

Minutes of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Group Meeting held on 4th June, 2009 to consider the Computer Education Plans of State Governments of Arunachal Pradesh, NCT of Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and Tamil Nadu under Scheme of Information & Communication Technology (ICT) in School Scheme.

.....

A meeting of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Group (PMEG) for the implementation of the Centrally sponsored scheme of 'ICT in Schools' was held on 4th June, 2009 at 1500 hrs in the Conference Room under the Chairmanship of Secretary (SE&L) to consider the Computer Education Plans (CEPs) received from the State Governments of Arunachal Pradesh, NCT of Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana, Manipur, Meghalaya and Tamil Nadu. State Govts. of Haryana and Manipur had informed about inability to participate in the meeting. There was no communication from Govt. of Meghalaya and no representative participated in the meeting. A list of the participants is annexed.

Initiating the discussion, Ms Anshu Vaish, Secretary (SE&L) highlighted the importance of scheme.

2. Shri S.C.Khuntia, Joint Secretary (SE) briefly explained about Govt. of India's perspective plan on ICT enabled education and computer literacy, particularly, in the light of India having a very high percentage of young people. He highlighted the following points:

- (i) Implementation of the scheme should be time-bound and utilization certificates for previous releases should be pre-requisites for appraisal of new proposals.
- (ii) Even though approvals have been given earlier by PMEG, the information on physical progress has not been received from a number of State Governments/ UTs. These should be sent on a quarterly basis till the completion of implementation of a particular phase.
- (iii) State Govts./ UTs should certify that at least 2 schools in each educationally backward block in the State have been covered under the Scheme
- (iv) BOOT Model should be the preferred option as it could ensure utilization failing which payment would not be released. However, if State Govts. prefer Outright Purchase model for any valid reason, suitable justification should be submitted for consideration by PMEG.
- (v) Budgetary provision should be made by the State Govt for both Central and State share and should be indicated as part of the proposal.
- (vi) The States should give details of the number of teachers trained in each school. Earlier the State Governments were mandated to impart training to five teachers per school covered. However, with the reduction in the prices of hardware and also the scheme being implemented in large number of schools under BOOT Model, it would be desirable to cover all teachers in the school in use of ICT in education.
- (vii) State Govts./UTs should also furnish details of number of students benefited so far school-wise.

- (viii) Since the scheme is under implementation for a number of years now, the States should get an evaluation of the scheme done by an independent agency like IIT, NIT, IIIT, etc. and submit the report to the Ministry. A deadline of 30th June 2009 was indicated for completing the evaluation.
- (ix) All physical assets created under the scheme should have the name of the scheme and year of purchase written on the surface so that the same asset is not shown under more than one scheme.

Secretary (SE&L) directed that, from the next PMEG meeting the Department would also make a presentation at the beginning of the meeting to highlight common issues and actions required by the States.

3. Thereafter the Computer Education Plans of the States were taken up for consideration of PMEG.

3.1. Tamil Nadu

Principal Secretary (School Education), Government of Tamil Nadu made a presentation which is summarized below:

- i) ICT scheme is being implemented to enhance the employability skills of the students
- ii) Tamil Nadu is in second place in software export, which is worth Rs.3500 crores.
- iii) Computer science has been introduced as a regular subject and the syllabus is periodically revised and updated.
- iv) From 2008 qualified Computer Instructors have been appointed.
- v) Proposal is to cover 1880 Govt. Higher Secondary Schools in 2009-10 on outright purchase.
- vi) The State Govt. has already provided the following facilities in these 1880 schools:
 - (a) One Server
 - (b) 8 Nodes
 - (c) One Laptop
 - (d) One 5KVA UPS
 - (e) One LCD projector
 - (f) One Dot--Matrix Printer
 - (g) Broadband Internet facility and
 - (h) One qualified Instructor per school.

3.1.1. On being asked for reasons for the proposal to implement the scheme only on Outright Purchase, Principal Secretary (Education) intimated that they had a bad experience of implementation of the scheme from 1999 to 2005 under BOOT Model. Principal Secretary elaborated that teachers who were appointed on contract basis @ Rs. 1000 had to be regularized with a salary of Rs.12,000/-. JS (SE) pointed out that since the State Govt. already had qualified Computer Instructor in every school, the problem of appointing teachers on contract basis was no longer there and the State Govt. could consider procuring only the required hardware and software, (and not computer instructor) under BOOT Model.

- 3.1.2. On the query about the arrangement for maintenance of these computers being obtained on Outright Purchase, Principal Secretary, Govt. of Tamil Nadu clarified that for the last three years ELCOT, a State PSU, had been supplying the computers and maintaining them. In each district ELCOT had opened an office to maintain these computers. It was further clarified that ELCOT got the maintenance done through contract with other agencies.
- 3.1.3. After detailed discussions, PMEG accorded "in principle" approval for coverage of 1880 Higher Secondary schools subject to the following conditions:
- a) State Govt. to furnish detailed justification in case it does not want to adopt BOOT Model.
 - b) As the server is already available and only the terminals have to be procured, the cost of the project would be less. The State has already provided 8 nodes, UPS, Projector, printer and BB connectivity to these schools, Therefore, the final requirement of funds may be resubmitted after correct estimation.

3.2. Madhya Pradesh

3.2.1 A presentation of the proposal 2009-10 was made by Sh.Anurag Srivastava, MDMPS, Education, Government of Madhya Pradesh, highlights of which were as follows:

- (i) Delay in implementation of the scheme is due to change of officers and two elections. Proposal is mooted under BOOT Model due to bad experience with Outright Purchase
 - (ii) State Electricity Corporation is a nodal agency to issue tender on turnkey basis.
 - (iii) Tendering has been done in three stages and model computer labs had been installed by the participating vendors as an experiment to see the capability of the vendors. At these labs the software was also tested.
 - (iv) 25 computers were established in each lab and evaluation was done on its performance and the State Govt. would submit its report also for perusal of the Ministry.
 - (v) The hardware installed in each school would also be utilized after school hours for commercial purposes.
 - (vi) Proposal is to cover 2000 schools under Boot Model (which includes 1000 schools already approved in 2008-09).
- 3.2.2. On enquiry by Secretary (SE&L) about the safety aspects and responsibility for the proposed use of the infrastructure after school hours, it was clarified that the Principal of each school would be responsible for the same. It was clarified that the responsibility of the infrastructure would be of the vendor and the additional revenue that is generated would be taken up by the vendor, which would hopefully bring down the cost. It was further clarified that the local community like Panchayat could utilize the infrastructure after school hours. The State officers stressed that all these points have been incorporated in the draft memorandum to be signed between the State Govt. and the vendors.
- 3.2.3 After detailed discussion, PMEG sanctioned 2000 schools (including 1000 schools already approved in 2008-09) under BOOT Model subject to the following conditions:

(i) As a sum of Rs.8.00 crores is already lying unutilized with the State Govt., no funds would be released for the 100 schools sanctioned for 2009-10 till the State Govt. utilizes this amount, submits UC and progress reports and also informs about implementation of the scheme including tendering, identification of vendors and placements of orders.

3.3. Punjab

3.3.1. A presentation was made by Shri Krishna Kumar, Director General, School Education, Government of Punjab, the highlights are as follows:

- i) All schools have been provided with broadband connectivity provided by BSNL.
- ii) All purchases under BOOT model is working successfully. Fortnightly meetings are held with vendors to ensure compliance of the implementation of the ICT Scheme.
- iii) 50% of the teachers have been trained.
- iv) Each school have been provided with 20 computers (10 from the Central Government and 10 from the State).
- v) Education Department of the State has a tie up with Punjab State Electricity Board (1.5 lakh employees) for imparting training to all personal above SDOs. A nominal amount is charged and 50% of this is given to schools and some honorarium is paid to the teachers for imparting training.
- vi) Rs.7.00 crores released earlier is still to be utilized.
- vii) Proposal for 2009-10 is for coverage of 870 schools (797 Secondary Schools and 73 Higher Secondary Schools) under BOOT Model in 2009-10. All schools of Punjab would now be covered.
- viii) Funds was sought to be released in three years for the BOOT model.

3.3.2 After detailed discussion, PMEG approved coverage of 870 schools under the scheme on BOOT Model, subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The Central share of Rs.5.00 lakhs per school would be released as under:
 - (a) **2009-10** - @.Rs.1.50 lakhs per school for 870 schools
 - (b) **2010-11**- @.Rs.1.50 lakhs per school for 870 schools
 - (c) **2011-12**-@.Rs.1.00 lakhs per school for 870 schools
 - (d) **2012-13**--@.Rs.0.50 lakhs per school for 870 schools
 - (e) **2013-14**--@.Rs.0.50 lakhs per school for 870 schools

(ii) The State Government should ensure that the computers procured under the ICT Scheme have the name of the scheme along with the year of purchase clearly written on each equipment so that equipments purchases under different schemes are clearly identifiable.

(iii) The State should communicate the budget provision made in 2009-10 for Central and State share to enable release to be made.

3.4. Arunachal Pradesh

3.4.1 Commissioner (Education), Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh made a presentation, highlights of which are as under:

- (i) 150 schools have been covered under the ICT Scheme.
- (i) 55 Schools, which have been upgraded to secondary stage earlier, is now proposed to be covered under the ICT Scheme in 2009-10.
- (ii) Another 29 schools which have now been upgraded to secondary stage and approval of PMEG is also sought for covering these schools in 2009-10.

- (iii) Internet facility has been provided by BSNL and in schools which does not have this facility, these schools are being covered under INMARSET.

3.4.2 On enquiry as to why the State Govt. has proposed for implementation under Outright Purchase, it was clarified that the schools in the State were located in remote locality and vendors were not willing to implement the scheme under BOOT Model. The State representative clarified that teachers training would be started from this year.

3.4.3 JS (SE) suggested introduction of Computer Science related subjects as electives in the higher secondary schools to optimally utilize the infrastructure provided in the scheme. It was noted that all Govt. schools in Arunachal Pradesh were affiliated to CBSE, which already offers such courses.

3.4.4 After discussion, PMEG approved implementation of the scheme in 55 schools on Outright purchase basis (due to remoteness of locations) subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The State Govt. is required to submit notification of their upgradation to secondary school and also to submit report of an evaluation of the schools covered earlier under the ICT Scheme by a third party to enable release of funds.
- (ii) Budgetary provision for Central and State share should be made
- (iii) A fresh CEP for the 29 additional schools along with a copy of the notification upgrading these schools should be submitted for consideration by PMEG.

3.5. **Delhi**

3.5.1 Shri Chandra Bhushan Kumar, Director(Education), Government of NCT of Delhi made a presentation, highlights of which are as under:

- (i) 75 Computer Labs have been set up for covering 106 schools, which includes schools with single as well as double shift.
- (ii) Proposal is to implement under Outright Purchase due to problems faced like litigation in earlier procurement under BOOT Model.
- (iii) Hardware would be procured under DGS&D rates.
- (iv) Each school would be procuring the infrastructure through their own tendering.
- (v) 5 CEPs have been implemented so far under the State funds.
- (vi) CEP –1 & II under BOOT Model failed due to vendors leaving midstream. 8 cases of arbitration are pending.
- (vii) CEP III & IV under BOOT Model did not take off as the vendor IEC backed out and he has been blacklisted. Arbitration case is pending.
- (viii) CEP V being implemented by ENVORNN under BOOT Model failed due to the vendor leaving the implementation midstream.
- (ix) Nearly all the vendors like Educom, NIIT, ECIL are not willing to implement the scheme under BOOT Model mainly due to very strict monitoring and implementation of penalty clause being enforced by the Delhi Government.

3.5.2 Secretary (SE&L) observed that the Delhi Government should not avoid implementation of the scheme under BOOT Model only due to fear of arbitration. Further, the State Govt. was asked as to whether they had any reason other than litigation, and whether they would like to reconsider their proposal on Outright Purchase in favour of the BOOT Model. .

3.5.3 The representative of the State Govt. stated he could not take a decision on the implementation of the scheme under BOOT Model and the UT Admn. would come back to PMEG on this issue..

3.5.4 After discussion, following decisions were taken:

- (i) 53 schools approved earlier in 2007-08 and not implemented would be cancelled.
- (ii) As per MHRD's records there was an unspent balance of Rs.134.60 lakh with UT Admn. under the earlier CLASS Scheme. The representative of UT Admn mentioned that there was no unspent balance and they could reconcile the figures with MHRD.

4. Other decisions taken by PM&EG:

4.1 There was a general discussion on ways and means of improving the implementation and impact of the ICT @ Schools scheme. These are summed up as follows:

- i) A Committee under the Chairmanship of DDG, NIC would be constituted for preparation of a Model Tender Document for guiding the States in their procurement processes.

Time Limit: 31.7.2009

Action: DDG, NIC

- ii) Laying stress on availability of appropriate e-content for schools covered. It was decided that Joint Director, CIET would share the contents developed in CIET/NCERT in English and Hindi for use by the States.

Action: Jt. Director, CIET

- iii) A Committee under chairmanship of Jt.Dir. CIET and including DDG, NIC and representatives from NCTE. would prepare guidelines for teacher training as well as curriculum on ICT in education.

Time Limit: 30.6.2009

Action: Jt Director, CIET

- iv) A template for web based online monitoring of the scheme would be developed by NIC with contribution from CIET.

Time Limit: 7.7.2009

Action: DDG, NIC

- v) A third party evaluation of the scheme should be carried out

Time Limit: 31.8.2009

Action: SE Bureau

- vi) A more comprehensive proforma for submitting CEPs by the States.

Time Limit: 30.6.2009

Action: Dr Rajaram Sharma, Head, Computer Education and Technology Aids, NCERT

The Meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

.....