.46 km are in T8 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 66.77 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 108.82 lakh/Km.
- (iv) 10 roads of length 96.79 km are in T9 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 57.22 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 83.99 lakh/Km.
- (v) 1 road of length 24.22 km is in IRC 37 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 62.31 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 73.97 lakh/Km.

### Roads in 5.50 m carriageway width

- (i) 1 road of length 19.48 Km is in T5 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 78.82 lakh/km and average cost of Rs. 93.48 lakh/Km.
- (ii) 12 roads of length 116.14 km are in T8 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 73.13lakh/km and average cost of Rs 95.4 lakh/Km.
- (iii) 77 roads of length 723.21 km are in T9 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 80.18 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 104.15 lakh/Km.
- (iv) 16 roads of length 179.70 km are in IRC 37 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 82.93 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 105.09 lakh/Km

### Road in 7 meter carriageway width

1 road of length 8.9 km in IRC 37 traffic category with pavement cost of Rs. 79.62 lakh/lm and average cost of Rs. 89.27 lakh/km.

## 9. PCU value

The PCU value of 129 roads proposed in the current batch are as under:-

Sl. No	PCU/day	No of roads		
		3.75 m	5.5 m	7.0 m
1	500-1000	1	-	-
2	1000-1500	8	1	-
3	1500-2000	5	-	-
4	2000-2500	2	14	-
5	2500-3000	4	30	-
6	3000-3500	2	38	-
7	3500-4000	-	7	-
8	>4000	-	16	1
	<b>Total</b>	22	106	1

12

#### 10. Distribution of Roads based on width

Width based distribution of 129 roads is as follows:-

Widening Details	Nos	Length	Average Pavement Cost
3.75-3.75	2	35.74	61.19
3-3.75	20	170.47	52.44
5.5-7.0	1	8.90	79.62
5.5-5.5	18	222.83	73.21
3.75-5.5	13	112.73	77.63
3-5.5	75	702.98	82.30
Grand Total	129	1253.65	75.58

#### 11. Pavement cost/km wise details

The pavement cost wise details of proposals are as under:-

Sl No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads		
		3.75 m	5.5 m	7.0 m
1	<50 Lakhs	6	2	-
2	50-55	4	1	-
3	55-60	5	6	-
4	60-65	4	4	-
5	65-70	3	1	-
6	70-75	-	8	-
7	75-80	-	25	1
8	80-85	-	20	-
9	85-90	-	29	-
10	90-95	-	8	-
11	95-100	-	1	-
12	>120	-	1	-
	Total	22	106	1

The State was requested to provide the justification for all the roads under 5.5. m category which have pavement costs more than 80 lakhs per kilometer.

#### 12. Non-pavement cost/km wise details:

The pavement cost/km wise details of proposals are as under:

Sl No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads		
		3.75 m	5.5 m	7.0 m
1	<20 Lakhs/km	6	47	1
2	20-25	3	22	-
3	25-30	6	17	-

P



SI No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads		
		3.75 m	5.5 m	7.0 m
4	30-35	2	9	-
5	35-40	1	2	-
6	40-45	1	7	-
7	45-50	1	2	-
8	50-55	1	-	-
9	75-80	1	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>1</b>

*The State was requested to provide the justification for all the roads under 3.75. m and 5.5. m category which have non-pavement costs more than 30 lakhs & 35 lakhs per kilometer respectively.*

### 13. Pre-EC Observations

- i. The Pre-EC observed that the State of Punjab had been allocated target length of 3,362.50 Km under PMGSY- III, out of which State had been sanctioned 2,083.99 km and 1278.51 Km remained to be sanctioned. The proposal placed before pre EC was for 127 road of 1248.76 Km, which was 29.745 Km short of the balance target length. The State representative intimated that they are not able to upload proposal for remaining 4 roads of around 29 Km length, as part of these proposed roads were taken up for upgradation under PMGSY-III in previous batches and the current stretch could not be taken up then as the same was under DLP at that time. The State and NRIDA were asked to examine if these proposals shall be uploaded as new proposals or balance length has to be added in the previously sanctioned projects as revision cases. Either of these two options should be followed. The State in EC requested for uploading the remaining 4 roads of around 29 Km length as new proposal. NRIDA informed that the remaining 4 roads have been uploaded to the current batch proposal.
- ii. It was observed in Pre-EC that all proposals except one have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA scrutiny of the proposal was under process. The State was asked to get the same completed on priority, before the EC meeting. State informed in EC that all the proposals have been scrutinized by STA. Only 1 (0.01%) proposal had been scrutinized by PTA. The State was asked to ensure 10% PTA scrutiny.
- iii. The State representative intimated during Pre-EC that there are errors in data entry. The State was asked to rectify the same and enter the correct data. The State apprised EC that the traffic data had been updated.
- iv. Pre-EC observed that large number of proposals with PCU/day value more than 2000 have been proposed in 3.00 m and 3.75 m carriageway width. Also, roads with PCU value less than 200 had been proposed in 5.50 m carriageway width. The State representative indicated some errors in data uploading. The State was asked to rectify the same on priority. The State apprised EC that the 8 no. roads shown on OMMAS under category 3.00 to 3.00 had been corrected. The roads where PCU is more than 2000 and widened from 3.00 to 3.75 m were due to land width constraints. PCU less than 200 on existing 5.5 m carriageway roads had been corrected. The NRIDA informed that State

had omitted 3m carriageway width roads. 1 road of 7 m carriageway width had been added by the State. Updation of number of 3.75 m and 5.5 m roads had been done.

- v. During Pre-EC it was observed that 7 DPRs of pavement cost more than Rs. 70.00 lakh/Km in 3.00 m and 3.75 m carriageway width and 57 roads in 5.50 m carriageway width with average pavement cost more than Rs. 75.00 lakh/Km were required to be checked again. Further, All proposals of average non-pavement cost more than Rs. 20.00 Lakh/Km were needed to be verified. The State apprised the EC that it was decided in the Pre-EC meeting that a team from NRIDA shall visit the State to check the DPRs. Accordingly after discussion with the team, the DPRs shall be amended. As per NRIDA, Team inspection of sample roads had been conducted by NRIDA & accordingly corrections had been done by the State.

**14. DPR observations:**

Sl. No.	DPR observation	State reply	NRIDA Comments
i.	State had taken in-situ stabilization of 230mm/ 240mm/250 mm along with 40mm BC for T8/T9 and IRC37. State should take 225mm stabilization. For T6 to T8 category of roads, State should provide 30mm BC instead of 40mm BC.	All PIUs have been directed to take 30 mm BC + 225mm stabilization for T6 to T8 categories of road and 40mm BC + 230 mm stabilization on T-9 as per IRC37 category roads.	Agreed as higher specification.
ii.	ATCC axle load survey shall be done of roads having traffic more than 1 msa and report should be sent to NRIDA on priority.	The ATCC axle load survey, has already been carried out on the roads having traffic more than 1 MSA and reports have been sent to NRIDA.	Agreed
iii.	State has added excess protection works in relatively plain areas and the same may not be required as per site conditions.	Justification regarding the protection work on from PIUs have been taken. Compliances regarding remaining works shall be submitted shortly.	Justification submitted by the State and agreed.
ix.	RSA report is not found attached in some of the DPRs, as per PMGSY-III guidelines. Road safety audit should be done on all road with a length of 5 km & more.	RSA has already been conducted for all the roads and reports have been appended in the DPR.	Agreed
x.	State need to get vetted the rate analysis of FDR works from NRIDA	The analysis of rate of FDR prepared on the basis of sample analysis of rate of FDR for Uttar Pradesh	State should ensure that there is no monopoly of any additive supplier.



		appended in the booklet issued by NRIDA in May 2022 for FDR.	Chemical additive should be chosen according to soil type and site conditions. Proper transparent procurement and competition should be ensured by the state.
--	--	--	---

### 15. Maintenance:

State has proposed Rs. 8,380.42 lakh for 5 years Routine maintenance, which is 6.72% of the construction cost and agreeable. Similarly, for 6<sup>th</sup> year renewal cost is Rs. 33,593.40 lakh, which is 26.93% of the construction cost and it is on higher side. The State should examine it and reduce the cost. The State should also to add the post DLP maintenance cost under PMGSY.

### 16. New technology proposals as per Vision Document 2022

- I. State representative intimated that 253.34 Kms road length as per OMMAS has been proposed using Waste Plastic, which is 20.78% of the proposal.
- II. The State has proposed entire length of flexible pavement surface course as 25 mm MSS while on FDR Proposals State has proposed BC as surface course.
- III. The State has not proposed any length using cold mix and only 3.34 km road length (09.37%) is proposed under paneled cement concrete/white topping/cell filled concrete.

State has not uploaded FDR roads and length under FDR technology under FDR Module on OMMAS though they have proposed 593 Km under this Technology. Moreover the comparison cost submitted by State shows that there are some roads under FDR Technology where cost is more than 10 % of the conventional cost. The State should take FDR only for those roads which are within 10 % and sufficient crust thickness are available. Correction and compliance to be done accordingly.

Also thickness of BC is not mentioned and state to confirm whether cost of BC is covered under higher specification and same is uploaded on OMMAS.

### 17. Progress of PMGSY works:

The status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II & III in the State of Punjab are as under:-

Road length in Km

Scheme	Sanctioned		Completed		Balance		Unawarded	
	No. of Roads	Length (Km)	Nos.	Length (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)
PMGSY I	1,050	6,937.21	1,050	6,912.43	0	0	0	0.00
PMGSY II	123	1,342.82	123	1,330.79	0	0	0	0.00
PMGSY III	206	2,083.99	111	1,512.13	95	567.19	6	42.06
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,379</b>	<b>10,364.03</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>9,755.36</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>567.20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>42.06</b>

**Bridge (No.)**

SCHEME	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unawarded (Nos.)
PMGSY II	7	7	0	0
PMGSY III	32	3	29	17
<b>Total:</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>17</b>

The State was advised to expedite the tendering process for the unawarded works under PMGSY-III on priority.

**18. Physical Progress 2023-24 (as on 22.12.2023):**

The State has made an achievement of 770 Km, against target for construction of 1,300 Km during FY 2023-24. *The State was asked to compete the target under the current financial year 2023-2024.*

**19. Maintenance of roads under DLP**

During 2021-22, against the liability of Rs. 14.49 crore, expenditure of Rs. 9.29 crore has been incurred. For the financial year 2022-23, against the maintenance liability of Rs. 14.94 crore, the expenditure of Rs. 13.50 crore has been incurred. For the FY 2023-24, the State has liability of Rs. 10.91 crore and the State has incurred expenditure of Rs. 11.43 crore. However, there has been difference in expenditure reflected on OMMAS and the State records. The State was asked to update expenditure correctly on OMMAS in this regard.

**20. eMARG**

There are 33 packages due for DLP and total packages in DLP in eMARG are 326. Total 12 package are pending for locking and 19 packages pending for MEE. All 41 road works eligible for Routine Inspection (RI) in the month of November, 2023 were inspected. 60 packages are pending for payment for more than 3 months and 8 packages are pending for first payment. *The Chairperson asked the Secretary, Public Works, Punjab to review the eMARG and saturate the progress on e-MARG.*

**21. PMGSY-III Awarded road works-tendering analysis**

Out of total 200 awarded works under PMGSY-III, 1 work has been awarded at -30% below the sanctioned cost, 7 works at 18-24% below sanctioned cost, 10 works at 12-18% below sanctioned cost, 37 works at 6-12% below sanctioned cost, 119 works at 0-6% below the sanctioned cost.

Further, 19 works are awarded at 0-6% above the sanctioned cost and 7 works at 6-12% above the sanctioned cost. *The State was asked to ensure additional visits of State Quality Monitors*



*on the low quoted PMGSY works so that these works are completed with good quality, in terms of advisory dated 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2022 issued by NRIDA.*

**22. Quality Control:**

- (a) Lab details were not uploaded for 1 package out of 100 ongoing packages.
- (b) Quality Control Registers (QCRs) for 2 works were not uploaded out of 86 ongoing works.
- (c) Number of active SQMs are 15 against requirements of 15 SQMS. Out of SQM inspection target of 320 during 2023-24, 300 inspections have been conducted.
- (d) It was observed that SQMs namely Shri Kulwant Singh, Shri P P Chaudhary, Shri Virinder Kumar Dhir, Shri Sukhbir Singh, Shri Satish Kumar Grover and Shri Satish Kumar Gupta, empaneled by the State have graded 100 % completed and ongoing projects as "Satisfactory" during financial year 2023-24. Whereas NQMs have reported the same project only 10.14% as "Unsatisfactory".
- (e) Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from **December, 2020 to November, 2023** for completed works is **05%**, for ongoing works it is **3% and** for maintenance works, it is **13%**. The unsatisfactory grading by NQM from **December, 2022 to November, 2023** for completed works is **07%**, for ongoing works, it is **09 % and** for maintenance works, it is **09%**. Thus, the unsatisfactory quality grading awarded by the NQM **from December, 2022 to November, 2023** is high for completed works and ongoing works when compared to grading awarded by the NQM **from December, 2020 to November, 2023**.

Similarly, unsatisfactory grading by SQM from **December, 2020 to November, 2023** for completed works is **9%**, for ongoing works it is **6%** and for maintenance works, it is **22%**. The unsatisfactory grading by SQM from **December, 2022 to November, 2023** for completed works is **11%**, for ongoing works, it is **08%** and for maintenance works, it is **22%**. Thus, the unsatisfactory quality grading awarded by the SQM **from December, 2022 to November, 2023** is high for completed works and ongoing works when compared to grading awarded by the SQM **from December, 2020 to November, 2023**.

**EC has observed that the quality of PMGSY works, as brought out in the reports of by NQMs and SQMs, has declined in recent years. State needs to put more attention on ensuring quality of ongoing works, completed works and also towards maintenance works.**

- (f) 17 NQM ATRs (ongoing works) are pending at State Level. 1 ATR is pending for more than 1 year. The State was informed the stringent action ensued on pending ATR for more than 1 year. The State should expedite to submit ATR at earliest.

**The State was asked to review the performance of active SQMs on priority and take action against the defaulting SQMs. State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid issues.**

**23. Financial Issues**

14 works pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 19.12.2023. *The State was asked to complete the financial closure of the works in next 15 days.*

**24. Recommendation of Empowered Committee**

Subject to the above observations and concurrent action/compliance by the State Government as stipulated in the foregoing paras, the Empowered Committee recommended the above proposals as at para-2 above.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to and from the Chair.

\*\*\*

