

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE HELD ON 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> January, 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY AND 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 TO CONSIDER NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS UNDER THE SCHEME OF INTEGRATED PROGRAMME FOR OLDER PERSONS (IPOP).**

A meeting of the Screening Committee of Social Defence Bureau of the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment was held on **30<sup>th</sup> January, 2013** under the Chairmanship of Shri T.R. Meena, Joint Secretary (Social Defence) to scrutinize and make recommendations on the new proposals for the years 2011-12 and 2012-13 of NGOs received through State Governments/Union Territories under the Scheme of Integrated Programme for Older Persons (IPOP). The Committee could not consider all the new proposals due to shortage of time. Therefore, it decided to meet again on **31<sup>st</sup> January, 2013, 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 and 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2013**. Due to ill health Shri M.M. Sabharwal, member of the Committee from Help Age India, authorized Ms. Anupama Datta to participate in the meeting on his behalf. Fr. Joe Pereira from Kripa Foundation, and Shri Sandeep Gupta, Deputy Secretary (Finance), Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Department of Social Justice & Empowerment, Members of the Committee, attended the meeting. Shri Surender Rawat, Deputy Secretary (Ageing), Shri J.K. Sahu, Under Secretary (Ageing) and Shri Budharattan, Section Officer (Ageing) were present in the meeting to assist the Committee in the scrutiny of the proposals during the meeting.

2. At the outset, the Committee members were briefed about the existing guideline of the Ministry (i.e. Order No.1-31/2006-Cdn date 05.09.2008), norms and guidelines of the Scheme, budget allocation for 2012-13 under the Scheme, notional allocation fixed for the States/UTs for 2012-13 within the budgetary outlay and number of new proposals received after the last Screening Committee meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2011, etc.

3. As per the existing guidelines of the Ministry release of grants-in-aid in respect of new cases which have been recommended by the Screening Committee is considered on receipt of State Government recommendations for the current year. No grant is released on the recommendations of the previous year. The Committee observed that many State Government send their recommendation's for release of grant-in-aid in the third and fourth quarter of the financial year. With a view to utilize the maximum funds under the Scheme, grants in aid to ongoing case are released on priority and new cases, which have been recommended by the Screening Committee earlier, are taken up for consideration thereafter. As a result, in many new cases, it is possible to release grant in aid during the financial year. The Committee found that the existing procedure is a hindrance for extending financial assistance for new projects. **The Committee, therefore, recommends that grant-in-aid to the new proposals of the organizations should be considered on the basis of available recommendations and inspection reports of the State/UT Governments. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that guidelines contained in the Ministry's Office Order No.1-31/2006-Cdn dated 05.09.2008 may be suitably amended, if it is found feasible.**

4. The Committee also decided to give priority to the proposals received from un-served/under-served States/Districts, followed by innovative projects in the revised Scheme of IPOP which has been implemented w.e.f 1.4.2008, while considering the project proposals for recommendations, subject to fulfillment of other requirements of the scheme and availability of funds.

5. Total 502 proposals for the year 2011-12 and 2012-13 were received from the following State Governments and were placed before the Committee for consideration. State wise number of proposals placed before the Committee and number of proposals recommended are as follows:

S.No.	Name of the States/UTs.	No. of proposals received	No. of proposals recommended.
1.	Andhra Pradesh	26	Nil
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1	1
3.	Assam	27	Nil
4.	Bihar	7	Nil
5.	Chhattisgarh	3	Nil
6.	Delhi	3	Nil
7.	Gujarat	15	Nil
8.	Haryana	25	Nil
9.	Himachal Pradesh	6	Nil
10.	Karnataka	23	4
11.	Kerala	39	10
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3	Nil
13.	Maharashtra	91	01
14.	Manipur	57	Nil
15.	Mizoram	4	Nil
16.	Nagaland	5	Nil
17.	Orissa	103	2
18.	Punjab	3	2
19.	Rajasthan	25	Nil
20.	Tamil Nadu	11	Nil
21.	Tripura	4	Nil
22.	Uttar Pradesh	11	1
23.	Uttrakhand	8	Nil
24.	West Bengal	2	Nil
TOTAL		502	21

6. State wise position of the new proposals placed before the Committee are given as under:

(i) **Andhra Pradesh:** All the 26 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Andhra Pradesh were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-I**.

(ii) **Arunachal Pradesh:** One new proposal under the IPOP Scheme duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh was placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee considered the proposal and recommended the same. Detail of the project alongwith the remarks of the Committee is at Annexure-II

S.No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the project and Location
1	Women and Child Dev. Society, Kimin	OAH, Kimin district :Papumpare

(iii) **Assam:** All the 27 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Assam were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-III**.

(iv) **Bihar:** All the 7 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Bihar were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-IV**.

(v) **Chhattisgarh:** All the 3 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Chhattisgarh were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-V**.

(vi) **Delhi:** All the 3 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Delhi were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-VI**.

(vii) **Gujarat:** All the 15 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Gujarat were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-VII**.

(viii) **Haryana:** : All the 25 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Haryana were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-VIII**.

(ix) **Himachal Pradesh:** All the 6 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Himachal Pradesh were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-IX**.

(x) **Karnataka:** All the 23 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Karnataka were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only four proposals suitable for recommendation details of which are given below:

S. No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the project and location
1	Ramanna Maharishi Trust for the Disabled Persons, Kolar District, Kaenataka	Physiotherapy Clinic Bangarpet, Kolar District
2.	DATE Charitable Society, Chitradurga District, Karnataka	Day Care Centre, Kopal
3.	Gayathri Grameena Vidya Samasthe, Davangere, Karnataka	MMU Devangere
4.	Chickmagalur Rotary Innerwheel Trust, Chikmagalur Distt.	OAH, Muguthihalli, Chikmagalur Distt

Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-X**.

(xi) **Kerala:** All the 39 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Kerala were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only 10 proposals suitable for recommendation details of which are given below:

S. No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the Project & Location
1.	House of Providence	OAH Ernakulam
2.	Amala Bhavan Charitable Society, Karamala, Kottayam	OAH Poovakulam
3.	Social Service Industrial Craft centre, Poonjar Kottayam	OAH Kozhikkode
4.	Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, Thrissur	OAH Ajedupuzha , Thrissur
5.	Dakshina Kerala Gramodharana Seva Samiti Thiruvananthapuram	Sensitisation of School/College Students Kottukal Thiruvananthapuram
6.	St.Anthony's Karunalayam Thrissur	OAH Karanchira, Thrissur
7.	Jeevodaya Old Age Home Alappuzha Kerala	OAH Alappuzha
8.	Home of Love, Kozhikode	OAH Kottooli, Kozhikode
9.	House of Providence, Cochin	OAH Providence Road, Cochin
10.	Alzheimer's and Related Disorders Society of India, Cochin	DCC Cochin

Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XI**.

(xii) **Madhya Pradesh:** All the 3 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Madhya Pradesh were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XII**.

(xiii) **Maharashtra:** All the 91 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Maharashtra were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only one proposal suitable for recommendation.

S. No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the project and Location
1.	Bodisatva Nagarjuna Smark Sanstha VA Anusaudhan Kendra, Buddha Nagar, Nagpur	Ramtek, Nagpur

Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XIII**.

(xiv) **Manipur:** All the 57 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Manipur were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee had taken a view that Manipur is a small State in terms of population and districts having a extensive coverage under IPOP Scheme. Further, the Committee is of the view that this State has reached at a saturated point, whereas there are many States in the North-East that are under serviced. Hence such States should be given priority. The Committee on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XIV**.

(xv) **Mizoram:** All the 4 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Mizoram were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XV**.

(xvi) **Nagaland:** All the 5 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Nagaland were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XVI**.

(xvii) **Odisha:** : All the 103 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Odisha were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only two proposals suitable for recommendation details of which are given below:

S.No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the project and Location
1	Nilanchal Seva Pratisthan, Daya vihar(Kanas), District Puri	Sensitization of School/College Students, Khordha District
2.	Vishwa Jeevan Seva Sangh, District Khorda	MFCC, Khorda District

Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XVII.**

(xviii) **Punjab:** All the 3 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Punjab were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only two proposals suitable for recommendation details of which is given below:

S.No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project and Location
1	Help Age India	Old Age Home Gurdaspur District
2.	Mohali Welfare Society for Health & Education and Research, Mohali, Punjab.	Physiotherapy Clinic, Mohali

Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XVIII.**

(xix) **Rajasthan:** All the 25 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Rajasthan were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XIX.**

(xx) **Tamil Nadu:** All the 11 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Tamil Nadu were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of each of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XX.**

(xxi) **Tripura:** All the 4 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Tripura were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing the proposal in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XXI.**

(xxii) **Uttrakhand:** All the 8 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of Uttrakhand were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing the proposal in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XXII.**

(xxiii) **Uttar Pradesh:** All the 11 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Govt. of Uttar Pradesh were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing these proposals in detail, found only one proposal suitable for recommendation details of which is given below:

S No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the Project and Location
1.	Mahadevisiddeswari Antarashtriya Shaktipeeth Sansthan, Varanashi	Old Age Home, Chunar, Mirzapur

Details of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XXIII**

(xxiv) **West Bengal:** All the 2 new proposals duly recommended by the State level GIA Committee and received through Government of West Bengal were placed before the Screening Committee for consideration. The Committee, on scrutinizing the proposal in detail, did not find any of the proposals suitable for recommendation. Details of the proposals along with the remarks of the Committee are at **Annexure-XXIV.**

7. The recommendations of the Committee in para 6 above are subject to other conditions and completion of necessary formalities as per the norms/ guidelines of the Scheme.

**(M.M Sabharwal)**  
Member

**(Fr. Joe Pereira)**  
Member

**(Sandeep Gupta)**  
Member

**(T.R. Meena)**  
Chairman

**Annexure-I**

**OBSERVATIONS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE – ANDHRA PRADESH**

S. No.	Name of the Organization	Project	Location	Year	Remarks
1.	Telagana Youth Rural Awareness' Voluntary Organization, Ranga Reddy	OAH	Moninpet, Ranga Reddy	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Project location is not specified clearly in the Inspection Report</li><li>2. Total covered area mentioned appears to be inadequate for housing 25 beneficiaries.</li><li>3. Annual report is only for one year</li><li>4. No activities pertaining to service to older persons is mentioned</li><li>5. Financial capacity as indicated in the audited statement of accounts is inadequate.</li></ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Vikas Bharathi, Tirupati	Help Line & Counseling	Park St. Pakala, Tirupati	2012-13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Sri Shirdi Sai Seva Society,, Adilabad	OAH	Sailingi, Adilabad	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It appears to be a bogus NGO since there is no proper address of the Project Location mentioned in the Inspection Report.</li><li>2. The proposal is not forwarded by the State Government.</li></ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	SC Women's Welfare Social Service Society, Hyderabad	OAH	Kamareddy, Nizamabad	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. There is a difference in the address of the location of the Project indicated in the state government's Inspection report. Moreover, it is not authenticated as Lease Deed does not specify the details of the address. Therefore, it</li></ol>



					<p>seems to be suspicious case.</p> <p>2. This needs to be further verified physically by the State Government.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Gracy Organisation for Development Services, Nizamabad	OAH	Pangraa, Nizamabad	2012-13	<p>1. This organization is running for less than one year –</p> <p>2. There is no focus on the Old Age related activities since NGO is conducting lot of programmes of other Ministries also.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	KIRANAM, Vanasthalipuram, RR Distt.	Physiotherapy Clinic	Hayathnaga, RR Distt	2012-13	<p>1. There is sufficient number of projects going on in the district.</p> <p>2. NGO is running other activities in the same building like vocational training for mentally disabled people and also running other welfare schemes. There is no focus on Senior Citizens.</p> <p>3 The details of the accounts shown do not tally with the breakup of the Heads given such as Honorarium of the physiotherapist and other expenditure heads</p> <p>4 There is no exclusive room set apart for this activity, it is not clear from the inspection report as well.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Amma Vadi Vrudha Asramam, Anantapur	OAH	Akuthotapalli, Anantapur	2012-13	<p>1. Lack of clarity of the address, both in the Lease Agreement and in the Inspection Report.</p> <p>2. According to a picture given on page no. 27 of the Project Proposal it seems that the Old Age Home will be constructed so it is not clear from where the facility is being run and from where it will continue.</p> <p>3. Discrepancy is found in the</p>

					<p>rent specified in the Inspection Report and audited statement of accounts.</p> <p>4. Audit report does not clearly states the expenditure on the facilities provide for the Older Persons Home.</p> <p>5. Rent Agreement is not found in the papers</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Surya Rural Development Society, Ananthapur Distt.	Maintenance of Respite Care Home	Chilamatur, Anantapur	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO, Memorandum of Association/Articles has not laid any aims &amp; objectives to work for welfare of the Elderly. The aims and objectives of NGO is different from the OLD AGE Sector/area.</p> <p>2. Very vague address of the Project Location and NGO both.</p> <p>3. Area of the building and rent amount paid is not matching</p> <p>4. Discrepancy in the area of the building and rent paid (30000 ft) whereas rent is only Rs. 7500/-</p> <p>5. Very huge mis-match – figures provided are vague and does not make any relevance of the project.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	Seva, Chittoor Distt.	Helpline & Counseling Centre	Tirupathi, Chittoor Distt.	2012-13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	Seva, Chittoor Distt.	MMU	Tirupathi, Chittoor Distt.	2012-13	<p>1 Already there are 30 operational projects under this scheme in the District.</p> <p>2 This organization is serving multiple causes. All of it does not match with the activities mentioned in the Annual</p>

					<p>Report.</p> <p>3 Excessive expenditure is mentioned in the audit statement which is not adequately reflected.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Viswa shanthi Welfare Society, Mahaboobnagar Distt.	OAH	Kollapoor, Mahaboobnagar	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO, Memorandum of Association/Articles has not laid any aims and objectives to work for welfare of the Elderly. The aims and objectives of NGO is different from the OLD AGE Sector/area.</p> <p>2. Annual Reports of year 2011-12, 2011-10, 2009-10 is submitted. Another year Annual report not given.</p> <p>3. List of beneficiaries not given.</p> <p>4. Address of the organization is the same as that of the Old Age Project and according to the Annual Report all the other activities of the organization are also being conducted from the same premises. It seems area is not exclusively used for Old Age Home.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12.	Gayatri Mahila Sangam,	MFCC	Nuthimadugur, Kambadur, Anantapur	2012-13	<p>1. Vague Address of the project location</p> <p>2. The NGO undertakes multiple activities and there is no focus on Senior Citizens.</p> <p>3. Organization seems to be multiple projects from the same building including the MFCC. Adequate details of usage of the building are not mentioned.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13	Santhi Sadam Vriddha Saranalaya,	OAH	Alankanpallim Kadapa	2012-13	<p>1. Annual Reports of year 2011-10, 2009-10 is submitted. In year 2010-11 it shows no</p>

					<p>activity for welfare of elderly.</p> <p>2. Last two years audited statement of accounts from 2010-11 and 2011-12 submitted. However no expenditure in 2010-11 on welfare of elderly.</p> <p>3. The building is on rent, copy of rent agreement given. However the rent agreement is valid up to 15.10.2012.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Mother Theresa Samkshema Seve Sangham	OAH	Borravaripalem, Prathipadu Mandal, Guntur	2012-13	<p>1. Last three years audited statement of accounts from 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 submitted. However no expenditure mentioned in all the three years on welfare of elderly.</p> <p>2. The building is on rent, copy of rent agreement given. However, the rent agreement is valid upto 1.4.2013</p> <p>3. The address of the organization and that of the project location is the same except the door no as mentioned in the project location.</p> <p>4. Multi-activities.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Srivennela Social Welfare Society	Maintenance of Respite Care Home	Rajaramnagar Colony, Bheemgal, Nizamabad	2012-13	<p>1. Annual Reports of year 2011-10, 11-12 submitted. However no mention of welfare of elderly activity in both the years.</p> <p>2. Last three years audited statement of accounts from 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-1 submitted. However no mention of expenditure in all the three years for welfare of elderly.</p> <p>3. The building is on rent, copy of rent agreement given.</p>

					<p>However the rent agreement is valid upto 31.3.2013</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	Shanthi Mahila Mandali	OAH	Devarakonda, Nalognda	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annual Reports of year 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 submitted. However no mention of welfare of elderly activity in the year 2010-11</li> <li>2. List of staff /employees is not given</li> <li>3. Address of the organization and the project location is the same.</li> <li>4. The organization is conducting Multi-activities from the same location as that of the project mentioned for Old Age Home.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
17.	Rural youth Development organisation	OAH	Makavarapale mMandal, Visakhapatnam	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project location address is vague.</li> <li>2. It is a prospective project. It will start if GIA Committee gives aid whereas the project should be functional at least for two years as per the guidelines.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18.	Health Care and Social Welfare Society	MFCC	C.S. Puram Post and Mandal, Prakasham District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This district is adequately serviced. In the scheme there are 19 ongoing projects</li> <li>2. Vague Address of the organization &amp; date of commencement is not clear</li> <li>3. According to the Inspection Report address of the organization and Project Location are the same. However, according to part 'A' of the application form the registered office of the organization is in Nellore. This seems to be contradictory and the address of the project is still incomplete in part 'A'.</li> </ol>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
19.	Teja Women Rural & Educational Development Society	MFCC	Rayalachevu (M) Yadiki (M), Anantapur District	2012-13	<p>1. Reasons for rejection are given in the last year's file by the then Secretary in this case. Reasons are as under :  "Supporting MFCC at the village level cannot be the priority. We should support project at district, sub-division and block Headquarters in that order on priority. Please request state governments accordingly while inviting proposals for 2012-13. The committee should also keep this in mind"</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
20.	Tabita Development Society	OAH	Pedameeram (V), Bhimavaram (M), W.G. Distirct	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement of the project is not mentioned in Part 'A' of the Form.</p> <p>2. The list of staff enclosed with the application form states that it is proposed project.</p> <p>3. The enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>4. The space available for residents according to the enclosed lease agreement appears to be inadequate for housing 25 older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
21.	Spoorthi Rural Development & Youth Welfare Organisation	OAH	Navab Pet, New Colony, Eluru, W.G. District	2012-13	<p>1. Application form is not in the prescribed format.</p> <p>2. Verification page is not submitted.</p> <p>3. Managing Committee details are not submitted</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22.	Godavari Nilayam Old Age Home & Social Service	DCC	Polavaram, W.G. District	2012-13	<p>1. State government's IR is not in prescribed format.</p> <p>2. Requisite Annual Reports are not submitted.</p>

	Organisation				<p>3. No expenditure towards older persons shown in audit report of 2010-11 and 2011-12.</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not submitted</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
23.	Kasturi Bai Mahila Mandali	OAH	Mangapet (V &M), Warangal District,	2012-13	<p>1. The dimensions of the building that has been rented for running OAH are not mentioned in the application form and also the inspection report.</p> <p>2. The enclosed rent agreement is also does not give any details</p> <p>3. The enclosed financial statements do not clearly reflect the rent paid for the OAH</p> <p>4. The enclosed annual report gives the very general description of OAH and gives no details.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24.	Janga Society for Social Services	OAH	Gamalapadu (V) and Dachepalli (M), Guntur	2012-13	<p>1. Rent agreement is photocopy not duly attested.</p> <p>2. Expenditure shown in 2010-11 and 2011-12 is not specific for OAH</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
25.	Godavari Nilayam Old Age Home & Social Service Organisation	OAH	Polavaram, W.G. District	2012-13	<p>1. State government's IR is not in the prescribed format.</p> <p>2. Audit report is only for the year 2009-10 and 2010-11 and also shows no expenditure towards welfare of older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
26.	Sri Tulsasidhama Vrudha Ashram	MFCC	Madakasira, Anantapur	2012-13	<p>1 Vague address of the organization and door no. specified in the project location.</p> <p>2 Lease Agreement does not have a specified address</p> <p>3 This is an over serviced Distt.</p> <p>4 In the Inspection Report date</p>

					<p>of commencement of the project is given as 5.5.2008 whereas in the part 'A' of the application form date of commencement of the project says 'New Project'.</p> <p>5 Annual Report for the year 2009-10 and 10-11 does not reflect activities for older persons whereas expenditure is shown in the income expenditure sheet for Old Age Home.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



## ARUNACHAL PRADESH

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project	Project Location	Received during	Remarks
1.	Women and Child Dev. Society	OAH	Kimin, distt.Papumpare	2012-13	<p>1. An eligibility criterion of minimum two years in operation is not applicable for the states in the North-East, so this may be overlooked.</p> <p>2. Since there is only one project proposal from Arunachal Pradesh and considering the fact that the Ministry is requesting states in the North-East to send as many as proposals the Committee would like to take a lenient view and recommend this project in this under service area.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>

**Annexure-III****ASSAM**

S. No.	Name of the Organization	Project	Location	Year	Remarks
1.	Women and Child Development Organisation , Hailakandi, Assam	Multi Facility Care Centre	Dowarbond, Cachar Distt. Assam	2012-13	<p>1. The Organization is already running Old Age/ MMU/ Day Care Centre Since 2010.</p> <p>2. There is no correct address. The address is vague as no house number etc. is mentioned; only village name is given which cannot be acceptable.</p> <p>3. The Rent Agreement does not specify the exact location of the project.</p> <p>4. Dimension of the building has not been specified so cannot verify if it is adequate for housing 49 residents.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Wodwichee, Distt. Hailakandi, Assam	Multi Facility Care Centre	Kanakpur, Silchar, Assam	2012-13	<p>It is important that the projects under the Scheme be available to the widest possible target area and include as many organizations; therefore, the Committee would not recommend the case for giving multiple projects under the Scheme to few NGOs.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Zila Bahumukhi Mahila Unnayan Samaj, Darrang, Assam	Multi Facility Care Centre	Dhula, Darrang, Assam	2012-13	<p>1. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement is not duly attested.</p> <p>2. The dimension/ specifications of the building given in the Rent Agreement do not tally with the figures and facts given in the state government's Inspection Report and application form.</p> <p>3. The address of the project is not specified, only the name of the village is mentioned.</p> <p>4. Enclosed Annual Report and Audited statement of accounts is only for the</p>

					year 2011-12  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
4.	Dhula Regional Physically Development Association, Darrang, Assam	Maintenance of Respite Care Home	Dhula, Darrang, Assam	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. List of beneficiaries is not enclosed.</li> <li>2. Supporting documents are only for the year 2011-12</li> <li>3. Inspection and Accounts Statement 2011-12 only</li> <li>4. The amount of money that is being used to run the project is very small, so the capacity of organization to run this project is limited.</li> <li>5. Address of the project location is not clear, only the name of V&amp;PO is mentioned</li> <li>6. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent Agreement is also not duly attested</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Zila Bahumukhi Mahila Unnayan Samaj, Darrang, Assam	Respite Care Home	Mazbat, Darrang, Assam	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of building is not given in the state government's Inspection Report.</li> <li>2. The purpose for which the house has been given on rent is also not mentioned in the Rent Agreement Documents</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	North Eastern Centre for Education, Kamrup, Assam	Physiotherapy Clinic	Dhubri, Assam	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project/new project</li> <li>2. Address is vague, no specific address is given. No specific project location is given</li> <li>3. The Inspection report is not properly signed. There is over writing in many columns.</li> <li>4. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development, Guwahati	Respite Care Home	Dhubri, Assam	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The organization does not have experience of running age care projects. The project also does not fulfill the eligibility criterion of minimum two years of</li> </ol>

					<p>operation. The Date of commencement of the project is given as is Nov-Dec 2012</p> <p>2 Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not attested by the Notary or Gazetted Officer</p> <p>3 It does not give specific projection location</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Integrated Development Association, Kamrup, Assam	Multi Facility Care Centre	Goalpara, Assam	2012-13	<p>1. Rent is not reflected in the Statement of Accounts though it is a rented building.</p> <p>2. Most of the projects being run by the organization is in the nature of awareness creation and not service delivery.</p> <p>3. Most of the projects are for women welfare.</p> <p>4. The supporting documents are not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development, Guwahati	Physiotherapy Clinic	Beltola, Guwahati	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commence is given Sept-Oct 2012 so activities cannot be verified by the enclosed Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	South Borbond Gram Unnayan Samity, Hailakandi	Multi Facility Care Centre	Katlicherra, Hailakandi	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO is also running DCC under the Scheme of IPOP</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement is not duly attested by the authorized signatory</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Dhalcherra Women Society, Karimganj	Multi Facility Care Centre	Asalkandi, Karimganj	2012-13	<p>1. The project location is vague</p> <p>2. According to the application form it is rented building and the enclosed rent agreement shown rent Rs. 10000/- per month but the expenditure not getting reflected in the enclosed audited statement of accounts</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12.	Rogurtook Club &	OAH	Karimganj,	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO is running an</p>

	Library, Karimganj, Assam		Assam		<p>old Age Home, in the brief history, objectives of the NGO no mentioned.(unclear observation)</p> <p>2. The address is also not specified, it is vague.</p> <p>1. The Committee feels since this NGO is already running a project and it should be clarified whether this would be a <u>subsidiary</u> project</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	Ashalkandi Gramin Bikash Kendra, Karimganj, Assam	OAH	DimaHaso, NC Hills	2012-13	<p>1. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</p> <p>2. The objective of the organization does not include old age persons and target groups.</p> <p>3. The Statement of Accounts does not reflect the specific Heads on which the money is spent under each programmes/project</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Rogurtook Club & Library, Karimganj, Assam	MMU	Nilam Bazar, Karimganj	2012-13	<p>1. The organization is running an Old Age Home .</p> <p>2. Details of Vehicle are not given</p> <p>3. The Committee feels since this NGO is already running a project and this needs to be <u>projected</u> whether they are running <u>subsidiary</u> project(unclear observation)</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Jagriti Sanmilita Unnayan Kendra, Lakhimpur	OAH	Islamgaon, Lakhimpur	2012-13	<p>1. The organization is running MMU</p> <p>2. There is a discrepancy in the enclosed records. The audited statement of accounts reflects expenditure on Old Age Home but Annual Report does not mention anything about it.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	Rupahi Kohinoor Club, Nagaon	DCC	Morigaon,	2012-13	<p>1. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement is not</p>

					<p>duly attested.</p> <p>2. The space mentioned in the state government's inspection report appears to be inadequate for housing 50 beneficiaries</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
17.	Gram Vikas Parishad, Nagaon, Assam	DCC	Moirabari, Morigaon	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is vague and the details are not even available in the enclosed rent agreement.</p> <p>2. The organization is working on many issues and lacks focus on service delivery for the elderly.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18.	Kalyan Parishad, Dibrugarh	OAH	Sonitpur,	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is not specific.</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement has not been attested by the Notary</p> <p>3. It is a prospective project.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
19.	Society of Total Social, Educational & Economical Development, Nagaon	OAH	Jamugurihat, Sonitpur	2012-13	<p>1. It is a new project. The organization does not have any experience for running an Old Age Home</p> <p>2. The organization is focusing on women and child welfare</p> <p>3. No focus on old age persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
20	Dhula Regional Physically Development Association, Darrang, Assam	Multi Facility Care Centre	Lakhipur, Goalpara	2012-13	<p>1. Consolidated statement of accounts is not enclosed with the application</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement is not duly attested. It is a photo copy.</p> <p>3. It is already a grantee under the Scheme for an Old Age Home.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
21	North East Voluntary	Physio-therapy	Beltola,	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement</p>

	Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	clinic	Guwahati		<p>is Sep-Oct 2012</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	OAH	Bvill Howly Bazar, distt. Barpeta	2012-13	<p>1. Details of the building cannot be verified by Rent Agreement as well.</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
23	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	OAH	Dhubri	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is December 2012</p> <p>2. The project location is in a rural area and exact address is not given.</p> <p>3. Dimension of the building is also not given in the report of the Statement Government</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not enclosed.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	Respite care homes & continuous care homes	Vill; Muduki, distt. Jarubari	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is December 2012</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
25	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	Mobile Medicare unit	Dhubri	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is December 2012</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
26	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	Physiotherapy	Bapeta	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is Sep-Oct 2012</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
27	North East Voluntary Association of Rural Development (NEVARD)	Physiotherapy	Dhubri	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is Sep-Oct 2012</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is not clearly mentioned</p> <p>3. Expenses on activities for older persons not mentioned in the statement of accounts</p> <p>4. Expenditure not reflected in the accounts statement for physiotherapy.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>



## OBSERVATIONS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE – BIHAR

	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	During the Year	Remarks
1.	Sister Nivedita Memorial Trust	DCC with Dementia	Chhapra	2012-13	<p>1. The project is not operational for two years hence does not meet the eligibility criterion.</p> <p>2. The Annual Report does not clearly reflect the specific facilities provided to the dementia patients</p> <p>3. The organization is already getting GIA under the IPOP Scheme to run DCC in Patna. In their present proposal they have mentioned that they are running DCC for dementia patients also. This seems to be confusing. This needs to be further verified. Also who is certifying whether they beneficiaries are dementia patients? It is the neurologists from the government hospital?</p> <p>1 Now since then the organization has applied for DCC with dementia patients in another distt. Chapra. This will be verified and inspected and if it is found satisfactory then their new project will be recommended. Time and date of inspection will be decided.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Nirman Ek Mission	OAH, MMU and DCC	Khagdi Raod, Samanpur Patna	2012-13	<p>1. 3 project proposals have been clubbed in a single application which is not as per guidelines of the Scheme</p> <p>2. Application is not in the proper form. The cover note of the Government of Bihar is not accompanied by the Proper Inspection Report.</p> <p>3. Beneficiaries mentioned in the DCC Project are under age.</p> <p>4. The audit statement of grants does not show expenditure on the MMU and Old Age Home.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Seva Sankalp Evam Vikas Samiti	OAH	Sahu Road	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>2. Inadequate space (21.6 sq. M)</p>

					<p>for housing 25 residents</p> <p>3. Other activities are going in the building.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Gramin MahilaVikas Samiti	OAH	Sherpur, MushahariMuzzaph-arpur	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO has no experience of working with older people.</p> <p>2. Annual Report submitted but shows no activity for older persons.</p> <p>3. Audited statement of accounts submitted but shown no expenditure for benefit of older persons.</p> <p>4. The date of commencement of the project as mentioned in the inspection report is 1.4.2011 hence, does not meet the minimum criteria of two years' operation.</p> <p>5. Vague address of the project location.</p> <p>6. Facilities are under construction (bathroom/toilets etc.)</p> <p>7. Original Lease Agreement is not available, only photocopy provided without proper authentication.</p> <p>8. They have provided a Blank Bond paper.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Global Foundation for Social Welfare and Educational Development	OAH	Digha, Patna	2012-13	<p>1. Multiple-project proposals in the same application</p> <p>2. Inspection Report of the Statement Government is not in the prescribed format.</p> <p>3. Rent Agreement is not available in the project proposal submitted.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Ang Vikas Parishad	DCC	Varari Bhagalpur	2012-13	<p>1. Annual Report submitted but does not reflect work for older persons.</p> <p>2. Same is the case with the Audited statement of accounts</p> <p>3. They do not have requisite two years' experience of running the project</p> <p>4. The following discrepancy found in the Inspection Report :</p> <p>a) Date of commencement is given 29.6.2011. In column 29</p>

					<p>Inspection report says that the project is yet to start functioning.</p> <p>b) In column no. 18 the no. of beneficiary present at the time of inspection is given as “NA” which is not clear whether it is “Not Available” or “Not Applicable”.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Shri Narayan Samaj Kalyan Kendra	OAH	Gaurakshini, Sasaram	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less than 2 years’ experience of running the project.</li> <li>2. The address of the project location is vague.</li> <li>3. Inspection Report of the state govt. is not in the prescribed format.</li> <li>4. Rent agreement is not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

On scrutinizing the proposals sent by State Government of Bihar the Committee found that multiple project proposals were attached with single application form with recommendation of the State GIA Committee. This is not as per the guidelines which require one proposal per application form. Some projects have to be rejected on this ground of procedural lapses. The Committee recommends that the State Government should be requested to ensure that Scheme guidelines are strictly followed in submitting the proposals.

## Chhattisgarh

S No.	Name of the NGO/ Organisation	Name of Project	Project Location	Received during	Observation of the Screening Committee
1	Shiv Mangal Mahila Samiti, Durg	OAH	Kabirdham	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Primary objective of the NGO is welfare of women and not older persons and the MOA does not include older persons under the aims and objectives of the NGO.</li> <li>2. The address and project location are vague.</li> <li>3. Only 7 residents were found at the time of inspection by the state government, which is recorded in the Inspection Report.</li> <li>4. There is no mention of the expenditure on the other activities of the NGO as indicated in the Annual Report.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Samata Manch, Rajnandgaon District	OAH	Rajnandangaon District C	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the NGO is vague.</li> <li>2. Inspection Report of the state govt. is not in the prescribed format. There is discrepancy in the date of commencement of the project and date of registration of the NGO. The former precedes the latter. The date of commencement of the project is December, 1994 whereas the date of registration of the NGO is December, 1997.</li> <li>3. The Audited statement of accounts submitted by the organization does not show correctly the</li> </ol>

					<p>expenditure which incurred on the residents of the OAH. The entries show the deposits received from the State Government meant for the destitute women beneficiaries. The accounts do not show activities for the welfare of Old Age Home.</p> <p>4. Annual Reports of only two years Viz.2010-11 and 2011-12 are submitted.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Jan Parishad Bilaspur Vridh Ashram, Bilaspur District	OAH	Bilaspur District	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the organization and project location are vague.</p> <p>2. Inspection Report of the state government does not indicate the dimension of the building, It appears that the organization and the OAH are running from the same building.</p> <p>3. The Rent agreement is a photocopy and it has not been attested.</p> <p>4. Requisite Annual Reports have not been submitted.</p> <p>5. MOA has not laid any aims and objectives to work for the welfare of elderly.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

<u>DELHI</u>					
S. No.	Name of NGO	Name of the project	Project Location	Received during	Observation
1.	Asha Deep Foundation, Dilshad Garden, Delhi	DCC	J&K Pocket, Dilshad Garden, Delhi - 95	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The date of commencement of the project is not given in the Inspection Report of the UT government.</li> <li>2. The organization does not have 'Two years' experience to run the project.</li> <li>3. Proposed budget estimate of the project is not indicated in the application form.</li> <li>4. Annual Report is available for the years 2009-10 and 2011-12 only.</li> <li>5. List of beneficiaries is not enclosed.</li> <li>6. List of staff/employees is not enclosed given.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Rangashree, Dwaraka, New Delhi	Sensitization of School/ College Students	pocket-4, Sector -12, Dwarka, New Delhi	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Organisation is doing activities for communal harmony, UNICEF, etc. and older persons are not the primary area of activities.</li> <li>2. Welfare of older persons is not included as the aims and objectives in the MOA.</li> <li>3. Audited statement of accounts for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 are submitted. But does not show any expenditure for the welfare of elderly.</li> <li>4. List of staff/employees is not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Core Care India Foundation	Physiotherapy Clinics	63, Zakir Bagh, Okhla Road, New Delhi	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of the project is 1.4.2012 and the organisation is seeking grant for the year 2012-13</li> <li>2. It does not meet the minimum two years of running criteria</li> <li>3. List of staff and equipment is not adequate.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## Annexure VII

### GUJARAT

S. No	Name of NGO	Name of the project	Project Location	Received during	Observations
1.	Samaj Ratna Chinubha iManjula Bhagini Mitra Mandal, Palitana, Bhavnagar, Gujarat	OAH	Palitana, Bhavanagar, Gujarat	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location of the project and location of the NGO is in the same building.</li> <li>2. Dimension of the building is neither given in the Inspection Report of the state government, nor in the application form.</li> <li>3. Annual Report for the only one year (2011-12) is submitted.</li> <li>4. The organization has less than Two years of experience to run the project.</li> <li>5. This is in an under-serviced area, the eligibility criteria of two years minimum to run the project may be waived.</li> <li>6. Recurring expenditure of the OAH is not clearly mentioned in the audited statement of accounts.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Shree Lok Seva Sarvajanic Trust, Bhuj, Kutch, Gujarat	OAH	Bhuj, Kutch	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a Prospective project.</li> <li>2. Date of commencement of the project is not given.</li> <li>3. According to the Activity Report submitted with the project application, elderly people's welfare is not specifically mentioned. The NGO is working only in the field of women and children welfare.</li> <li>4. Audited statement of accounts is only for the year 2010-11.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Shri Shardha Mahila Arthik Utkarsh Mandal, Jamnagar, Gujarat	OAH	Jamnagar	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The aims and objectives of the NGOs do not include the welfare of elderly.</li> <li>2. Requisite Annual Reports</li> </ol>

						not submitted. 3. The Inspection Report of the state government is not enclosed  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
4.	Shri Hari Public Charitable Trust, Ahmedabad, Gujarat	OAH	Ahmedabad	2012-13		1. Only the Annual Report for the year 2010-11 is enclosed 2. The dimensions of the building to be used for the old age home are not mentioned. 3. According to the inspection report this building is owned by the organisation and no details of the dimension of the building are given. So the committee cannot verify the adequacy of the space for residence 4. The enclosed statement of Accounts does not show clearly the expenditure on the activity. 5. The focus of the Organisation on children's welfare activities.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
5.	Gram Vikas Mandal, Lunawada, Gujarat	OAH	Lunawada, Pnchmahal,	2012-13		1. It is a Prospective project. 2 The focus of the organization is not on welfare of senior citizens, 2. The expenditure on the activities pertaining to older persons is not reflected in the audited statement of accounts. Only in the year 2010-11 the NGO celebrated International day of older Persons. 3. The aims and objectives of the organization does not specifically mention welfare of the older persons. 4. Inspection I Report of the state govt. is not clear and not in the prescribed format.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
6.	Usha Charitable Trust, Godhra, Gujarat	OAH	Godhra	2012-13		1. List of beneficiaries is not enclosed. 2. Requisite Annual Reports are not enclosed. 3. No specific details of the programmes for the elderly



					<p>have been indicated in the audited statement of accounts.</p> <p>4. The entire proposal and papers are not in original.</p> <p>5. The project proposal is in the regional language. Requires a translator to read the project proposal.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	NiratVrudhashram, Godhra, Gujarat	OAH	Godhra	2012-13	<p>1. Inspection Report of the state govt. is incomplete. Many columns are left blank.</p> <p>2. Staff list is not submitted in the prescribed format.</p> <p>3. Rent agreement is not enclosed.</p> <p>4. The details of the building are not given.</p> <p>5. Annual Report is submitted for only one year.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Shri Nityanand Swami Education Trust, Petlad, Anand, Gujarat	OAH	Petlad, Anand	2012-13	<p>1. Audited statement of accounts and Annual Report submitted for one year only.</p> <p>2. No expenditure of the OAH is reflected in the audited statement of accounts, though the date of commencement of the project is 2006.</p> <p>3. Only 12 residents were found at the time of inspection as given in the Inspect Report of the State Government.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	ShriNavchetanAndhjanM andal, Kutch, Bhuj, Gujarat	Physiot herapy Clinics	Kutch, Bhuj	2012-13	<p>1. Primary focus of the organization is welfare of the disabled.</p> <p>2. Audited statement of accounts shows expenditure on physiotherapy equipment. Organisation has employed 2 Physiotherapists.</p> <p>3. Inspection Report of the state government mentions an average of 30 beneficiaries per day in the centre.</p> <p>4. Annual Report and audited statement of accounts is only for the year 2010-11.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

10.	JayhanumanVyayam Mandal, Mova, Pannchmahal, Gujarat	OAH	Mova, Pnchmahal	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project.</li> <li>2. Requisite Annual Reports are not enclosed.</li> <li>3. MOA is in the regional language, needs to be translated.</li> <li>4. Audited statement of Accounts does not show any expenditure incurred for welfare of senior citizens.</li> <li>5. The rent agreement is not enclosed.</li> <li>6. Specific location for running the project is not given in the Inspection Report of the state government.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	ShriBharamSevaSamaj Trust, Patan, Gujarat	OAH	Patan	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multiple project proposals are enclosed in the same application form. It is not in the prescribed format.</li> <li>2. Inspection Report submitted is not permissible under the guidelines of the Scheme.(Check the observation)</li> <li>3. No specific objectives related to elderly welfare indicated in the MOA of the NGO.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12.	Shri Swami Vivekananda Seva Trust, Patan, Gujarat	Old Widow Wome n Care Centre	Patan	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The State GIA Committee recommendation is not enclosed.</li> <li>2. The date of commencement of the project is given as 10th June, 2012, so it does not have two years' experience.</li> <li>3. No clear objective related to the elderly.</li> <li>4. Annual Report mentions that the activities are for women and adolescent girls. No focus on the welfare of senior citizens.</li> <li>5. Audited statement of accounts indicates no expenditure for the welfare of senior citizens.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	JivanJyoti Charitable	Physiot	patan	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement</li> </ol>

	Trust, Patan, Gujarat	herapy			<p>of the project is July; 2012. It does not fulfil the eligibility criteria of running for two years.</p> <p>2. The Beneficiaries' list indicates that they are mostly below the age of 60 years.</p> <p>3. It is a General Hospital for general public.</p> <p>4. The staff/ employees list does not mention physiotherapists.</p> <p>5. The Audited statement of accounts shows an expenditure of only 3 lakhs on physiotherapy clinic.</p> <p>6. The facilities available in the Trust do not seem to be exclusively for the welfare of senior citizens.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Shri Vikas Seva Kendra, Rajpipla, Narmada, Gujarat	OAH	Rajpipla, Narmada	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project.</p> <p>2. The proposal is for the construction of OAH. The Scheme does not have provision for construction of OAH.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Adhar Trust, Udwada, Valsad, Gujarat	OAH	Udwada, Valsad	2012-13	<p>1. The Date of commencement of the project is not given.</p> <p>2. Requisite Annual Reports are not enclosed.</p> <p>3. There is over-writing in many columns in the application form.</p> <p>4. No expenditure incurred for the welfare of senior citizens as per the audited statement of accounts.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## HARYANA

S.No	Name of the Organization	Project	Location	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Indian Red Cross Society, Panchkula, Haryana	OAH	Panchkula, Haryana	<p>1. Enclosed Audited Statement of Accounts is only for the year 2010-11</p> <p>2. Annual Report for only one year is enclosed</p> <p>3. SUBJECT TO THE submission of the FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS PROPOSAL may BE CONSIDERED</p> <p>A) Statement of Accounts Required</p> <p>B) Audited Statement for 2 years required</p> <p>C) Annual Report for the last 3 years required</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Indian Red Cross Society, Panchkula, Haryana	Physiotherapy Clinics	Panchkula, Haryana	<p>1. The NGO, Memorandum of Association/Articles <b>has not laid any aims &amp; objectives to work for Welfare of Elderly.</b> The objectives is not clearly defined</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Adarsh Saraswati Shiksha Samiti, Sonapat	Physiotherapy Clinics	Kakroi Road, Sonapat	<p>1. Rent Agreement is not clear.</p> <p>2 Help Age is also giving financial help to this NGO for Old Age Homes Help Age will submit the report about their capacity and experience of running physiotherapy centre</p> <p>3 Already they are running Day Care Centre in the Scheme of IPOP.</p> <p>4 The organization is to be requested to submit duly attested rent agreement.</p> <p>5 Help Age India is requested to submit a report on the capacity of the organization to run the project listed at Sr. no. 3 and Sr. no. 5</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

4.	Eco-Club, Bhiwani	Physiotherapy Clinic	Siwani Mandi, Bhiwani	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement is 1.4.2012., so it does not qualify the minimum 2 years in operation criteria.</li> <li>2. Enclosed Rent Agreement is a Xerox not duly attested .</li> <li>3. List of staff does not include a qualified Physiotherapist for the Centre</li> <li>4. The staff employed is not as per the requirement of the scheme</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Adarsh Saraswati Shiksha Samiti, Sonapat	OAH	Kakroi Road, Sonapat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Rent Agreement is not clear.</li> <li>2 Help Age is also giving financial help to this NGO for Old Age Home so Help Age will submit the report about their capacity and experience of running physiotherapy centre</li> <li>3 Already they are running Day Care Centre in the Scheme of IPOP.</li> <li>4 The organization is to be requested to submit duly attested rent agreement.</li> <li>5 Help Age India is requested to submit a report on the capacity of the organization to run the project listed at Sr. no. 3 and Sr. no. 5</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Royal Foundation of India, Hansi, Hissar	Physiotherapy Clinic	Hansi, Hissar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement is 1.4.2010 so it does not qualify the minimum two years operation eligibility criteria</li> <li>2. No proper address of the project location</li> <li>3. Rent Agreement without attestation. <i>It is a photo copy</i></li> <li>4. Physiotherapist is not employed for running this project as per the requirement.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Haryana NavYuvak Kala	MMU	Meham,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. List of Beneficiaries is not</li> </ol>

	Sangam, Meham, Rohtak		Rohtak	<p>attached.</p> <p>2. Specific location of the MNU is not provided, vehicles details are also not given.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Haryana NavYuvak Kala Sangam, Meham, Rohtak	RRTC	Meham, Rohtak	<p>1. The organization has completely focused on the activities for the benefit of the youth.</p> <p>2. The Organisation does not have any experience of running programmes of the older persons</p> <p>3. It completely lacks the required extensive experience, competence and capacity for running programmes for older persons and training other NGO to do the same</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	NavjanMorchaSamiti, Faridabad	OAH	Faridabad, Haryana	<p>1. Annual Report is not enclosed</p> <p>2. Dimension of the room available for older persons is not clearly specified, neither in the Inspection Report nor in the enclosed Blue Print of the building</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	Society for All Around Development, Bahadurgarh	Helpline & Counseling Centre	Bahadurgarh, Jhajjar Distt.	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Samaj Kalyan Shiksha Samiti, Sonapat	Multi Facility Care Centre	Garhi Brahman, Sonapat	<p>1. Dimensions of the building not mentioned in the state government's Inspection Report</p> <p>2. List of beneficiaries is not given in the prescribed format, age of the beneficiaries is not mentioned in the list</p> <p>3. List of staff is not enclosed</p> <p>4. There are discrepancies in the inspection report.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

12.	Samaj Kalyan Shiksha Samiti, Sonapat	Physiotherapy Clinic	Garhi Brahman, Sonapat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. List of employee is not enclosed</li> <li>2. List of beneficiary is not given in the prescribed format</li> <li>3. Project address is incomplete</li> <li>4. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent Agreement has not been duly attested</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	Gram Swarajya Sansthan Prem Nagar, Hissar	OAH	Vill: Neolikalan, Hissar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annual Report is not proper</li> <li>2. Audited statement 2011-12 is not available</li> <li>3. The address of the building to be used for Old Age Home is vague</li> <li>4. 400 sq. feet area available for old Age Home is mentioned in the application form appears to be inadequate for housing 25 older persons.</li> <li>5. Annual Report is not enclosed</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14	Modern Education Society, Sonapat.	Helpline & Counselling Centre	GopalPur Road, Hissar	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Modern Education Society, Sonapat	DCC	Thana Kalan, Sonapat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Dimensions of the building are not mentioned in the state government's Inspection Report</li> <li>2 List of beneficiary is not given in the prescribed format, age of the beneficiaries is not mentioned in the list</li> <li>3 List of staff is not enclosed</li> <li>4 Discrepancies in the state government's inspection report</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	MahilaChetnaSamiti, Mahendragarh	OAH	Narnaul, Mahendragarh	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</li> <li>2. Dimension of the building used for old age home is not clearly mentioned.</li> <li>3. Floor plan is also not enclosed</li> </ol>

				<p>4. Statement Government's Inspection Report does not mention the number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection</p> <p>5. Annual Report of the organization gives very generalized report</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
17	Mukt iYuva Mandal, Hissar	Multi Service Centre	Barwala, Hissar	<p>1. Specific address of the project location is not mentioned neither in the state government's Inspection Report nor in the Rent Agreement.</p> <p>2. Annual Report of the organization does not mention any activity pertaining to benefits of older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18	Women's Organisation, Bhiwani	Sensitization of School/College Students	Bawal Khera, Bhiwani	<p>1. List of beneficiaries is not given</p> <p>2. Date of commencement of the project is not mentioned</p> <p>3. It is prospective project</p> <p>4. Since the application form mentioned that the list of beneficiary would be provided once the project is operational, it is likely that the project is yet not on the grounds; hence not meeting the basic eligibility criteria for running the project for minimum two years.</p> <p>5. List of staff is also not given which confirms the above status.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
19.	Women's Organisation, Bhiwani	Training of Care-givers	Bawani Khera, Bhiwani	<p>1. Date of commencement is not mentioned in the Inspection Report as well as in application</p> <p>2. The list of beneficiaries and staff employed is not enclosed .</p> <p>3. Annual Report for only one year is enclosed</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not enclosed with the application</p>



				<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
20.	Haryana Nav Yuvak Kala Sangam, Rohtak	Training of Care-givers	Meham, Rohtak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the project location is incomplete</li> <li>2. DOC is not given</li> <li>3. List of beneficiaries y is not enclosed</li> <li>4. List of staff employed is not</li> <li>5. Rent agreement is also not enclosed</li> <li>6. Dimensions of the building have not been indicated in the inspection report of the state government.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
21.	Chaubisee Vikas Sangh, Rohtak	MMU	Meham, Rohtak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No list of beneficiary is enclosed</li> <li>2. No list of staff is enclosed</li> <li>3. Details of MMU vehicle are not mentioned</li> <li>4. The audited statement of accounts does not reflect the expenditure on the project which has been in operation since 1.10.2010</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22.	Chaubisee Vikas Sangh, Rohtak	Sensitization of School/College Students	Meham, Rohtak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a prospective project</li> <li>2. List of beneficiary and staff is not enclosed</li> <li>3. Incomplete details of the project location</li> <li>4. There is no mention of older persons, in the examination of annual report The statement of accounts shows no expenses on any such programme. The NGO appears to lack competence and capacity to run sensitization programme on ageing</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
23.	Jan Shikshan Sansthan, Rohtak	Sensitization of School/College Students	Meham, Rohtak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC is not mentioned</li> <li>2. It is a prospective project</li> <li>3. List of beneficiaries is not</li> </ol>

				<p>provided</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. List of staff is not provided</li> <li>5. Aims and objectives in the MOA of the NGO do not include welfare of older persons</li> <li>6. Address of the project location is incomplete</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24	Jan Shikshan Sansthan, Rohtak	Training of Care-givers	Meham, Rohtak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project and does not have list of beneficiary and of the staff.</li> <li>2. Rent Agreement is not enclosed.</li> <li>3. No activity for the welfare of the elderly persons was undertaken</li> <li>4. The organization does not seem to have experience for the trainers</li> <li>5. The details of infrastructure to be used for imparting training is also not given</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
25.	Haryana Nav Yuvak Kala Sangam, Rohtak	Helpline & Counselling	Meham, Rohtak	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

**HIMACHAL PRDESH**

S. NO.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project	Project Location	Year	Observations
1.	H.P. Senior citizen Forum	DCC	at Dehar, District Mandi	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inspection Report is faulty</li> <li>2. It is a Prospective Project</li> <li>3. Supporting Documents are</li> <li>4. Annual Report for only year is enclosed.</li> <li>5. Date of inspection is not mentioned in the Inspection Report of government.</li> <li>6. Inspection Report has not been signed by the Inspecting Officer.</li> <li>7. Enclosed Staff list is incomplete in all respects.</li> <li>8. Audit Report enclosed for the year 2009-10</li> <li>9. Statement of Accounts for the last three years are not enclosed with the project proposal.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	H.P. Senior citizen Forum	DCC	at Dalan, Tehsil Kumarsain, District Shimla	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inspection Report is faulty</li> <li>2. It is a Prospective Project</li> <li>3. Supporting Documents are</li> <li>4. Enclosed Annual Report is for the year 2010-11.</li> <li>5. Date of inspection is not mentioned in the state government's IR.</li> <li>6. Inspection Report has not been signed by the Inspecting Officer.</li> <li>7. Enclosed Staff list is incomplete in all respects.</li> <li>8. Enclosed Audit Report is for the year 2009-10</li> <li>9. Statement of Accounts for the last three years not enclosed with the project proposal.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

3.	H.P. Senior citizen Forum	DCC	at Alampur, District Kangra	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inspection Report is faulty</li> <li>2. It is a Prospective Project</li> <li>3. Supporting Documents are</li> <li>4. Enclosed Annual Report i the year 2010-11</li> <li>5. Date of inspection not me the state government's IR.</li> <li>6. Inspection Report is not the Inspecting Officer.</li> <li>7. Enclosed Staff list is incom respects.</li> <li>8. Enclosed Audit Report is o year 2009-10 given</li> <li>9. Statement of Accounts for years not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	The Suket Senior Citizens Home (International ) Trust,	OAH & DCC	Sundernagar, District Mandi, Himachal pradesh	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supporting Documents are</li> <li>2. Enclosed Annual Report i the year 2010-11</li> <li>3. Date of inspection not me the state government's IR.</li> <li>4. Inspection Report has not b by the Inspecting Officer.</li> <li>5. Enclosed Staff list is incom respects.</li> <li>6. Audit Report for only 20 enclosed</li> <li>7. Statement of Accounts for years not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Old age Helpline Society	DCC	Solan	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State Government's Inspect is faulty; date of inspection mentioned; it is not signed by eth officer.</li> <li>2. It is a Prospective Project</li> <li>3. Supporting Documents are</li> <li>4. Enclosed Annual Report i the year 2010-11</li> <li>5. Enclosed Staff list is incom respects.</li> <li>6. Enclosed Audit Report is o year 2009-10</li> <li>7. Statement of Accounts for years is not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

6.	Himachal Pradesh Senior Citizens Forum	VBOP	Shimla	2012-13	<p>1. Inspection Report of government is faulty: it does not mention date of inspection; it is not signed by concerned officer</p> <p>2. It is a Prospective Project</p> <p>3. Supporting Documents are missing</p> <p>5 Enclosed Annual Report is for the year 2010-11 Enclosed Statement is incomplete in all respects.</p> <p>6 Enclosed Audit Report is for the year 2009-10</p> <p>7 Statement of Accounts for the last 3 years is not enclosed.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
----	--	------	--------	---------	---

The Committee wanted to take a lenient view as it is an under serviced area; but as there were serious lacunae in the proposals so none could be recommended.

KARNATAKA

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	Year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Archana MahilaMandal, Bidar	OAH	Bhalki, Bidar	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project. In the application form the NGO has mentioned that the project would start functioning after the grant is sanctioned.</p> <p>2. The organization's address and project location address are the same.</p> <p>3. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement is not duly attested</p> <p>4. As per the enclosed audited statement of accounts no expenditure has been incurred for the welfare of senior citizens by the NGO.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Shaikshanika Mattu GramabhivruddiVividhesagala, BijapurDistt	OAH	Ibrahimpur, Bijapur	2012-13	<p>1. The period of operation of the project is less than two years and it does not qualify the minimum duration of operation criteria.</p> <p>2. The expenditure incurred for the project is not getting reflected in the enclosed audited statement of Accounts.</p> <p>3. copies of Annual Report and Authentic Rent Agreement are not enclosed.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Thirumala Education and Social Welfare Society, Bijapur	Sensitization of the School & Colleges Students	Bagalkot Road, Bijapur	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project.</p> <p>2. State government's IR is not complete as point information on column No.31 is not available.</p> <p>3. As per the enclosed audited statement of accounts of 2010-11 and 2011-12, no expenditure has been incurred for the welfare of older persons.</p> <p>4. Enclosed Rent agreement is a photocopy and not duly attested.</p> <p>5. The address of project location is vague.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Sri Siddeshwara Vidya Peea, Bijapur	Sensitization of	Renuka Nagar, Bijapur	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the NGO and project location is same and vague</p>

	Distt.	the School & College Students			too. 2. It is a prospective project. 3. As per the enclosed audited accounts of accounts for the years 2010-11 and 2011-12, no expenditure has been incurred for the welfare of older persons. 4. Registration Certificate is not Enclosed (Incomplete) <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
5.	Sri Male Mahadeshwara Swamy Krupa Education Society, Chamarajnar Distt.	OAH	Kollegal, Chamarajnar Distt	2012-13	1. The Application form is not complete. 2. MOA is not authenticated by the Registrar of Societies, it is simply a photocopy. 3. Rent agreement is photocopy and not duly attested. 4. NGO's address and project location address is the same. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
6.	Chickmagalur Rotary Innerwheel Trust, Chikmagalur Distt.	OAH	Muguthihalli, Chikmagalur Distt	2012-13	<b>RECOMMENDED</b> IT IS VYOSRETHA SAMMAN WHICH WAS GIVEN IN 2007 Since the building is owned by the organization but supporting documents are not enclosed. The organization may be asked to furnish the same
7.	Swadeshi Mahila Mandali, Chitradurga Distt.	Multi Service Centre	Molakalmur, Chitradurga Distt	2012-13	1. It is prospective Project 2. No of Beneficiaries not given in Inspection Report (Incomplete) <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
8.	Ramana Maharshi Trust for the Disabled Persons, Kolar Distt.	Physiotherapy Clinics	Bangarpet, Kolar Distt	2012-13	Complete <b>RECOMMENDED</b>
9.	Om Sri Raghavendra Seva Ashrama Trust, Kolar Distt.	OAH	Malur, Kolar Distt.	2012-13	Annual Report does not shown the running of OH Project by the Organization (Incomplete) <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
10.	DATE Charitable Society, Chitradudrga Distt.	DCC	Kinnal Road, Koppal	2012-13	Complete <b>RECOMMENDED</b>
11.	Rakshitha Vrudhashrama Gramabhivrudhi Haagu Vividodesha Sangha	DCC	Sarasthipuram, Tumkur Distt.	2012-13	No of Beneficiaries not indicated in IR (Incomplete) <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
12.	Rural Development Education Society,	OAH	Yargoi, Yadagiri Distt.	2012-13	MOA not enclosed (Incomplete)

	Yadgiri				<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
13.	Eshwar Educaion and Welfare Society, Bangalore	Multi Service Centre	Peenya, Bangalore	2012-13	It is prospective project No of Beneficiaries has not shown in IR(Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
14.	Poornima MahilaMandali, Bellary Distt.	Multi Facility Care Centre	Hadagali, Bellary	2012-13	No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report No expenditure about the project mentioned in the audited account (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
15	Tirumala Education and Social Welfare Society, Bijapur Distt	Helpline & Counselling Centre	Swami Vivekanand Nagar, Bijapur	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPO accordingly, under revision.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
16.	Shri Siddeswar Vidya Peetha ,Bijapur Distt.	OAH	Talikoti, Bijapur	2012-13	No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
17.	Sri Shakthi Association, Davangere Distt.	DCC	Uppalli, Chikkamagalur Distt	2012-13	It is prospective project No of Beneficiaries has not shown in IR (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
18,	Date Charitable Society, Chitradurga	OAH	Kunigali Hollkere, Chitradurga Distt.	2012-13	No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report No expenditure about the project mentioned in the audited account(Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
19.	Akila Karnataka VeerashaivaMahasabha, ChitradurgaDistt.	DCC	Rayadurga Road, Molakalmur	2012-13	It is prospective project (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
20.	Sri Vimalleshwara Education Association, DavangereDistt.	DCC	Davangere Distt.	2012-13	No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report No of Beneficiaries has not shown in IR (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
21.	Gayathri Grameena Vidya Samsthe, Davangere	MMU	Mayakonda, Davangere	2012-13	Complete  <b>RECOMMENDED</b>



22.	Annapurna Association, Harihar, Davangere	DCC	Madikeri, Kodadu Distt.	2012-13	It is prospective project No of Beneficiaries has not shown in IR (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
23.	Date Charitable Society, Chitradurga	OAH	Gangavati, Koppal Distt.	2012-13	No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report No expenditure about the project mentioned in the audited account (Incomplete)  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>

## Kerala

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	During the Year	<b><u>OBSERVATIONS</u></b>
1.	Dekahin Kerala Gramodhaya Seva Samithi	Sensitization of school/college students	Kottukal, Thiruvananthapuram	2012-13	<p>1. Annual Report and audited statement is not given for the last year.</p> <p>2. Focus areas of the NGO is on welfare of women and children and not for older persons.</p> <p>3. As per the enclosed Annual Report for 2 years 2009-10, 10-11, ,no activity for Welfare of Elderly was undertaken</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Social Relief Association, Abhaya Bhawan	OAH	Kanirappally, Kottayam	2011-12	<p>1. The NGO's Memorandum of Association/Articles has not laid any aims &amp; objectives to work for welfare of the Elderly. The aims and objectives of NGO is different from the OLD AGE Sector/area.</p> <p>2. Annual Report is not submitted.</p> <p>3. The Audited statement of accounts to be checked by experts.</p> <p>4. Inspection Report is incomplete. It does not mention important details like number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection, dimensions of the building.</p> <p>4. The building is owned by the organization; but there is no supporting document to prove that.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	House of Providence	OAH	Ernakulam	2012-13	<p>1. <b>Found to be in order in all respects</b></p>

					<b>RECOMMENDED</b>
4.	Sign	MMU	Kasargod	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective Project</li> <li>2. Location of the project has not been given in the state government's Inspection Report</li> <li>3. Registration of the vehicle has not been given in the application form</li> <li>4. The name of Doctor has not been given along with the application</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Sneha Old Age Home	MFCC	Kasargod	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The dimension of the Old Age Home is not mentioned in the state government's inspection report.</li> <li>2. The names of the inspection team are mentioned at page 1. However, the name of District Social Welfare officer is not mentioned in the stamp.</li> <li>3. It appears from the application form that the organization would use the existing building to Old Age Home for running MFCC as it is their own building.. However, the dimension of the building are not mentioned in the inspection report or any other supporting documents</li> <li>4. Annual report is not enclosed available</li> <li>5. Statement of Accounts is not enclosed available</li> <li>6. Audited Report is not submitted</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Thelichery Social Service	Sensitization of	Kasargod	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project and the organization is exclusively</li> </ol>

	Society	School/College students			<p>concerned for children</p> <p>2. The Account statement at the end of the Annual Report is consolidated statement and does not help in verifying the expenditure of activities for benefit of older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Punnyam Trust	Construction of OAH	Kottayam	2011-12	<p>1. Consideration of Old Age Home is not permitted under the Scheme</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Koyilandi Palliative Care Society	MMU	Kozhikkode	2011-12	<p>1. The aims and objectives does not include welfare of the older people</p> <p>2. DOC is not mentioned in the application form</p> <p>3. Audited accounts statement for 2011-12 has not been submitted</p> <p>4. Annual Report has not been submitted</p> <p>5. Vehicle details are not given.</p> <p>6. Doctor's details are not given</p> <p>7. The staff list does not given all the details of the medical professional employee</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	Koyilandi Palliative Care Society	Sensitization of School/College students	Kozhikkode	2011-12	<p>1. Annual Report for the last years is not enclosed</p> <p>2. Audit Statement is also not given</p> <p>3. Objectives do not include working for older people</p> <p>4. Organization does not have expertise to run the project on sensitization of ageing issues</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

10.	Socioeconomic Development Society	Sensitization of School /college students	Kasargod	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project</li> <li>2. Address of the project location is incomplete</li> <li>3. Date of commencement of the project is not given in the IR inspection report.</li> <li>4. Annual report for one year is given only</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Tellichery Social Service Society	RRTC	Kasargod	2011-2012	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It is a prospective project and the organization is exclusively concerned for children</li> <li>2 The Account statement at the end of the Annual Report is consolidated statement and does not help in verifying the expenditure of activities for benefit of older persons</li> <li>3 The organization does not have the capacity, experience and expertise to play the role of RRTC.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12	Pushpalayam Social Service Society	OAH	Ulikkal, Kannur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application of grant is for Financial year 2011-12</li> <li>2. <b>State Government recommendation to be checked</b></li> <li>3. The details of the building are not given in the inspection report</li> <li>4. List of beneficiary is mentioned this organization is working exclusively for older persons</li> <li>5. The Annual Report and audited statements are given</li> </ol> <p>Dimension of the building are not given</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	Home of Love	OAH	Kozhikkode	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The NGO Memorandum of Association Articles has laid aims and objectives to work for welfare of the Elderly.</b></li> </ol>

					<p>2. Annual Report of 2 years is submitted</p> <p>3. 2 years Audited statement of accounts is submitted.</p> <p>4. List of beneficiaries given</p> <p>5. List of staff/employee is given</p> <p>6. Inspection Report available</p> <p>7. To be read along with the comments of project no. 29 which is for the same organization and same project, it was for the next financial year.</p> <p><b>STRONGLY RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Social Service Industrial Craft centre, Poonjar Kottayam	OAH	Kuravilangadi Kottayam	2012-13	<p>1. All the documents of the proposals are in order</p> <p>2. The total expenditure of the organization is Rs. 10 lakhs and proposal is for approximate Rs. 7.00 lakhs.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Amala Bhavan Charitable Society, Karamala, Kottayam	OAH	Poovakulam	2012-13	<p><b>Recommended with the proviso that the details of the building of Old Age Home</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	Centre for Gerontological Studies, Thiruvananthapuram	Help Line & Councelling	Kailas Nagar, Thiruvananthapuram	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is not clear</p> <p>2. List of beneficiary is not indicted in the IR</p> <p>3. No regular staff employed with the organization</p> <p>4. It has already been decided by the Ministry that instead of running the individual help lines by NGOs under this scheme we should have nationalized help line which is set up in NISD</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

17.	<b>Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, Thrissur</b>	OAH	Ajedupuzha , Thrissur	2012-13	<p><b>1. Proposal is in order .</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18.	Dakshina Kerala Gramodharana Seva Samiti Thiruvananthapuram	Sensitisation of School/College Students	Kottukal Thiruvananthapuram	2012-13	<p>1. All Documents are in order.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
19.	<b>St.Anthony's Karunalayam Thrissur</b>	OAH	Karanchira , Thrissur	2012-13	<p><b>1. The project has been running successfully for a long time. However, due to misunderstanding the question of date of commencement it is stated as current financial year. The Committee recommends that this may be overruled.</b></p> <p><b>2. All the documents are in order</b></p> <p><b>3. Further the dimension of the building are not given in the inspection report and because this building is owned by the organization number is also not available. Since the organization should be asked to furnish these documents.</b></p> <p><b>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE</b></p>
20	Jeevodaya Old Age Home Alappuzha Kerala	OAH	Alappuzha	2012-13	<p>1. All documents are in order.</p> <p>2. However since the building is owned by the organization the dimension need to be verified with proper evidence.</p> <p>3. The organization may ask to furnish the same</p> <p>4. The annual report for the year 2010-11 should also be furnished along with other documents.</p>

					RECOMMENDED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE
21	Soukya Sadan- Ernakulam	MMU	Cheticode, ernakulam	2012-13	SINCE THESE ARE CONTINUOUS CASES HENCE BEYOND THE PERVIEW OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE
22.	Soukya Sadan, Ernakulam	OAH	Cheticode, Ernakulam	2012-13	SINCE THESE ARE CONTINUOUS CASES HENCE BEYOND THE PERVIEW OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE
23.	Pushpalayam Social Service, Kannur Distt.	OAH	Ulikkal- Kannur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the project location is not complete</li> <li>2. Annual report is not submitted</li> <li>3. Budget estimates has not been prepared as per the scheme</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24.	MAFM Charitable Trust	DCC	Padinhatt ummuriM alappuram Distt.	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement is 15.4.2012.</li> <li>2. It does not fulfill the minimum eligibility criteria of two years in operation</li> <li>3. Details of the building are not mentioned</li> <li>4. One page incomplete annual report which does not give details of the activities</li> <li>5. The Statement of accounts does not show any expenditure of older persons.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
25.	Vazhayur Grama Panchayath Karad Pramba, Malappuram Distt.	Constructi on of Old Age Home	Kakkove, Malappura m	2012-13	<p>Proposal is for construction office building for old age home which is not permissible under the scheme</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>



26.	Koyilandy Palliate \care Society, Koyilandy	MMU	Koyilandy, Arikkulam	2012-13	<p>1. The Inspection Report does not give details of the beneficiaries present at the time of inspection or facilities being provided by the MMU which is in operation since 8.3.2006.</p> <p>2. Audited statements of accounts not given</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
27.	Daya Rehabilitation Trust Vadakara	OAH	Vadakara	2012-13	<p>1. The organization is running Old Age Home since 2008 in its own building.</p> <p>2. The details of the building are however not provided in the inspection report or with the project proposals.</p> <p>3. The annual report only gives the details of the old age home whereas the organization is undertaking many other activities. The Annual report is given only for one financial year i.e. 2011-12</p> <p>4. The audited statement of accounts give clear details of expenditure of Old Age Home</p> <p>5. The Project is Conditionally Recommended that the organization will be asked to provide the details of the building with supporting documents</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
28.	Koyilandy Palliatie Care society, Koyilandy	Physiotherapy Clinics	Koyilandy Municipality	2012-13	<p>Incomplete documents</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
29.	Home of Love, Kozhikode	OAH	Kottooli, Kozhikode	2012-13	<p>1. To be read along with the comments given for project no. 13 as it is for the same organization, same project but for two</p>

					<p>consecutive years.</p> <p>2. This is a project proposal for the financial year 2012-13,</p> <p>3. The same organization has also submitted the proposal for the year 2011-12 at Sr. No. 13.</p> <p><b>BOTH THE PROPOSALS ARE RECOMMENDED</b></p>
30.	Stella Maries Palliative Care Society, Trivandrum	MMU	Kadinamkulam, Trivandrum	2012-13	<p>1. No proper address</p> <p>2. No Rent Agreement</p> <p>3. No Annual Report</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
31.	Satyanweshana Charitable Society, Thiruvananthapuram	OAH	Urutajidom Thiruvananthapuram	2012-13	<p>1. Statement of accounts does not show activities for older persons and for the project.</p> <p>2. It is new project</p> <p>3. The organization owns the building and details of the building not given</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
32.	Sree Kailaas Charitable Society, Kattakkada, Thiruvananthapuram	Sensitizing Programmes for Children Particularly in Schools and Colleges	Perumkadavila Block, Thiruvananthapuram	2012-13	<p>1. Aims and objectives do not include welfare of the older persons.</p> <p>2. Date of Commencement 2012</p> <p>3. There is no application with proposal</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
33.	House of Providence, Cochin	OAH	Providence Road, Cochin	2012-13	<p>1. To be read along with the comments given for project no. 13 as it is for the same organization, same project but for two consecutive years.</p> <p>2. This is a project proposal for the financial year 2012-13,</p> <p>3. The same organization has</p>

					also submitted the proposal for the year 2011-12 at Sr. No. 13 <b>RECOMMENDED</b>
34.	Home for the Destitute Perumannor, Cochin	Constructi on of OAH	Perumann or, Cochin	2012-13	1. <u>It is outside the purview of the Scheme</u>  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
35.	Home for the Destitute Perumannor, Cochin	OAH	Perumann or, Cochin	2012-13	1. The documents are incomplete 2. Annual report is given only for one year 3. Building is owned by the organization according to the inspection report but no details are given <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
36.	MEA Home, Kozhikkode Kerala	OAH	Malapara mba Kozhikkode	2012-13	1. Aims and objectives do not include welfare activities for citizens 2. Annual Report only for one year is submitted 3. Application is not in the prescribed format  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
37.	AWH Mobile Medicare Unit- Kozhikkode	DCC	Four Centres, Kozhikkode	2012-13	1. This is disputed case and as it is being run by the court appointee. Hence not recommended.
38.	Alzheimer's and Related Disorders Society of India, Cochin	DCC	Cochin, Kerala	2012-13	1. All the documents are in order 2. This ORGANISATIO IS also A VYOSRETHA SAMMAN WINNER 3. Have got extensive experience to running the facilities for dementia patients. <b>RECOMMENDED</b>

39.	Alzheimer's and Related Disorders Society of India Cochin	RRTC	Vennala, Cochin	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. At present the organization is not running any centre under the scheme of IPOP</li><li>2. The strength of the organization is in dealing with Alzheimer and dementia patient related activities</li><li>3. It appears that organization does not have the competence to run RRTC which requires comprehensive understanding and experience of dealing with ageing issues.</li></ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
-----	---	------	-----------------	---------	--

## Madhya Pradesh

		<b>Project</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Observation</b>
1	Shastri Shiksha Awam Samaj Kalyan Samiti, Amiliya, Sidhi, Madhya Pradesh	OAH	Gopad, Sidhi	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address is of the organization/project location is vague.</li> <li>2. The date of commencement of the project is not given in the application, Though; according to the State's Inspection Report it is 1st April, 2006.</li> <li>3. The comments of the Inspection Authority are not given in the government's Inspection Report.</li> <li>4. The organization is doing other activities like de-addiction, child care etc. t is not primarily working for the older persons.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2	Society for Maximizing Agriculture & Rural Technology, Khandwa, Madhya Pradesh	OAH	Ganesh Ganj, Khandwa	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Date of commencement of the project is 25.9.2011 so it does not qualify the minimum duration for running criteria.</li> <li>2. According to the enclosed MOA welfare of the older persons is not listed in the aims and the objectives of the organisation.</li> <li>3. The address of the project location is vague</li> <li>4. The dimension of the building are not given in the inspection report</li> <li>5. Only 6 older persons were found at the time of inspection which is too few.</li> <li>6. Expenditure on old age home are not reflected in the statement of accounts.</li> <li>7. The organisation works</li> </ol>

## Madhaya Pradesh

					<p>primarily for training and awareness programmes and it is not for expertise or experience for running the OAH</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3	New Shivam Vyavasayik Prashikshan Yuvati Mandal, Hoshangabad	OAH	Kori Ghat, Hosangabad	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the organization/project location is vague.</p> <p>2. The rent agreement is only a photocopy and not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## MAHARASHTRA

S.No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the Project	Project location	Received during	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Saraswati Mahila Mandal, MIDC Road, Latur	DCC with Dementia	Patange Nagar, Osmanabad	2012-13	<p>1. The enclosed list of beneficiaries is incomplete</p> <p>2. The rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</p> <p>3. The organization is focusing on too many issues and lacks focus on older persons. It does not have competence to deal with serious issues like care of dementia patients</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Adarshajivan Bahucdeshiya, Patange Nagar, Osmanabad	Multi Service Centre	Jain Niwar, Sastur, Osmanabad	2012-13f	<p>1. The enclosed beneficiaries list is incomplete</p> <p>2. The enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect expenditure on the facilities provided in the Centre.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Lok Vikas Pratisthan, Padma Nagar, Latur	Help line & Counselling Centre	Khadgaon Road, Latur	2012-13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Late Ranubai Bahuddeshiya UtkarshaMandal, Chalisgaon, Jalgaon	DCC with Dementia	Adarshnagar, Beed	2012-13	<p>1. The organization is running multiple projects and the Date of Commencement of the project is 1.2.2009. However, Part 'C' of the application form i.e. income and expenditure is left blank</p> <p>2. List of beneficiaries is not available</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

5.	Shree Khodiyar Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Yavatmal	DCC with Dementia	Wadsa, Gadechiroli	2012-13	<p>1. Date of Commencement of the project is 1.5.2012, hence it is projective project</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>3. Rent agreement is not available/attached with the application</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Ashirwad Shaikshanik & Samajik Sanstha, Khadgaon Road, Latur	DCC with Dementia	Ambejogal, Beed	2012-13	<p>1. Vague address of the project location</p> <p>2. Rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</p> <p>3. It runs many projects and lacks focus on older persons. It does not have demonstrated capacity to care for older persons with dementia.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Late Bhikajirao Alies Dada Jagtap Pratishthan, Pune	DCC with Dementia	Bibavewadi, Pune	2012-13	<p>1. The enclosed statement of Accounts does not reflect the work</p> <p>2. Rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested</p> <p>3. Details of the building not given, so cannot verify.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Santh Shiromany Vandaniy Tukdoji Bahuudeshiya Gram VikashSanstha, Wardha	DCC	Pipri(Meghe) Wardha	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>2. Building specifications are not given in the state government's inspection report</p> <p>3. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	Aazad Shikshan Prasarak Sanstha, Deopur, Dhule	DCC with Dementia	Sahahada, Nandurbar	2012-13	<p>1. The NGO is running multiple projects and lacks focus on older persons</p>



						<p>2. Enclosed Staff list is incomplete</p> <p>3. Rent Agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	Lok Manya Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Udgir, Latur	DCC with Dementia	Mitra Nagar, Beed	2012-13		<p>1. The address of the project location and that of the NGO is the same</p> <p>2. The detail of the project which is running since 2008 is not getting reflected with the enclosed Audited Statement of Accounts.</p> <p>3. There is no narrative report on the activities of the Centre pertaining to dementia patients</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not duly attested and it is for the future.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Roshani Bahuuddeshiya Gramin Vikas Sanstha, Pachkhed, Yavatmal	DCC with Dementia	Panchkhed, Yavatmal	2012-13		<p>1. Xerox copy of the enclosed Rent Agreement is not attested</p> <p>2. Enclosed audited statement of Accounts does not reflect expenditure on the project</p> <p>3. Supporting document does not show Doctor on Rolls for dementia patients</p> <p>4. List of beneficiaries is incomplete and does not reflect the dementia patients</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12.	Vithai Bahuuddeshiya Sevabhavi Sanstha, Opp. Collector Office, Latur	DCC with Dementia	Pashan, Pune	2012-13		<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete.</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. The enclosed audited Statement of accounts does not reflect the expenditure on DCC</p>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
13.	Shree MahilaBal Kalyan & ApangPunarvasan Vikas Mandal, TrimurtiChowk, Dhule	DCC with Dementia	Kasare, Dhule	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the projection location is vague and also same as that of the organization</p> <p>2. The name of the old age home and project proposal is different from the one appearing in the annual report and the audited statement of accounts</p> <p>3. It is mentioned as a rented building but details or supporting documents are not enclosed</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Vidarbha Bahuuddeshiya Seva Samiti, Wani, Yavatmal	DCC with Dementia	Sindhi Wadhona, Yavatmal	2012-13	<p>1. Vague address of the project location</p> <p>2. List of staff not available</p> <p>3. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and duly attested</p> <p>4. List of beneficiaries looks manipulated, some names are re-appearing</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Samta Gramvikas Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Mohda, Yavatmal	DCC with Dementia	Padoli, Chanrapur	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project.</p> <p>2. Application has not been signed</p> <p>3. Date of rent agreement not mentioned in the enclosed Rent Agreement</p> <p>4. Aims and objectives as per the enclosed MOA do not include welfare activities for senior citizens.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	Vithai Bahuuddeshiya Sevbhavi Sanstha, Latur	Help Line & Counseling Centre	Ambejogai, Beed	2012-13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

17.	Azad Shikshan Prasarak Sanstha, Dhule	Help line & Counselling	Adarsha Nagar, Beed	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
18.	Bhartiya Aushadhi Anusandhan Sanstha, Khapa, Bhandara	Help line & Counseling	Rajiv Gandhi Chowk, Bhandara	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
19.	Sant Gajanan Maharaj Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Sindewahi, Chandrapur	Sensitization of School/ College Students	Sindewahi, Chandrapur	2012-13	1. The project location address is vague 2. It is a prospective project 3. Manipulated audited report  <b><u>(NOT RECOMMENDED)</u></b>
20.	Sant Gajanan Maharaj Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Sindewahi, Chandrapur	OAH	Sindewahi, Chandrapur	2012-13	1. Major discrepancies in the details of the building: Details not given in the proforma, supporting documents not enclosed and drawings also not available. Since building is the most crucial aspect of an old age home; in the absence of these details the project cannot be recommended.  Drawing not available Details of the building are not available Inadequate proof of number of dimension of the building  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
21.	Sant Gajanan Maharaj Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Sindewahi, Chandrapur	DCC with Dementia	Sindewahi, Chandrapur	2012-13	1. Address of the project location is incomplete 2. Date of commencement of the project in the Inspection report and

					<p>the application does not tally.</p> <p>3. Building's specifications are not given in the state government's IR</p> <p>4. Rent agreement has been tempered with</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22.	Vishwabharati Sevabhavi Sanstha, Sayedpur, Latur	OAH	Sayedpur, Latur	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement is 1.4.2012 and the project does not qualify the eligibility criteria of running for at least two years.</p> <p>2. Dimension of the building are not mentioned in the inspection report of the state government.</p> <p>3. Annual report of the organization does not show activity for older persons and neither the statement of accounts show the expenditure on activity show any expenditure pertaining to older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
23.	Sainath Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Andhori, Latur	Multi Facility Centre	Dampuri, Parbhani	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>2. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. The organization is involved in multiple activities without adequate focus on issues on old age</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24.	ShradhaMahilaMandal, Umred, Nagpur	OAH	Kargao, Nagpur	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>2. Inspection Report is not available with the application</p> <p>3. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

25.	Vidarbha Apang Vikas Sanstha, Karanja, Washim	OAH	Karanja(Lad), Washim	2012-13	<p>1. Part of the inspection report of the State Government is dealing with IPOP and other part is dealing with scheduled caste students</p> <p>2. Enclosed MOA of the organization does not mention Sr. Citizens as a target groups</p> <p>3. The rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>4. The enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect any expenditure on OAH.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
26.	Late Ganpatrao Ahir Bahuddeshiya Shikshan Sanstha, Buldana,	OAH	Malvirtha, Buldana	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project</p> <p>2. Date of registration of the organization not given in the State Governments inspection report.</p> <p>3. The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>4. Full particulars of the ownership of the building are not given</p> <p>5. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
27.	Panchshil Magasvargiya Bahuddeshiya Seva Bhavi Sanstha, Latur	OAH	Chincholi, Latur	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the organization as well as project location is vague.</p> <p>2. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
28.	Jijai Education Society,	OAH	Bhaler,	2012-13	<p>1. The date of</p>

	Deopur, Dhule		Nandurbar		<p>commencement of the project is not given in the state government's inspection report. It does not bear the official stamp of the concerned officer.</p> <p>2. Multiple names have been used in the project proposal which causes confusion</p> <p>3. Rent agreement of the building is not enclosed</p> <p>4. The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>5. Dimension of the building is also not given</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
29.	Vijay Sarvangin Vikas Sanstha, Mohadi, Dhule	OAH	Dahivel, Dhule	2012-13	<p>1. The dimensions of the building are not clear from the enclosed documents, so the adequacy of space cannot be verified.</p> <p>2. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and it is not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
30.	Lokmanya Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Harkare Nagar, Latur	OAH	Udgir, Latur	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is vague</p> <p>2. Space appears to be inadequate for housing 20 older people</p> <p>3. Rent agreement is photo copy and it does not give the exact particulars of the building</p> <p>4. The enclosed statement of accounts should be examined by the Finance Member of the Screening Committee</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
31.	Chhatrapati Shivaji Sarvajanik Shaikshanik Bahuuddeshiy Sanstha, Nandurbar	OAH	Taloda, Nandurbar	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is vague</p> <p>2. Space available appears inadequate for housing 30 older persons</p>

					<p>3. Rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested and also does not given the exact address of the project</p> <p>4. The enclosed annual report gives a very general description of the Old Age Home</p> <p>5. Statement of Accounts to be examined by the Finance Member of the Screening Committee</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>	
32.	Tavvakal Shikshan VaJankalyan Sevabhavi Sanstha, Saigaon, Beed	OAH	Saigaon, Beed	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>2. The number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection by the state government official is not indicated in the IR</p> <p>3. The enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect the expenditure of old age homes</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>	
33.	Gram Vikas Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Jalgaon	OAH	Nandurbar,	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>2. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. The enclosed audited statement of accounts does not show any expenditure on the project</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>	
34.	Jogaimata Samajik Mandal, Dhule	Sanskrutik Shaikshnik Kapadane,	OAH	Navapur, Nandurbar	2012-13	<p>1. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and duly attested.</p> <p>2. It appears that entries in Column no. 18(ii) of the state government's inspection report have been tampered</p> <p>3. The organization is running multiple projects and does not focus on old age care</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

35.	Indira ShikshanKrida and Gramvikas Mandal, Parbhani,	OAH	Khadi, Parbhani	2012-13	<p>1. Project location address is incomplete</p> <p>2. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. Address of the members of the Managing Committee not furnished</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
36.	Bodisatva Nagarjuna Smark Sanstha VA Anusaudhan Kendra, Buddha Nagar,Nagpur	OAH	Ramtek, Nagpur	2012-13	<p>1. This building is owned by the NGO and details and supporting documents should be provided</p> <p>2. All other documents are in order</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
37.	Swami Vivekanand Gramin Vikas Sanstha, Andhori, Latur	Multi Facility Care Centre	Guttewadi, Latur	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete.</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. The enclosed Audited statement of accounts does not reflect expenditure on multi facility care centre</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
38.	Lok Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Hingoli, Kamanagar,	Multi Facility Care Centre	Kurula, Nanded	2012-13	<p>1. No drawing, no details of the building are given with the proposal, so the Committee cannot verify the adequacy of the infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. Address of organization and project location is incomplete</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
39.	Indira Mahila Balkalyan & Apang Punrvasan Vikas Mandal, Kapadane,	MFCC	Shahada, Nandurbar	2012-13	<p>1. Rent agreement is a photocopy.</p> <p>2. NGO is running multiple projects.</p>



	Dhule				<p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
40.	Vidarbha Bahuuddeshiya Sava Samiti, Wani, Yavatmal	Multi Facility Care Centre	Wansadi, Chandrapur	2012-13	<p>1. NGO address is vague. 2.. report submitted for one year only. 3. Rent certificate is photocopy.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
41.	Sainath Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Andhori, Latur	Multi Facility Care Centre	Dampuri, Parbhani	2012-13	<p>1. Address of the project location is incomplete 2. Enclosed rent agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>The enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect the expenditure of the multi facilities care centre</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
42.	Marathwada Institute of Career Education Management Studies & Research, Aurangabad	Sensitisation of School / College Students	Paithan Gate Nirala Bazar Road, Aurangabad	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement of the project is less than 2 years. 2.No activity about the project indicated in Annual Report. 3.No expenditure about the project shown in audited accounts.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
43.	Mathoshri Bahuddeshiya Vikas Shikshan Sanstha,	MMU	Ramtek, Distt. Nagpur	2012-13	<p>1. Date of inspection and date of signing of IR does not tally.</p>

	Trimurti Nagar, Nagpur.				<p>2 IR is photocopy. 3 project location is vague. 4. Rent Agreement is photocopy and illegible.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
44	SubhdradeviBhosleShi kshanPrasarakMandal, Latur	OAH	Ahmedpur	2012013	<p>i.I.R. is countersigned by the NGO. ii.Rent agreement (Photocopy and countersigned ). iii.IR for 2012-13 but the application proposal for 2011-12.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

45	VithalRukmaniSevabhavi Sanstha, A/P PokariTq. & District – Beed, Maharashtra	MFCC	Tq. & District – Beed	2012-13	<p>i. Address of NGO and project location is vague. ii. Rent agreement is photocopy. iii. Application is photocopy. iii) Audited Accounts not provided.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
46	Vithal Rukmani Sevabhavi Sanstha, A/P Pokari Tq. & District – Beed, Maharashtra	DCC with Dementia	Tq. & District – Beed	2012-13	<p>i. Address of NGO and project location is vague. ii. Rent agreement is photocopy. iii. Application is photocopy. iii) No expenditure has been shown in audited accounts.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not</p>

					enclosed or not in order <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
47	Magaswargiya Mahila Vikash Manda, Anand aNagar, Thakur PimpalgaonTq. Shevgaon District Ahmednagar Maharashtra	MFCC	Tq.ShevgaonAhmednagar District-Pune	2012-13	i. Application is not complete. ii) Document submitted in regional languages. ii. Annual Report is in regional Language iii. Rent Argument is photocopy According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
48	Annapurna Shikshan Santha Hingoli District, Maharashtra	MFCC	Hingoli District	2012-13	i. NGO is implementing multiple projects. ii. Rent Certificate is photocopy. iii. Objective of welfare of older persons not included in MOA According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
49	Dongar Tukai Gram Vikash Pratisthan Parbhani District Maharashtra	MFCC	Parbhani District	2012-13	i. Date of commencement of the project is less than two years. ii. Objective of welfare of older persons not included in MOA. iii) Rent agreement is photocopy According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
50	Swami Vivekanand Gramin Vikas Sanstha Ahmedpur District Maharashtra	DCC	Ahmedpur District	2012-13	i. Location of the project is vague. ii) Rent certificate is photocopy. iii. No expenditure has not been incurred on the project. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
51	Panchil Magasvargiya Bahu Sevabhav	Helpline and	Latur District	2012-13	In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national

	SansthaLatur District, Maharashtra	Counseling			helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
52	Swami Vivekanand Gramin Vikas Sanstha Ahmedpur District Maharashtra	Helpline and Counseling	Ahmedpur District	2012-13	In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
53	Sainath Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Latur District Maharashtra	Helpline and Counseling	Latur District	2012-13	In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
54	Panjabrao Chavhan Gramin Vikas Pratishan Yavatmal District Maharashtra	Sensitization of School College students	Yavatmal District	2012-13	i. Address of project location is vague ii. IR is a photocopy. iii. Rent agreement is photocopy iv. The organization is running multiple projects. iv. Application form is not complete. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
55	Lokseva Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Yavatmal District - District-Maharashtra	DCC with Dementia	Akola District	2012-13	i. NGO is running multiple projects. ii. Rent certificate is photocopy.,  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
56	Ahilyadevi Shikshan Prasarak & Bahuuddeshiya Mandal Washim District Maharashtra	DCC with Dementia	District Washim	2012-13	i. NGO is running multiple project. ii. Age of some of the beneficiaries in the beneficiaries list is below 60 years. iii. Rent agreement is photocopy.  According to the preliminary

					<p>screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
57	Ahilya Bahuuddeshiya Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Latur District Maharashtra	MFCC	Latur District		<p>i. Project location is vague.  ii. Beneficiaries list for 2012-13 not provided.  iii)Staff list for 2012-13 not provided.  iv)Rent agreement is photocopy..  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
58	Panchil Magasvargiya Bahu Sevabhavi SansthaLatur District, Maharashtra	MFCC	Latur District	2012-13	<p>I. Organization/location address are vague.  ii. Rent certificate is photocopy.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
59	Vithal Rukmani Sevabhavi Sanstha, A/P PokariTq. & District – Beed, Maharashtra	OAH	Tq. & District – Beed	2012-13	<p>i. Address of organization and project location is vague.  ii. Application is a photocopy.  iii. Beneficiaries list is tempered.  iv. Rent agreement not furnished.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
60	Chhatrapati Shikshan Sansthan Latur District	OAH	Latur District	2012-13	<p>i. IR photocopy  ii. Date of commencement of the project not given.  iii)NGO and project location are vague.  iv)Application form not complete.  v)Date of entry not of beneficiaries not given.  vi.Rent agreement is a photocopy.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the</p>

					basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
61	Shree Sarvathnya Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha District Nagpur	OAH	Nagpur	2012-13	i Address of organization and project location is vague. ii. MOA in Regional Language. iii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iv. No expenditure about the project indicated in audited accounts. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
62	Gramin Mahila Vikash Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha Wardha District	OAH	Wardha District	2011-13	i. The NGO, Memorandum of Association/Articles has laid aims & objectives. But elderly not reflected ii. Audit statements submitted for 2009-10. 2010-11 and 2011-12. Expenditure not mentioned. iii. Inspection report available in photo copy. iv. Organisation and project Location are vague. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
63	Sainath Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Latur District Maharashtra	MFCC	Latur District	2012-13	i Audit statements submitted for 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12. <b>Expenditure not mentioned.</b> ii. Organization and project location are vague. iii. Incomplete staff list. iv. It is multiple projects. v. No. expenditure shown on the project. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
64	Sainath Shikshan	OAH	Latur District	2012-13	i. Address of organization and

	Prasarak Manda ILatur District Maharashtra				<p>project location is incomplete.  ii. Rent agreement is a photocopy.  iii. No expenditure on the project shown in audited accounts.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
65	Sainath Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Andhori TQ, Latur District Maharashtra	OAH	Andhori TQ, Latur District	2012-13	<p>i. Address of organization and project location is incomplete.  ii. Rent agreement is a photocopy  iii. No expenditure about the project shown in audited accounts.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
66	Swami Vivekanand Gramin Vikas Sanstha Ahmedpur District Maharashtra	Helpline and Counseling	Ahmedpur District	2012-13	<p>In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
67	Jagruthi Bahuuddessy Sethkari Mitra Mandal	MFCC	District Washim	2012-13	<p>i. It is prospective project.  ii. IR indicated building is owned whereas the application indicates on rent.  iii. Rent agreement is not in proper format and appears to be vague.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
68.	Late Bhikajirao Alies Dada Jagtap pratishthan, Tq. Haveli, Pune District, Maharashtra	Physiotherapy Clinics	Bud Depot, Tq. Katraj Pune District	2012-13	<p>i) Date of expiry of rent agreement is not correct.  ii) Rent certificate is photocopy.  iii)List of equipment not available  According to the preliminary</p>

					screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
69	Jogai Mata Krishi Gramin Vikas Sevabhavi SansthaTq. Kapadane Dule District, Maharashtra	Physiotherapy Clinics	Nandurbar District Nandurbar,	2012-13	Rent Agreement is expired and is photocopy.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
70	Shri Krishna Seva Vrundhashram Sanstha, At P.O. PimparkhedTq. Shirur District, Pune, Maharashtra	DCC with Dementia	Tq. Ambegaon District Pune	2011-12	i. List of staff is not provided. ii Expenditure on the project not shown in audited Accounts. iii) Audited accounts for 2011-12 not provided.  According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
71	Shri Krishna Seva Vrundhashram Sanstha, P.O. PimparkhedTq. Shirur District, Maharashtra	OAH	PimparkhedTq. Ambegaon District-Pune	2011-12	i. Address of Location of the project is vague. ii) Detail of the accommodation and purpose of the accommodation not given in rent certificate.. ii Expenditure on the project not shown in audited Accounts. iii) Audited accounts for 2011-12 not provided. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
72	Shri Krishna Seva Vrundhashram Sanstha, P.O. PimparkhedTq. Shirur District, Maharashtra	MFCC	PimparkhedTq. Ambegaon District-Pune	2011-12	i. Project location address is vague. ii) Detail of the accommodation and purpose of the accommodation not given in rent certificate.. iii) Expenditure on the project not shown in audited Accounts. iii) Audited accounts for 2011-12



					<p>not provided. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
73	Shree Sant Mauli Bahuuddheshiya ShikshanSanstha, Karanja (LAD) Tq. Karanja District-Washim, Maharashtra	OAH	Yashwant Colony, Karanja (LAD) District-Washim	2011-12	<p>i) Details of beneficiaries tempered in IR ii. Beneficiaries list has been provided for 2009-10.. iii) Annual Report only for 2010- iv) Rent Certificate is photocopy. v) Staff list not provided. vi) No expenditure about the project in audited accounts. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
74	Achary Narendra Development Educational, Social &Economical Development Research Project &Baharat Padyatri Cemter	OAH	Kranti Nagar, Parbhami	2011-12	<p>i. Period of commencement of the project is less than 2 years. ii) Address of organization and location of the project is vague. iii) Rent certificate is photocopy. iv) NGO is running multiple-project. v) No expenditure incurred on the project in the Audited Statement According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
75	Shree Grudeo Sevashram Samittee, Karnaja, Near Ram mandir, Kranja (LAD) District-Washim, Maharashtra	OAH	TQ Karanja (LAD) district-Washim	2011-12	<p>i) IR is photocopy. ii) Address of the organisation and location of the project is vague. iii) No. of beneficiaries tempered in IR. iv) Date of entry not shown in beneficiaries list. v) Rent Certificate is photocopy. vi) No activity about the project is shown in Annual Report.</p>

					According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
76	Roshni Bahuudheshiy Gramin Vikash Sanstha, Warud, District-Yawatmal, Maharashtra	OAH	At DadegaonTq. District-Washim	2011-12	i) No activity about the project in MOA. ii) No activity about the project in Annual Report. iii) No expenditure about the project in audited accounts. iv. Proposal is for 2011-12 v. Rent agreement is a photocopy. vi. List of Beneficiaries/Staff incomplete. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
77	Vishakh Bahuuddeshiya Aanstha, Bhuddha Nagar, Kawatha-Tq. Tah. Deoli District-Wardha, Maharashtra	DCC	Kawatha-Tq, Deoli-Tah, District-Wardha	2011-12	i) No activity about the project in Annual Report. ii) No expenditure about the project in audited accounts. iii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iv. List of beneficiaries incomplete. v) Address of NGO and project location are vague. vi) Staff not appointed as per requirement of the project According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
78	Vishakha Bahuudde shiyaAanstha, Bhuddha Nagar, Kawatha-Tq. Tah. Deoli District-Wardha, Maharashtra	DCC	Buddha Nagar Kawatha-Tq, Deoli-Tah, District-Wardha	2011-12	) No activity about the project in Annual Report. ii) No expenditure about the project in audited accounts. iii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iv. List of beneficiaries incomplete. v) Address of NGO and project location are vague.

					vi) Staff not appointed as per requirement of the project . According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
79	Gurudas Seva Ashram, Gurudas Nagar, GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai-District- Beed Maharashtra	MFCC	Gurudas Nagar, GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai- District-Beed	2011-12	i. No expenditure about the project shown in audited accounts 2009-10 and 2010-11. ii. Address of organization and project location is same as per IR. iii. IR tempered. iv. Accommodation details not given in rent agreement. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
80	Gurudas Seva Ashram, Gurudas Nagar, GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai-District- Beed Maharashtra	OAH	GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai- District-Beed	2011-12	i. No expenditure about the project shown in audited accounts 2009-10 and 2010-11. ii. Address of organization and project location is same as per IR. iii. Accommodation details not given in rent agreement According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
81	Gurudas Seva Ashram, Gurudas Nagar, GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai-District- Beed Maharashtra	MFCC	Ghatnandur Tq., Ambajo gai- District-Beed	2011-12	i) IR is photocopy and tempered ii) Rent agreement is not furnished. iii. Staff list is same provided with other projects. iv. Annual report 2011-12 not provided. v. No expenditure has been shown in audited accounts. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
82.	Gurudas Seva Ashram, Gurudas Nagar, GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai-District- Beed Maharashtra	OAH	GhatnandurTq., Ambajogai- District-Beed	2011-12	i) IR is photocopy. ii) Details of accommodation not given in rent agreement iii. Project is for 2011-12. iv. NGO has submitted application for multiple projects with same address. v. Rent agreement is a photocopy.. vi) Address of NGO and project location are same. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
83.	Astha Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Sadguru Nagar, Bhosari, Pune-, Maharashtra	DCC	Ser No.124, Pune-Nasik Highway,	2011-12	i) Application form is unsigned. ii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iii) Address of NGO and project location are vague. iv) Staff has not been appointed as per the requirement of the project. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
84	Astha Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Sadguru Nagar, Bhosari, Ser No.124, Pune-Nasik Highway, Pune-, Maharashtra	Helpline & Counseling	Ser No.124/1, Pune-Nasik Highway,	2011-12	In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
85.	Astha Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Sadguru Nagar, Bhosari, Ser No.124, Pune-Nasik Highway, Pune-, Maharashtra	Helpline & Counseling	Ser No.124/1, Pune-Nasik Highway,	2011-12	In view of the decision of the Ministry to start a national helpline for older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under IPOP.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
86.	Astha Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Sadguru Nagar, Bhosari, Ser No.124, Pune-Nasik	DCC with Dementia	Ser No.124/1, Pune-Nasik Highway,	2011-12	i) No activity about the project in annual report. ii) Rent agreement not available. iii. Organisation has submitted

	Highway, Pune-, Maharashtra				<p>application for different projects with same address. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
87.	Sahara Bahuuddesiya Sanstha. Sant Tukaram Nagar Bhosari, Pune-39	DCC with Dementia	Chimbal-Tq, Khed-District, Pune	2011-12	<p>i. No activity about the project in MOA. ii. Address of organization and project location is same. iii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iv. Same list of beneficiaries as with project mentioned at S.No. 86.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
88	Sahara Bahuuddesiya Sanstha. Sant Tukaram Nagar Bhosari, Pune-39	DCC with Dementia	Chimbal-Tq, Khed-District, Pune	2011-12	<p>i. Address of organization and project location is same and vague ii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iii) No activity about the project shown in Annual Report.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
89	Shrikant Pratishtan, Ekta Colony, Vasmata Road, Parbhani, Maharashtra	OAH	Brahman Gali, Sonpet-Tq., District-Parbhani	2011-12	<p>I .No expenditure about the project in audited accounts. ii. Address of organization and project location is vague. iii. Rent agreement is a photocopy. iv. No activity about the project mentioned in Annual Report.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

90	International Longevity Centre-India (ILC-I), Gurutrayee Smarak, Khajina Vihir, Near Bharat Scout Ground, Sadashiv Peth, Pune-411030, Maharashtra	Sensitization of School and College Students	Gurutrayee Smarak, Khajina Vihir, Near Bharat Scout Ground, Sadashiv Peth, Pune	2011-12	<p>i) no. of beneficiaries not given in IR.</p> <p>ii) no expenditure about the project mentioned in Audited Accounts</p> <p>iii. Inspection Report bears the stamp of the organization also. According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
91.	International Longevity Centre-India (ILC-I), Gurutrayee Smarak, Khajina Vihir, Near Bharat Scout Ground, Sadashiv Peth, Pune-411030, Maharashtra	One day Workshop on Feminization of Ageing	GurutrayeeSmarak, KhajinaVihir, Near Bharat Scout Ground, SadashivPeth, Pune	2011-12	<p>No such project exists in the IPOP Scheme.</p> <p>According to the preliminary screening it was found that the basic documents were either not enclosed or not in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## **MANIPUR**

### **GENERAL COMMENT**

Manipur is a small state in terms of population and districts which is already having an extensive coverage under IPOP Scheme. As there are 53 projects being run by various NGOs at present ( 26 Old Age Homes, 23 DCC, 2 Mobile Medical Care Units and 1 RRCT. However, the Committee scrutinized all the proposals received from Manipur (57) and none of them were found complete in all respects, hence REJECTED.

Further, the Committee is of the view that this state has reached a saturation point; whereas there are many states in the North-East that are under-serviced. Hence such states should be given priority.

## Annexure XV

### MIZORAM

S.No.	Name of the Organization	Name of the project	Project Location	Received for the year	Observations
1.	Save, Help & Develop (SHADE)	DCC	Sangthuama Bldg, Charkawn, Mamit, Mamit Dist.	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is vague and is also not clearly given in the enclosed rent agreement.</li> <li>2. The rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>3. Annual report for the last two years should be submitted and duly attested rent agreement and details of the building should be provided</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Save, Help & Develop (SHADE)	DCC	K. Zalawma Bldg, diakkawn, Kolasib, Kolasib Dist.	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is vague and is also not clearly given in the enclosed rent agreement.</li> <li>2. The rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>3. Annual report for the last two years should be submitted and duly attested rent agreement and details of the building should be provided.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Save, Help & Develop (SHADE)	Helpline & Counseling	FVL. Ringa bldg. Saron Veng, Aizawal	2012-13	In view of the decision of the Ministry to create a centralized help line for the older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under the Scheme.
4.	Save, Help & Develop (SHADE)	Sensitization of schools	20 schools within Aizwal city	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of the project is not given in the application form</li> <li>2. It is a prospective project according to the inspection report of the Statement Government.</li> <li>4. Annual report for the last two years should be submitted and duly attested rent agreement and details of the building should be provided.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>



## AnnexureXVI

### NAGALAND

S.No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project	Project Location	Received for the year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	<u>Goodwill Society, Kohima</u>	<u>MMU</u>	<u>Vill; Kidima, Kohima</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of the project is not given</li> <li>2. Date of inspection of the project is not given in the State Govt.'s Inspection Report.</li> <li>3. The address of the project location is vague</li> <li>4. The enclosed MOA does not mention older persons as the target groups</li> <li>5. The enclosed annual report does not mention any activities for older persons.</li> <li>6. The enclosed statements of account do not reflect activities for older persons.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	<u>Rural Development Society</u>	<u>OAH</u>	<u>Vill; Five Panchayat, Block/Mandal; Kohima</u>	<u>-DO-</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The enclosed MOA does not include older persons as a target group</li> <li>2. Enclosed statements of accounts do not reflect expenditure on activities for benefit of older persons.</li> <li>3. Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>4. The enclosed lease deed does not give the complete address of the building</li> <li>5. The date of commencement of the project is not given</li> <li>6. Prescribed format is not used for the application</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	<u>Logos Ministries</u>	<u>OAH</u>	<u>Sovima village, Dimapurdi st.</u>	<u>-do-</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of the project is given as 13.4.2010 and the date of commencement of government grant is given as 2011. Besides, it does not qualify the 'minimum duration of running' criteria of the scheme</li> <li>2. The organization's work done for older persons is not getting reflected in the enclosed annual report and statement of accounts.</li> <li>3. Since the organization owns the building they should be asked to furnish the documents to prove the dimension and ownership.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	<u>Nagaland Bhasha</u>	<u>MFCC</u>	<u>Kuda khel,</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inspection report of the state government is not in the prescribed format.</li> </ol>

	Academy		Dimapur		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It is a prospective project.</li> <li>3. The organization has mainly worked on issues concerning women, children and youth.</li> <li>4. The enclosed statement of accounts does not reflect any expenditure and programmes for the benefit of older persons</li> <li>5. The enclosed MOA does not include older persons and target group.</li> <li>6. Rent Agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>7. The address of the building on rent is not mentioned in the rent agreement.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Longnam Charitable Society, Mon Town, District Mon.	MFCC	mon	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li> <li>2. The exact address of the building is not given in the enclosed supporting document.</li> <li>3. Older persons are not mentioned as a target group in the enclosed MOA</li> <li>4. According to the enclosed annual reports the organization has only undertaken minor distribution programmes for the benefit of the older persons.</li> <li>5. The application is not in the prescribed format so the date of commencement is not available.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

**Orissa**

S.No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project	Project Location	Received for the year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	AABAHANA Malyabanta, At/po- Nachuni, Khurda	Awareness for older persons	At/po- Nachuni, Khurda	2011- 12	<p>1. The state inspection report is a photo copy</p> <p>2. The project is operational since 1.8.2008 but list of staff is not enclosed</p> <p>3. Other documents are in order</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	AABAHANA Malyabanta, At/po- Nachuni, Khurda	Sensitization of School/college students	-do-	-do-	<p>1. The Inspection Report is not in original , it is a photo copy</p> <p>2. Address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>3. Rent agreement is not available.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Bright Career Academy  At; Dolomandap, Chandanbad area, PO; Jeypsore, distt. Koraput	Helpline & Counselling	Jeypore, distt. Koraput	-do-	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Development Alternative through Research and innovative action (DARIA)  At/PO Chasikhanda,	-do-	Jagatsinghp ur	-do-	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p>

	via-Anakhia, dist. Jagatsinghpur				<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
5.	MaaDurga Rural woman's Udyog,  At;Rajendra Nagar, PO;Madhupatna, dist. Cuttack	-do-	At; Kapaleswar PO; Choudwar Dist. Cuttack	-do-	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
6.	LaxmiNaryanaSevaPrasthan, Jajpur, Orissa	OAH	Mansapol, Jajpur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement is 2011 and hence does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum two years operation.</li> <li>2. Beneficiaries' list does not tally in the state inspection report and application form.</li> <li>3. Rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</li> </ol> <p>There is no description of the area of the building, and no supporting documents to verify the space available for the Facility.</p> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
7.	Orissa Social Rural Technology Institute, Subarnapur, Orissa	OAH	B.M.Pur, Subarnapur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>2. There is no mention of old age home in the annual report</li> <li>3. Rent for the project building is not reflected in the statement of accounts</li> <li>4. Minimum duration eligibility for the project is not fulfilled.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>

8.	Society for Upliftment of Poor Through Peoples Organisation Research & Training (SUPPORT), Deogarh	OAH	Purunagarh, Deogarh	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welfare of senior citizens is not one of the objective mentioned in the MOA</li> <li>2. It is an application for multiple projects. This is not as per the guidelines of the Scheme.</li> <li>3. The details of the activities of the Old Age Home are not mentioned in the enclosed Annual Report.</li> <li>4. Rent Agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	Social Rural Development for Weaker Section, Bhubaneswar	OAH	Distt. Subarnapur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li> <li>2. The enclosed Annual report does not reflect on the work of old age home</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	Khallikote Mardraj Sanskritika Parishad, Khallikote	OAH	Khallikote	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project is not given in the Inspection Report of the state government.</li> <li>2. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</li> <li>3. The Building is owned by the organization but supporting documents are not enclosed</li> <li>4. The activities of the organization are in the nature of providing technical education to the students and do not have focus on older persons.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

11.	Society for Education, Environmental Protection and Rural Area, Koraput	OAH	Ramanagar, Koraput	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement is October 2009 and it does not need the minimum criteria of two years' operation</li> <li>2. Rent Agreement is a Xerox copy and it is not duly attested</li> <li>3. Pictures of older women shown in the annual report for the year 2010-11 appears to be taken from the Annual Report of another organization</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12.	National Institute for Community and Child Development, Khurda	OAH	SrikrishanaVihar, Cuttack	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The space mentioned for the old age home appears to be inadequate. The building is owned by the organization but the supporting documents of the building and ownership are not enclosed</li> <li>2. The list of beneficiaries is not enclosed</li> <li>3. The list of staff also not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	VanaDurgaKhadi and Village Industries Society, Bargarh	Multi Facility Care Centre	Padampur, Bargarh	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific address of the project location is not given</li> <li>2. Staff list is not enclosed</li> <li>3. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</li> <li>4. Date of Commencement of the project is 1.4.2010 and does not meet the minimum duration (of two years) criteria of the Scheme.</li> <li>5. The enclosed Annual Report mentions about the activities of multi facility care centre</li> </ol>

					<p>however, the audited statement of accounts does not show any expenditure towards MFCC.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	MaaDurga Rural Woemn'sUdyog, Cuttack	Multi Facility Care Centre	Kapaleswar, Choudwar	2011-12	<p>1 The address of the project location is incomplete</p> <p>2 Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>3 The enclosed Annual Report does not show any activity of multi facility care centre</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Sri SriJadimahal Youth Club, Balasore	Multi Facility Care Centre	Oupada	2011-12	<p>1. Inspection report is a photo copy and this is not as per the guidelines of the Scheme</p> <p>2. Rent agreement is a photocopy and it is not duly attested</p> <p>3. The date of commencement of the project is given as 1.4.2010, hence it does not meet the criteria of minimum duration of operation.</p> <p>4. In the state government's inspection report The number of beneficiaries present at the time are not given and it is stated it is a new project</p> <p>5. According to the rent agreement Rs. 7500 being paid which is not reflected in the audited statement of accounts.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

16.	Perpetual Reconstructive Institute for Youth Activity, Rayagada	Multi Facility Care Centre	Muniguda, Rayagada	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rent Agreement is photo copy and it is not duly attested.</li> <li>2. The audited statement of Accounts does not show adequate expenditure for benefit of older persons</li> <li>3. Standard format was not used in the state government's inspection report</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
17.	GangadharYubakSangha, Kalahandi,	Multi Facility Care Centre	Bhawanipatna, Kalahandi	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project</li> <li>2. The enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested</li> <li>3. There is no mention of the older people in the objective of the organization as stated in its MOA.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18.	National Rural Development Cooperation, Bhubaneswar	Multi Facility Care Centre	Subarnapur,	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC of the project is 1.4.2011. So, it does not fulfill the criteria of minimum duration of operation for two years.</li> <li>2. The enclosed Rent Agreement is not proper and it is a photo copy</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
19.	Centre of Integrated Development & Research, Baleshwar	Multi Facility Care Centre	SahadevKhunta, Baleshwar	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is prospective project</li> <li>2. The organization has used the proforma for de-addiction scheme for submitting application under IPOP scheme. Hence rejected.</li> </ol>



					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
20.	Social Rural Development for Weaker Section, Subarnapur	DCC	Ullunda, Subarnapur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The name of the welfare officer is not mentioned in the state government's inspection report</li> <li>2. Annual report does not mention any activities for older persons</li> <li>3. Budget and expenditure of the organization are very small; hence the capacity to run the project is doubtful.</li> <li>4. As per the enclosed MOA, older persons are not mentioned in the aims and objectives</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
21.	Orissa Social Rural Technology Institute, Cuttack	DCC	Gaudagada, Subarnapur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The enclosed Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested. The term of the agreement has expired.</li> <li>2. The dimensions of the building are not clear. It is depicted with a Xerox copy of a handmade sketch</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22.	Gandhian Instt. of Technical Advancement, Kerdrapara	Physiotherapy clinics	Madana, Naindipur, Kerdrapara	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project is 1.4.2011, hence it does not fulfill the minimum duration criteria as per the scheme</li> <li>2. Rent agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>3. The inspection report of</li> </ol>

					<p>the state government indicated that at the time of inspection, there were only 5 beneficiaries. (This number of beneficiaries is too less)</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
23.	VanaDurgaKhadi and Village Industries Society, Bargarh	physiotherapy clinics	Baragarh	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State government's Inspecting officer has not signed the inspection report</li> <li>2. No beneficiaries were found at the time of the inspection as per the inspection report</li> <li>3. No specific address of the project location</li> <li>4. According to the annual report 2010-11 the organization is running the project at Padampur (Shantinagar) and the proposal is for Baragarh</li> <li>5. The expenditure for running physiotherapy clinics as per audited accounts is for Padampur (Shantinagar) while project location is for Padam Bharaghar</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
24.	National Rural Development Cooperation, Bhubaneswar	Physiotherapy clinics	Ramabhasin dhol, distt. Subarnapur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the project location is not complete</li> <li>2. Date of commencement of the project is April 2011 which does not meet the minimum duration criteria of two years</li> <li>3. Qualification of the doctor listed in the enclosed staff list is not clear</li> <li>4. The enclosed Rent agreement is not proper</li> </ol>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
25.	Peace Bird of Capability, Amara, Balasore	Physiotherapy clinics	Ranipatana, distt. Balasore	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The relevant documents required to be submitted by the State government re not enclosed</li> <li>2. The date of commencement of the projevt is 2010; so it does not meet the Minimum duration of operation criteria</li> <li>3. Welfare of older persons is not mentioned in the aims and objectives as per the enclosed MOA</li> <li>4. Enclosed Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
26.	Sahayoga India, Bhadrak	MFCC	Bhadrak	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the project location is incomplete</li> <li>2. Inspection report does not contain important details like date of commencement of the project, specification of the building etc. and name of the Inspection officer is not indicated</li> <li>3. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
27.	PatitapabanSevaSangh, Puri,	MFCC	Nimapara, Puri	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC given in the inspection report is different from the date of commencement given in the application form</li> <li>2. Total area available for the facility seems to be</li> </ol>

					<p>inadequate for 32 beneficiaries present at the time of inspection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Older persons are not mentioned in the aims and objectives of the organization as per the enclosed MOA.</li> <li>Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li> <li>Rent payment is not reflected in the enclosed statement of accounts</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
28.	Society for Upliftment of Poor through Peoples Organisation, Deogarh	Physiotherapy Clinics	Purnagarh, Deogarh	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address of the organization as well as projection location is vague</li> <li>Expenditure of physiotherapy centre not reflected in the statement of accounts</li> <li>Rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested</li> <li>Physiotherapy and activities of older persons are not mentioned in the enclosed annual reports</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
29.	Institute of Development Alternatives, Bhubaneswar	Physiotherapy Clinics	Chindaguda	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The date of commencement of the project indicated in the IR is 1.4.2011. Hence it does not meet the minimum criteria of two years of operation as per the Scheme</li> <li>In the inspection report the number of beneficiaries is shown as 6 which is much less than the prescribed number as per the scheme</li> </ol>

					<p>3. The balance sheet does not indicate entries of physiotherapy equipment</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
30.	Association for Social Reonstructive Activities, Cuttak	Physiotherapy Clinics	Naugaon, Jagatsinghpur	2012-13	<p>1. Inspection report and application form are in duplicate which cannot be acceptable.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
31.	The CHETNA, Dhenkanal	Physiotherapy Clinics	Durgabazar, Dhenkanal	2012-13	<p>1. The project does not qualify the minimum two years operation criteria</p> <p>2. Enclosed Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. Does not have experience for running physiotherapy clinic</p> <p>4. As per the assets and liability statement, the organization does not have physiotherapy equipment</p> <p>5. The activities run by the physiotherapy centre does not relate to physiotherapy related services</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
32.	Community Action for Reconstruction &Empowerment, Sundergarh	Physiotherapy Clinics	Rourkela, Sundergarh	2012-13	<p>1. Date of Commencement of the project is October 2011,so it does not meet the criteria of minimum of two years operation.</p> <p>2. The inspection report of the state government does not mention the specific number of</p>

					<p>patients present at the time of inspection.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
33.	Bhairabi Club, Khordha	Physiotherapy Clinics	Naarangarh, Khordha	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project in the state government's IR has been shown as 1.4.2010, hence it does not fulfill the criteria of two years of operation; as per the Scheme.</li> <li>2. Rent Agreement, staff list and beneficiaries are not enclosed with the proforma,</li> <li>3. Only 5 patients were present at the time of inspection as per the Inspection report. This is far too few patients given the scope of the facility.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
34.	NilachalSevaPratisthan, Puri	Physiotherapy Clinics	Dayavihar, Puri	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The specific address of the project location is not mentioned.</li> <li>2. The Centre does not seem to have adequate equipment for physiotherapy</li> <li>3. Enclosed Rent agreement not duly attested</li> <li>4. No specific activities pertaining to the centre of older persons is mentioned in the Annual Report</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
35.	Jua Jyoti JubakSangha, Subarnapur	Physiotherapy Clinics	Sonepur, Subarnapur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Dist.Social Welfare Officer has not signed the Inspection Report of the state government</li> <li>2. Date of Commencement is 2012 and does not</li> </ol>

					<p>fulfill the minimum duration requirement of 2 years</p> <p>3. At the time of inspection only four beneficiaries were present which is too few for the capacity of the project</p> <p>4. Though it is an ongoing project, the list of beneficiaries is not provided</p> <p>5. Enclosed rent agreement is not duly attested</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
36.	AABAHANA Malyabanta, At/po- Nachuni, Khurda	Sensitization of School/college students	Nachuni, distt. Khordha	2012- 13	<p><b>1. The inspection report enclosed is a photo copy whereas the original is required</b></p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
37.	Nilachal Seva Pratistan (NSP), Dayavihar (Kanas) Distt. Puri	-do-	Dayavihar (Kanas) Distt . Puri	2012- 13	<p><b>1. The proposal is for sensitization of school and college students</b></p> <p><b>2. The application seems to be in order and complete</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
38.	Gandhian Instt. Of Technical advancement (GITA), Kendrapara	Helpline & counseling centre	Tusuba, distt. Koraput	2012- 13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p> <p>1. The project does not meet the minimum duration criteria. It is</p>

					<p>an ongoing project.</p> <p>2. Only 8 beneficiaries were found at the time of inspection.</p> <p>3. The salary given to three staff members and the rent agreement does not match with the expenditure sheet.</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not available.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
39.	Bright Career Academy At; Dolomandap, Chandanbad area, PO; Jeypore, distt. Koraput	Helpline &Counselling	Jeypore, distt. Koraput	2012- 13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
40.	National Rural Dev. Cooperation (NRDC)	Do-	Rambhasind hol, distt, Subarbaoyr	2012- 13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
41.	Association for Social Reconstructive Activities(ASRA)	-do-	Distt. Jagatsinghpur	2012- 13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
42.	Development Alternatives Though Research and Innovative Action	-do-	Distt. Jagatsinghpur	2012- 13	<p>In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under</p>



	(DARIA) Jagatsinghpur				revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
43.	Rural Dev Action Cell (RDAC)	Helpline & Counseling centre	Mayurbhanj	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
44.	Association for voluntary Action (AVA), Distt. puri	-do-	pO; Ektali, Distt. Jharsuguda	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
45.	District disabled school, Distt. Juarsuguda	-do-	Budapara, Jharsuguda	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
46.	JanKalyanSevaSanstha, Kendrapara	-do-	Kharinasi, distt. Kendrapara	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
47.	Association for voluntary Action (AVA), Distt. puri	-do-	Distt. Sundargarh.	2012-13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>

48.	JanKalyanSevaSanstha, Naupada	-do-	Khariar, distt. Kendrapara	2012- 13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
49.	SOPUTRA	-DO-	At/poNiali	2012- 13	In view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline, individual projects by NGOs are not considered. The Scheme of IPOP is accordingly, under revision. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
50.	GandhianInstt. Of Technical advancement (GITA), Kendrapara	MFCC	Tusuba, distt. Koraput	2012- 13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project is 1-4-2010 and it does not meet the minimum eligibility criteria of two years in operation</li> <li>2. Complete address of the project is not given in the States Inspection Report.</li> <li>3. Only 15 beneficiaries were present at the time of inspection.</li> <li>4. The consolidated expenditure shown in the statement of accounts which should include rent, staff salary and daily expenses does not seem adequate for 15 residents</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>

51.	SEEPARD (Society for Education, Environmental Protection and Rural Area Development)	MFCC	Nandapur, Dist. Koraput	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Organization's Address is inadequate</li> <li>2. As per the details of the space available for housing 50 beneficiaries appears to be inadequate</li> <li>3. Enclosed Rent Agreement not duly attested</li> <li>4. Audited statement of accounts is not duly attested</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
52.	National Rural Dev. Cooperation (NRDC), Subarnapur	MFCC	Rambhasindhol, distt, Subarbaoyr	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is incomplete.</li> <li>2. Number of beneficiaries shown at the time of inspection is 36</li> <li>3. The budget expenditure shown for multi facility care centre, does not seem to be adequate for the 36 beneficiaries</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
53.	Sri SriJadimahal Youth Club,	MFCC	Talkia, Dist. Balasore	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement is April 2010 so it does not meet the minimum eligibility criteria of two years in operation</li> <li>2. Project location is rural and the exact address is not given</li> <li>3. The dimensions of the building are not clearly mentioned in State Inspection Report.</li> <li>4. Enclosed Rent agreement is not duly</li> </ol>

					attested. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
54.	Juba Jyoti JubakSangha, Sonapur	MFCC	Subarnapur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC of the project in the state government's inspection report and the application form are different</li> <li>2. The activities undertaken for the benefit of aged people are not mentioned in the enclosed annual report</li> <li>3. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
55.	HOLY Home, Nuapada	MFCC	PO Kurum Puri, dist. Nuapada	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project at a rural location.</li> <li>2. The address is not clearly given</li> <li>3. Space available for use is inadequate for housing 50 beneficiaries present at the time of inspection</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
56.	Jana KalyanSevaSanstha, District-Nuapadea, Orissa	MFCC	District-Nuapadea, Orissa	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is vague and incomplete</li> <li>2. Enclosed Rent agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>3. The number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection by the state government official is just 10</li> </ol>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
57.	Society for Upliftment of Poor Thorough peoplesOrganisation Research & Training (SUPPORT), District-Deogarh	MFCC	District-Deogarh	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete address of the project location is not given</li> <li>2. State government's Inspection report does not mention the number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection</li> <li>3. Older persons not mentioned in the aims and objectives of the organization as given in the enclosed MOA</li> <li>4. Expenditure of programmes or projects for older persons not reflected in the statement of accounts.</li> <li>5. No activity regarding older people is mentioned in the annual report.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
58.	Radhakrishna ClubDevelopment Alternatives Through Research & Innovative Action (DARIA) Jagatsinghpur-District	MFCC	Jagatsinghpur-District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete address of the project location is not given</li> <li>2. Date of Commencement as given in the Proforma does not meet the minimum criteria of two years for operating the project</li> <li>3. Discrepancy in the dimensions of the building given in the rent agreement and in the inspection report of the state govt.</li> <li>4. No specific mention for the care of old in the aims and objectives of</li> </ol>

					<p>organization as given in the enclosed MOA</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
59.	Radhakrishna Club,60 Jagatsinghpur-District	MFCC	Jagatsinghpur-District	2012-13	<p>CASE No.59</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC of the project is 1/6/2012 and does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum two year duration of running the project.</li> <li>2. The address of the project location is vague and incomplete.</li> <li>3. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement not duly attested</li> <li>4. Annual Report of the organisation does not mention any activities undertaken for the benefit of older persons.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
60.	Perpetual Reconstructive Institute for Youth Activity (PRIYA), Bhubaneswar District	MFCC	Bhubaneswar District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project is not clear</li> <li>2. The address of the location of the project is vague</li> <li>3. The enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement is not duly attested</li> <li>4. No specific mention of the activities/projects or programmes undertaken by the organization for the benefit of older persons in the annual report</li> <li>5. Older persons not mentioned in the aims and objectives of the organization as given in the enclosed MOA</li> </ol>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
61.	GangadharYubakSangh, District- Kalahandi	MFCC	District- Kalahandi	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inspection report of the State Government is not in the prescribed format. It is a photo copy.</li> <li>2. DOC of the project is 2012 and does not meet the basic minimum requirement of running the project for two years.</li> <li>3. The expenditure on older persons are not reflected in the Statement of Account.</li> <li>4. Annual Report does mention any activities for the older persons.</li> <li>5. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent agreement is not duly attested.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
62.	Women Organisation for Social Welfare (WOSW), District Keonjhar	MFCC	District Keonjhar	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC is 2012 hence does not meet the basic criteria for running the project for a minimum of two years duration.</li> <li>2. Incomplete address of the project location.</li> <li>3. There were no beneficiaries present at the time of state government's Inspection.</li> <li>4. Rent agreement does not have signatures of both parties and is not duly attested</li> <li>5. The statement of</li> </ol>

					<p>accounts does not shows expenditure on budget related to older persons.</p> <p>6. Annual Report does not mention any activities for older persons.</p> <p>7. The aims and objectives of the areas also do not include older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
63.	UtkaliyaHindudharmaSamsad, District- Bhadrak	MFCC	District-Bhadrak		<p>1. DOC of the project is different in the inspection report and the application form.</p> <p>2. There is lot of over writing in the inspection report</p> <p>3. No stamp of the inspecting officer in the IR</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
64.	AASHRAYA, Cuttack District	MFCC	Cuttack District		<p>1. The enclosed Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>2. The inspection report does not bear the signature of the inspecting officer of the state government.</p> <p>3. DOC is different in the inspection report and the application form</p> <p>4. Expenditure of old age home does not figure in the statement of accounts</p> <p>5. Activities on older people does not figure in the annual report</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>



65.	Orissa Institute of Education and Social Development District Jajpur	MFCC	Jajpur District	2012-13	<p>2 The project is not operational for two years as the date of commencement of the project is given as 1.04.12. It does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum duration of operation of two years.</p> <p>2 Area of the building as shown in the enclosed documents is not adequate to accommodate 50 older persons</p> <p>3 Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>4 There is confusion as regards the status of the building, it is not clear if it is rented or owned by the NGO.</p> <p>5 As per the enclosed audited statement of accounts there is a meagre amount spent for the welfare of senior citizens</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
66.	Vishwa Jeevan SevaSangh District Khorda	MFCC	Khorda District	2012-13	<p><b>1. All the papers are in order</b></p> <p><b>2. However the rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested so organization should be asked to furnish the same</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED</b></p>
67.	Jaya Kishan Youth Club Puri District	MFCC	Puri District	2012-13	<p><b>1. The Size of the building and number of rooms available is not adequate to accommodate 50 older persons.</b></p> <p><b>2. Audited statement of accounts and annual report for only 2011-12 is enclosed</b></p> <p><b>3. Enclosed Rent</b></p>

					<p>agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Honorarium paid to the staff employed during the previous year is not given</li> <li>5. Very meagre amount was spent for multi facility care centre</li> <li>6. Annual report does not mention about activities for running MFCC</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
68.	Neelanchal Seva Pratisthan Puri District	MFCC	Puri District	2012-13	<p>This NGO running various projects, hence not recommended.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
69.	Rural Development Action Cell Mayurbhanj District	Training of Care Givers	Mayurbhanj District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of Commencement of the project is 2011, So, it does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum two years operation.</li> <li>2. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent agreement is not duly attested</li> <li>3. Enclosed Auditors reports is not attested</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
70.	Juba Jyoti JubakSanghaSubarnapur District	Training of Care Givers	Subarnapur District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is incomplete.</li> <li>2. The number of beneficiaries present at</li> </ol>

					<p>the time of inspection by the officials of the state government are not indicated in the IR</p> <p>3. The rent agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
71.	NilachalSevaPratisthan Puri District	DCC-Dementia	Puri District	2012-13	<p><b>This NGO running various projects, hence not recommended.</b></p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
72.	Association for Voluntary Action(AVA), Puri District	RRTC	Puri District	2012-13	<p>1. It is prospective project,</p> <p>2 The organisation does have the experience and the expertise to run the RRTC where experts in gerontology are required to build the meet capacity of other organisations for running age care projects.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
73.	The Chetna, Dhenkanal  District	Respite Care  Homes	Dhenkanal District	2012-13	<p>1. DOC of the project is 1.11.2011 which does not fulfill the minimum duration requirement</p> <p>of the Scheme.</p> <p>2. The space mentioned in the proforma is not adequate for 26 older people</p> <p>3. Enclosed Rent agreement is a photo copy which is not duly attested</p>

					<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
74.	NilachalSevaPratisthan Puri District	Respite Care Homes	Puri District	2012-12	Inspection Report not available in the proposal.  <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
75.	Social Education for Women's Awareness (SEWA), Jharsuguda District	Project not mentioned here	Jharsuguda District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a prospective project</li> <li>2. The NGO does not have any experience in the field of old age homes</li> <li>3. Dimension of the building has not been indicted in the state government's IR</li> <li>4. List of beneficiaries has not been enclosed with the application.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
76.	Orissa Social Rural Technology Institute, Malkangiri District	OAH	Malkangiri District	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project does not fulfil the minimum duration of operation criteria.</li> <li>2. The address of the project location is incomplete.</li> <li>3. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent Agreement not duly attested.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
77.	National Rural Development Cooperation, Subarnapur	OAH	Khaliapalli, Subarnapur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The organization is running OAH since 2008</li> <li>2. The expenditure is not getting reflected from the statement of accounts</li> <li>3. The enclosed Annual Report gives very sketchy description of the activities of the organization</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>

78.	Juba Jyoti JubakSangha, Subarnapur	OAH	Sonepur, Subarnapur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First page of State Inspection Report is not duly signed by District Social Welfare Officer.</li> <li>2. No beneficiaries were found at the time of inspection though the project is operational from the year 2008</li> <li>3. The organisation is running too many projects on various issues and does not have focus on older persons.</li> <li>4. Enclosed Xerox copy of the rent agreement is not duly attested.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
79.	Jan Kalyan SevaSanstha, Nuapada	OAH	Khariar, Nuapada	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project is incomplete</li> <li>2. The building specifications have not been given</li> <li>3. The number of beneficiaries at the time of inspection was just 15, which is not adequate as per the guidelines</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
80.	Society for Education, Environment Protection	OAH	Ram Nagar, Koraput	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project location address is incomplete</li> </ol>

	and Rural Area Development, Koraput				<p>2. Audited Statement of accounts is not attested</p> <p>3. In the enclosed Annual Report no activity/project is shown to be undertaken for the older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
81.	Priyadarshini Voluntary Organisation, Baleshwar	OAH	Balasore	2012-13	<p>1. This is a prospective project</p> <p>2. As per the details of the building given in the proforma, the space for housing older persons appears to be inadequate.</p> <p>3. Enclosed Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>4. The enclosed Annual Report of the NGO does not give any details of the activities undertaken by the NGO for the benefit of older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
82.	Association for Voluntary Action, Puri	OAH	Rajgangapur, Slundergarh	2012-13	<p><b>CASE No.82</b></p> <p>1. It does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum duration of operation for 2 years.</p> <p>2. Only 10 beneficiaries were found at the time of Inspection by the State Government.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

83.	United Rural Development Organisation, Keonjhar	OAH	Sainkul, Keonjhar	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of project is June 2012 which does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum duration of operation</li> <li>2. The address of the project location is vague</li> <li>3. The inspection report does not bear the stamp of the inspecting officer of the state govt.</li> <li>4. Older persons not mentioned in the aims and objectives of the organization as per the enclosed MOA.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
84.	WOSW, Keonjhar	OAH	Maidankel, Keonjhar	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the project location is vague</li> <li>2. Date of commencement of the project is shown as 2012 and does not fulfill the minimum duration of operation criteria</li> <li>3. There is over writing in the state government's inspection report</li> <li>4. Older persons not mentioned in the aims and objectives of the organization as per the enclosed MOA.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
85.	Community Action for Reconstruction & Empowerment, Sundergarh	OAH	Rourkela, Sundergarh	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC of the project is shown as Oct 2011 which does not fulfill the minimum duration of operation criteria</li> <li>2. Total area of the building is not mentioned in the enclosed rent agreement</li> <li>3. Expenditure on old age home not reflected in the</li> </ol>

					enclosed audited statement of accounts <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
86.	MAA BhuasuniYubakSangha, Jajpur	OAH	Jabara, Jajpur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is incomplete in the state government's IR</li> <li>2. Date of Commencement of the project is not indicated in the proforma</li> <li>3. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent agreement is not legible, and it is not duly attested.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
87.	National Institute for Community and Child Development, Khurda	OAH No. WCD- SD-SCHM- 0063- 2012/794/WC D dated 19.1.13	Banki, Cuttack	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Major discrepancies found in the state government's Inspection Report: The Inspecting Officer has not signed the report, his/her stampo has not been affixed.</li> <li>4. Only 15 beneficiaries were found at the time of inspection by the state government. This number is too low and since the authenticity of the Inspection report is not clear even this number is not authentic.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
88	BharatiyaViswaPremiSe vaSangathana, Bhadrak	OAH	Dhulipda, Bhadrak	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enclosed Rent Agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</li> <li>2. DOC of the project as indicated in the inspection report is 14.2.2009</li> <li>3. Enclosed Annual Report does not indicate activities for running old</li> </ol>



					<p>age home</p> <p>4. Audited statement of accounts shows a little expenditure for running old age home. Moreover the expenditure does not match with the honorarium paid to the staff, rent paid and expenses for 25 residents .</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
89	BapujiSevaSadan, Balasore	OAH	Chandipur, Balasore	2012-13	<p><b>CASE 89</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project does not meet the minimum duration of operation criteria of 2 years.</li> <li>2. Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent agreement not duly attested</li> <li>3. Older persons are not mentioned in the aims and objectives enclosed MOA of the organisation</li> <li>4. Enclosed Annual report does not mention any activity for older persons</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
90	Gandhian Institute of Technical Advancement, Kendrapara	Multi Service Centre	Lamtaput, Koraput	2012-13	<p><b>CASE 90</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. List of beneficiaries not enclosed</li> <li>2. As per the state government's inspection report only 15 beneficiaries were present which is not sufficient.</li> <li>3. No mention of the space for the</li> </ol>

					<p>residents. So cannot verify its adequacy for housing older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
91	Bright Career Academy, Koraput	Multi Service Centre	Mundaguda, Koraput	2012-13	<p><b>CASE 91</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It does not meet the minimum duration of operation criteria of 2 years.</li> <li>2. At the time of State government's inspection 50 persons were present; but the building only has 3 rooms and one toilet available. This is clearly not adequate for the residents.</li> <li>3. List of staff not enclosed</li> <li>4. List of beneficiaries is also not enclosed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

92	National Rural Development Cooperation, Bhubaneswar	Multi Service Centre	Rambhasindhol, Subarnapur	2012-13	<p>1. It does not meet the minimum duration of operation criteria of 2 years.</p> <p>2. Inadequate space for 25 beneficiaries</p> <p>3. The salary paid to the staff is not getting reflected in the enclosed audited statement of accounts.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
93	National Rural Development Cooperation, Bhubaneswar	Multi Service Centre	Khaliapali, Subarnapur	2012-13	<p>Staff not employed as per the project and no expenditure has shown about the project in the audit accounts.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
94	Institute of Development Alternatives, Bhubaneswar	Multi Service Centre	Chindguda, Nuapada	2012-13	<p>1. DOC is 1.4.2011 which does not meet the minimum requirement of two years of operations</p> <p>2. The building specifications indicated in the IR does not seem to be adequate for the beneficiaries</p> <p>3. Inspection Report of the state government shows the number of beneficiaries as 15 only which is low</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
95	BapujiSevaSadan, Balasore	MSC	Mitrapur, Balasore	2012-13	<p>1. The inspection report is a photo copy</p> <p>2. DOC of the project is shown as 4/2012 which does not fulfill the minimum duration of operation criteria</p> <p>3. The area of the building is not properly given, so its adequacy for the facility cannot be verified.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
96	Prayas Voluntary Organisation, Balasore	MSC	Chandrapur, Balasore	2012-13	<p>1. The Date of Commencement of the project in the IR is shown as 2.10.2011, hence the project does not fulfill the eligibility criteria of two years of operation.</p> <p>2. The dimensions of the building have not been clearly specified in the IR of the state govt.</p> <p>3. The activities of multi service centers have not been indicated in the annual report for</p>

					the financial year 2011-12 <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
97	BIKASH	MSC	Bramadhia, Balasore	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the state government's IR, Date of Commencement of the project has been shown as 31.10.2011, which does not fulfill the minimum duration of operation criteria of two years.</li> <li>2. The dimensions of the building have not been specified in the state government's IR</li> <li>3. The rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
98	SEEPRD, Koraput	MMU	Semia, Koraput	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inspection report is a photo copy</li> <li>2. This is an ongoing project but the expenditure on MMU is not reflected in the enclosed statement of accounts.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
99	Jaya Kishan Youth Club, Puri	MMU	Malud, Puri	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the project location is incomplete</li> <li>2. The number of beneficiaries found at the time of inspection has been shown as 23 which is less than the beneficiaries prescribed in the guidelines</li> <li>3. The details of beneficiaries have not been given along with the application</li> <li>4. Column no. 9,10,11 in the state government's IR have not been filled up.</li> </ol> <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
100	Participatory & Reconstructio	MMU	Kankadahad,	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOC of the project is shown as Jan 2012 which does not fulfill</li> </ol>

	n Institute Action, Dhenkanal		Dhenkanal		<p>the minimum duration of operation criteria.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The address of the organization is not complete</li> <li>No activity pertaining to older persons is mentioned in the enclosed annual report</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
101	National Rural Development Cooperation, Subarnapur	Physiotherapy Clinics	Rambhasindhol, Subarnapur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DOC of the project in the IR has been mentioned as 1.4.2011 hence the application does not fulfill the criteria of minimum two years of operations</li> <li>The number of beneficiaries present at the time of inspection is 14 which are not adequate.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
102	Peace Bird of Capability, Balasore	Physiotherapy Clinics	Ra nipateana, Balasore	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rent agreement is photo copy and not duly attested.</li> <li>The Doctor is not qualified physiotherapist</li> <li>Equipment available with the organization cannot cater to physiotherapy.</li> <li>There is no mention of physiotherapy activities for older people in the enclosed annual report.</li> <li>There is not mention of any expenditure on physiotherapy activities in the enclosed audited statement of accounts.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
103	Rural Dev. Action Cell	<b>Details Missing</b>	<b>Details missing</b>	<b>Details missing</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The date of commencement of the project is April 2011, which does not fulfill the minimum duration of operation requirement.</li> <li>Not enough people were found present at the time of inspection by the state govt.</li> </ol>

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Certificate of the physiotherapist is not enclosed</li><li>4. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested.</li></ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Annexure XVIII****PUNJAB**

S. No.	Name of the NGO	Name of the project	Project Location	Received during	Observations
1.	Help Age India	OAH	Gurdaspur	2012-13	The project proposal is complete in all respects.  RECOMMENDED
2.	Mohali Welfare Society for Health & Education and Research, Mohali, Punjab	Physiotherapy Clinics	Mohali	2012-13	The project proposal is complete in all respects.  RECOMMENDED

**Annexure XIX**

**Rajasthan**

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	During the Year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Nehru NavYuvak Mandal, Kashmir, Barmer	OAH	Shastri Nagar, Barmer	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The address of the project location is vague</li> <li>There is confusion in this application form as it uses the Performa meant for Drug De-Addiction for application for grant of aid for IPOP</li> <li>The list of staff enclosed is also that of the Drug- de-addiction Shastrinagar</li> </ol> <p align="center"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Shri Maharshi Ved VyasSevaSamiti, Bhilwara	OAH	Azad Nagar, Bhilwara	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application is for multiple projects</li> <li>All the proposals are for prospective projects</li> <li>The project location and the registered office of the organisation are the same</li> </ol> <p align="center"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	HSP SahikshanEvamPrasikshanSansthan, Bharatpur	OAH	Sewar, Bharatpur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of staff enclosed includes school teachers, which is invalid for running the old age home</li> <li>List of beneficiaries is not enclosed.</li> <li>It is a prospective project</li> <li>The details of the project location are not clear either in the inspection report or in the</li> </ol>



					<p>rent agreement.</p> <p>5. Annual Report does not show any activity for older persons.</p> <p>6. The NGOs works mainly for women, children and youth.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	People's Reform Association for Better & Advance Livelihoods, Bharatpur	Multi Service Centre	Rupwas , Bharatpur	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project and does not meet the eligibility criteria of minimum two years operation.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	PragyaYuva Chakshu Shikshan, Bari, Bikaner	DCC	Sarikol yat, Bikaner	2012-13	<p>1 It is a prospective project and Date of commencement is given s 2012-13</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Gramin Uthan Manav Sansthan, Bikaner	OAH	Dantour , Bikaner	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project and date of commencement is 2012-13. It does not meet the basic eligibility criteria of minimum two years of operation.</p> <p>2. DOC is 2012-13</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Deep Vidya Mandir Samiti, Dausa	OAH	Gayatri Nagar, Dausa	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project and date of commencement is 2012-13. It does not meet the basic eligibility criteria of minimum two years of operation.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8.	Gyan Jyoti Vidya Mandir Samiti, Mahua, Dausa	OAH	Mahua, Dausa	2012-13	<p>1. It is a prospective project and date of commencement is 2012-13. It does not meet the basic eligibility criteria of minimum two years of operation.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
9.	Human Educational Cultural Art & Rural Development	Helpline & Counselling	Sehakar Road, Jaipur	2012-13	<p>This project proposal will not be considered in view of the Ministry's decision to start</p>

	Society, Jaipur	Centre			a national helpline for senior citizens.
10.	SambalSamiti, Jaipur	OAH	Gaitor, Jaipur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project</li> <li>2. Dimensions of the building are not specified</li> <li>3. Discrepancy in the inspection report which mentioned the project is prospective. It mentioned 19 beneficiaries present at the time of inspection</li> <li>4. The inspection report is not duly stamped.</li> <li>5. The rent enclosed agreement is a photo copy not duly attested.</li> <li>6. Older persons are not mentioned in the enclosed MOA.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Subham Kalyan Sansthan, Jaipur	OAH	Jaipur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Standard prescribed format is not used for application.</li> <li>2. It is a prospective project</li> <li>3. Incomplete Address of project location</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
12	Society for All Round Development, Nagaur	OAH	Lathi, Jaisalmer	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project</li> <li>2. It is a rural location with unclear address</li> <li>3. Vague address</li> <li>4. The enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested</li> <li>5. Even specific address of the building is not mentioned</li> <li>6. According the rent agreement Rs. 7500/- is being paid for the month however it is not getting reflected in the enclosed statement of accounts.</li> <li>7. Enclosed annual report also mentions about OAH.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
13.	Yogita	OAH	Jhalawa	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of the commencement of</li> </ol>

	Entrepreneurship Development Sansthan, Jhalawar		r		<p>the project is not given</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Older persons are not mentioned in the aims and objective mentioned in the MOA.</li> <li>3. Programme for older persons is not given in the Annual Report.</li> <li>4. List of beneficiaries is not enclosed.</li> <li>5. Expenditure incurred for programme for welfare of older persons are not reflected in the Statement of Accounts</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
14.	Ambedkar Vikas Samiti, Jodhpur	OAH	Osian, Jodhpur	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date Of Commencement of the project is not given in the state government's Inspection report</li> <li>2. The name of the officer who inspected the project is also not given</li> <li>3. Rent agreement is on plain paper. It is not authenticated.</li> <li>4. Activities for older persons are not mentioned in the Annual Report</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
15.	Ganga Vision, Kota	Multi Care Centre	Teacher's Colony, Kota	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The date of commencement of project is 1.10.2011 and it is requesting for grants for the year 2012-13, it does not fulfil the minimum duration of running criteria.</li> <li>2 The details of the estimate budget are not given in the application form</li> <li>3 Rent agreement is not enclosed</li> <li>4 The enclosed building plan is</li> </ol>

					<p>not signed by the owner</p> <p>5 The expenditure in the statement of accounts is the consolidated figure which looks small for 50 residents found at the time of inspection</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
16.	Madhu Smiriti Mahila Bal Kalyan Utthan Samaj, Kota	OAH	Rangbad i, Kota	2012-13	<p>1. It does not meet the basic eligibility criteria of minimum two years of operation.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
17.	Rajasthan NavChetnaSamiti, Nagaur	OAH	Khinvas ar, Nagaur	2012-13	<p>1. It does not meet the criteria of minimum 2 years for running the project.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
18.	Arogya Health Care Research Sansthan, Sikar	Physiotherapy Clinic	Shastri Nagar, Sikar	2012-13	<p>1. Does not meet the criteria of Minimum 2 years for running the project</p> <p>2. Project location is not specified</p> <p>3. Space seems inadequate as per rent agreement.</p> <p>4. Assets sheet does not reflect equipment for physiotherapy</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
19.	Sahyog Samajik Sansthan, Sawai Madhopur,	Multi Facility Care Centre	Khandw a Tal Newai, Tonk	2012-13	<p>1. Discrepancies in the Date Of Commencement of the project , given in the state government's inspection report and the application form</p> <p>2. Rent agreement states that the premises are being given on rent for running a home for destitute children.</p> <p>3. Enclosed photocopy of the</p>

					<p>Rent agreement is not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
20	Sahyog Samajik Sansthan, Sawai Madhopur,	OAH	Banasth ali, Tonk	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discrepancies in the Date of Commencement of the project in the state government's inspection report and the application form.</li> <li>2. Specific address of the project location is not given.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
21	Sahyog Samajik Sansthan, Sawai Madhopur,	Helpline & Counselling	Banasth ali, Tonk	2012-13	<p>This project proposal will not be considered in view of the Ministry' decision to start a national helpline for senior citizens.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
22.	Sai Baba Sansthan, Jaipur	OAH	Aligarh, Tonk	2012-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The rent agreement is a photo copy not duly attested</li> <li>2. The address of the building is not mentioned even in the rent agreement</li> <li>3. There is discrepancy in the date of commencement of the project mentioned in the inspection report and the application form</li> <li>4. The address of the location is vague</li> <li>5. According to the inspection report of the State Government 24 beneficiaries were found at the time of the inspection but the enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect adequate expenditure on the project.</li> <li>6. The monthly rent is also not reflected</li> <li>7. The enclosed annual report does not found any</li> </ol>

					mentioned of the OAH <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
23.	AOES, Baran	OAH	Chomukha Bazar, Baran	2012-13	1. It does not meet the criteria of minimum 2 years of running the project <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
24.	Karmanya, Baran	OAH	Kota Road, Baran	2012-13	1. It does not meet the criteria of minimum 2 years of running the project 2. Dimension of the building mentioned in inspection report is inadequate for the purpose of an old age home. 3. Rent agreement is not authentic 4. Specific address of the building is not mentioned in the rent agreement 5. List of beneficiaries is not in order. <b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
25.	Lohagarh Sanskriti EvamSamajikSansthan, Bharatpur	Helpline & Counselling	Bharatpur	2012-13	This project proposal will not be considered in view of the Ministry's decision to start a national helpline for senior citizens.

## Annexure XX

### Tamil Nadu

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	During the Year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Bharatmatha Family Welfare Foundation Thiruvarur district Tamil Nadu	Helpline and counseling	Thiruvarur District	2012-13	<p>In view of the decision of the Ministry to create a centralized help line for the older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under the Scheme.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Beatitudes Social Welfare Centre Vyasarpadi Chennai	OAH	Vyasarpadi Chennai	2012-13	<p>1 The state is serviced by sufficient number of old age homes and the organization is getting funds from Statement Government for running the old age home.</p> <p>2 Annual Report for only 2011-12 is enclosed</p> <p>3 Statement of accounts is a photo copy and not duly attested.</p> <p>4 There is discrepancy in the number of residents mentioned in the state government's inspection report and annual report of the organisation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3.	Bharatmatha Family Welfare Foundation Thiruvarur District, Tamil Nadu	DCC with Dementia	Thiruvarur District	2012-13	<p>1 Enclosed Xerox copy of the Rent agreement is not duly attested</p> <p>2 The rent for the project location is not getting reflected in the enclosed statement of accounts.</p> <p>3 The organization is getting funds from MOSJE for Old Age Homes</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Moulding Integrity Culture Health Aids Prevention Education & Livelihood Trust	Respite Care Home for Older Person	Erode District	2012-13	<p>1 It is a prospective project</p> <p>2 Particulars of the project location are incomplete</p>

	Erode District				<p>3 The expenditure statement does not reflect expenditure on rent.</p> <p>4</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5.	Singampatty Grama Munntra Sangam Shivaganga District	DCC with Dementia	Shivaganga District	2012-13	<p>1 It is prospective project</p> <p>2 The description given in the enclosed annual report is a factually incorrect and the details of the DCC are also not given.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
6.	Vidivelli Rural Development Society Trichirappalli District	Helpline and Counseling	Trichirappalli District	2012-13	<p>In view of the decision of the Ministry to create a centralized help line for the older persons, individual projects are not being considered for grant under the Scheme.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Vidivelli Rural Development Society Trichirappalli District	DCC	Trichirappalli district	2012-13	<p>1. The address of the project location is not clear even from the enclosed rent agreement.</p> <p>2. Recommendation that they should provide the complete address of the location and attested statement of accounts for two years i.e 2011-12, 2010-11</p> <p>3. Rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>The Project is funded by the State Government</p> <p><b><u>NOT RECOMMENDED</u></b></p>
8.	Centre for Action & Rural Education CARE Erode District	DCC with Dementia	Erode District	2012-13	<p>1. Project is operational since 1.4.2010 but the expenditure is not getting reflected in the statement of accounts</p> <p>2. The Rent agreement is photo copy not duly attested.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>



9.	Gramiya Sangh Theni District	DCC with Dementia	Theni District	2012-13	<p>1. List of staff employees is not enclosed</p> <p>2. List of the beneficiaries of the project causes concern in the minds of the members of the Screening Committee and it is recommended that this is to be verified further. If so many people in the area are afflicted with mental disorder then it should be brought to the notice of the Chief Medical Officer of the area for professional medical intervention.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
10.	Voluntary Educational Social Cultural Organisation Thiruvallur District	DCC	Thiruvallur District	2012-13	<p>1 Rent Agreement is photo copy and not duly attested</p> <p>2. Supporting documents are not complete,</p> <p>3. Statement of accounts is given only for one year</p> <p>3 Project is operational since 2007</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
11.	Development Health Education for Rural Mass, Pudukkottai District	OAH	Pudukkottai District	2012-13	<p>1. According to the dimensions of the building given in the state government's Inspection Report, the space appears to be inadequate for housing 25 residents</p> <p>2. Amended Trust Deed is a photo copy not duly attested</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## TRIPURA

S. No.	Name of the Organisation	Name of the project	Project Location	Received during	Observations
1	Sangh Dip	OAH	Dewanpasha, Dharmanagar	2012-13	<p>1.Application form not complete.</p> <p>2.Inspection Reprt of the state govt. is not in the prescribed proforma.</p> <p>3.Objective of welfare of older persons not included in the enclosed MOA.</p> <p>5.As per the enclosed beneficiaries' list some of beneficiaries are below 60 yrs.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2	Shanti Need, Thana Road, Dharmanagar, North Tripura	DCC	Dharamnagar		<p>1. Objective of welfare of older persons is not included in the enclosed MOA.</p> <p>2.Rent agreement not given.</p> <p>3.Annual Report not given.</p> <p>4.Audited accounts not submitted.</p> <p>5. As mentioned in the State Government's Inspection Report very small premises for the facility.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
3	Mahatma Gandhi Old Age home at Narsingarh, Near Airport Police Station, Agartala	OAH	Narsigarh	2012-13	<p>1. This is totally incomplete proposal.</p> <p>2. Documents/Papers are not complete</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4	Mahatma Gandhi Old Age home at Narsingarh, Near Airport Police Station, Agartala	Awarenes generation Programm e for older persons and care givers	Narsigarh		<p>1. This is totally incomplete proposal.</p> <p>2. Documents/Papers are not complete</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

UTTRAKHAND

S.No	Name of the Organisation	Project	Location	Year	OBSERVATIONS
1.	Jan Kalyan Vikas Samithi, Bageshwar Uttarakhand	OAH	Village Shail, Almora	2011-12	<p>1.Date of commencement of project is 18.5.2012</p> <p>2.There is a discrepancy in the State Government's Inspection Report, Date of inspection is mentioned as 1.6.2011 and date of commencement of the project is mentioned as 18.5.2012</p> <p>3.Project location address is vague</p> <p>4.Dimension of the building to be used for Old Age Home are not given in the Statement Government's Inspection Report.</p> <p>5.The Name of the Distt. Social Welfare Officer is not given in the inspection Report.</p> <p>6.The rent agreement is Xerox Copy and not duly attested. Even these documents does not have the exact address of the building</p> <p>7.The enclosed statements of accounts do not reflect any expenditure for the welfare of the older persons</p> <p>8.Annual Report is not enclosed</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2	Jan Kalyan Vikas Samithi, Bageshwar Uttarakhand	MMU	Village Dhauladevi, Almora	2011-12	<p>1. Date of commencement of project is May 2012 and it is seeking grant from the Government for the year 2011-12, hence not eligible.</p> <p>2. Discrepancy in the State Government's Inspection Report, Date of inspection is mentioned 1.6.2011 and date of commencement is mentioned as 18.5.2012</p> <p>3. The address of the project location is very vague</p> <p>4. The details of the vehicle are not given</p> <p>5. Details of MMU site is not given</p> <p>6. Annual report is not enclosed</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

3	Arpan Socio Samiti, Dehradun	Sensitization of School/college students	Raipur, Dehradun	2012-13	<p>1. Objective of welfare of older persons is not included in MOA.</p> <p>2. Audited Accounts for last two years (2010-11 &amp; 2011-12) are not provided. The enclosed audited accounts provided for the previous year does not show expenditure on older persons.</p> <p>3. Date of registration of the organization is mentioned as June 2011. This organization is not eligible for grants as the organization should have two years' experience</p> <p>4. Date of commencement of project is August 2011 and it does not qualify the minimum running duration of two years.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
4.	Arpan Socio Samiti, Dehradun	Awareness generation programme for Older Persons	Raipur, Dehradun	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement of the project is less than two years. It does not qualify the criteria of 'minimum duration of two years running'</p> <p>3. Objective of welfare of older persons is not included in MOA.</p> <p>4. Audited Accounts for last two years (2010-11 &amp; 2011-12) are not provided. Audited accounts provided for the previous year does not show expenditure on older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
5	Arpan Socio Samiti, Dehradun	DCC	Dehradun	2012-13	<p>1. Date of commencement of the project is less than two years. It does not qualify the criteria of 'minimum duration of two years running'</p> <p>2. Objective of welfare of older persons is not included in MOA.</p> <p>3. Audited Accounts for last two years (2010-11 &amp; 2011-12) are not provided. Audited accounts provided for previous year does not show expenditure on older persons.</p> <p>4. Annual Report not provided for last two years.</p> <p>5. Details of the building to be used for Day Care Centre are not given in the inspection report.</p> <p>6. Enclosed audited statement of accounts does not reflect expenditure on activities of older persons.</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

6	Indira Rashtriya Chetna Samojsthan Sansthan, Raiwala, Dehradun	OAH	Raiwala, Dehradun	2012-13	<p>1. Objective of welfare of Senior Citizens not mentioned in MOA.</p> <p>2. Rent Agreement is photocopy and not duly attested.</p> <p>3. As per audited accounts submitted only for 2011-12, no expenditure has been incurred on the project.</p> <p>4. Address of the project location is vague</p> <p>5. Older persons are not mentioned as a target group in the enclosed MOA</p> <p>6. The exact address of the building is also not mentioned in the rent agreement.</p> <p>7. Audited statement of accounts is not enclosed</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
7.	Nav Bharat Manav Vikas Sansthan, Doiwala, Dehradun	OAH	Doiwala, Dehradun	2012-13	<p>1. As per state government's Inspection Report, this is prospective project and the NGO in the application form has mentioned that they will start the work after receiving of the grant.</p> <p>2. Objective of welfare of sr. citizens not included in MOA.</p> <p>3. Project location address is vague.</p> <p>4. Rent Agreement is not enclosed</p> <p>5. Annual report does not mention any activities for older person except for old Age Home. Here also the description is very general</p> <p>6. As per the enclosed statement of accounts no expenditure has been incurred for the welfare of the older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
8	Himaliyan Gramodhyog Vikas Sansthan, Pithoragarh	OAH	Pithoragarh.	2012-13	<p>1.Date of commencement is 1.7.2012 so it does not qualify the minimum duration criteria</p> <p>2.The address of the project location is vague</p> <p>3.The enclosed annual report is a very general description of activities of the Old Age Home</p> <p>4.Enclosed rent agreement is a photo copy and not duly attested. It does not clearly give the address of the project</p> <p>5.Audited statement of accounts does not reflect the expenditure for benefit of older persons</p> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>

## UTTAR PRADESH

S. N.	Name of NGO	Project	Project Location	Year	Observation
1.	Shashikant Jan Kalyan Samiti, Janpad Hardoi, U.P.	OAH	Sirauli, Birauli, Dist-Hardoi	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the organization and location of the project are vague.</li> <li>2. According to the State government's IR, there is no date of commencement of the project. However, it mentions 23 residents were found at the time of inspection.</li> <li>3. Rent agreement is not enclosed with the project proposal.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
2.	Jawahar Jyoti Shikshan Evam Gramya Vikas Samiti, Patwai, Rampur, U.P.	MFCC	Patwai, Rampur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of commencement of the project is not given and the project is not recognized by the State Government.</li> <li>2. Address of the project location is vague.</li> <li>3. Rent agreement expires on 31st March, 2013.</li> <li>4. As per the audited statement of accounts, no amount was spent for the welfare of elderly.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
3.	Prabhat Gramodyog Seva Samsthan, Bareilly, U.P.	MFCC	Awala, Bareilly	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address of the organization is vague and incomplete.</li> <li>2. Rent agreement is only a photocopy. It is not duly attested.</li> <li>3. As per the audited statement of accounts, no specific money has been spent on elderly inmates.</li> <li>4. Only One year audited statement of accounts submitted for the year 2009-10.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
4.	Preserver	OAH	Dubhia,	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific address either of</li> </ol>

	Organisation, Nagla Al, Hathras, Aligarh, U.P.		Kol, Aligarh		the NGO or the location of the project is not given. 2. Enclosed Rent agreement is only a photocopy not duly attested.  NOT RECOMMENDED
5.	Mahadevi Siddeswari Antarrashtriya Shaktipeeth Sansthan, Varanasi	OAH	Rasulganj, Chunar, Mirzapur	2011-12	1. The Date of commencement of Project is 2011-12 2. This is an under serviced area 3. All the papers are in order RECOMMENDED
6.	Shankar Jan Kalyan Shiksha Samiti, Bareilly, U.P.	OAH	Kunwarga on, Badayun	2011-12	1. No specific address either of the project location or of the NGO is given. 2. Rent agreement is only a photocopy and certified. 3. Registration of the NGO is expiring in September, 2013.  NOT RECOMMENDED
7.	Shanti Sarvodaya Sansthan, Gonda, U.P.	Helping and Counsell ing	Rajajipuram, lucknow.	2011-12	1. Date of commencement of the project is April, 2009. 2. Address given in the application is different from the address and project location and not authenticated. 3. Rent agreement is not enclosed . 4. State govt.'s IR is not in the prescribed format. 5. The main activities of the organization are de- addiction, children's welfare activities. 6. According to the audited statement of accounts only Rs.32000/= was spent on "old age programmes", no details provided along with the statement of accounts. 7. No specific building where the activities are being carried out.  NOT RECOMMENDED
8.	Gramin Kala Evam	OAH	Pandri	2011-12	1. No specific address for the

	Kalyan Samiti, Gonda, U.P.		Kripal, Gonda		<p>project location is given in the application form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The project is an on-going project, but the date of commencement has not been indicated in the application.</li> <li>3. The audited statement of accounts does not show any mention of running OAH.</li> <li>4. Address of the organization is vague.</li> <li>5. The building is on rent and copy of the rent agreement is enclosed, but period of rent agreement not indicated.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
9.	Sadhna Seva Sansthan, Manakpur, Bhadohi, U.P.	OAH	Manikpur, parsipur, Bhadohi	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project.</li> <li>2. State Govt.'s Inspection Report mentions that no beneficiaries were present at the time of inspection. However, list of beneficiaries is enclosed with the project proposal.</li> <li>3. The building is on rent and copy of the rent agreement enclosed, but period of rent agreement not indicated.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
10.	The Solidarity of the Nation Society, Lucknow, U.P.	OAH	jankipuram, lucknow	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a prospective project.</li> <li>2. Date of commencement of the project is not given; the project is not recognized by the State Government.</li> <li>3. Welfare of senior citizens and elderly is not the aims and objectives of the organization.</li> <li>4. As per the audited statement of accounts, no expenditure incurred for the welfare of the senior citizens, elderly.</li> <li>5. Part (b) of the application, "flow of funds" is left blank.</li> </ol> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED</p>
11.	Vivekananda Sanskrit Sansthan,	OAH	Mairwa Kushinagar	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The date of commencement of the project is given as</li> </ol>



	Gram Hafua, Kushi Nagar, U.P.				<p>October, 2011. According to the application, the date of commencement column shows "from date of sanction".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 The project is being operated from the H.O. of the organization.</li> <li>3 The rent agreement is valid till March, 2011 and only photocopy of the rent agreement is enclosed. It is not duly attested.</li> <li>4 This project proposal is for multiple projects under IPOP, but the IR is only about the OAH.</li> <li>5 Specific address of the organization is not indicated.</li> <li>6 As per the audited statement of accounts, a consolidated amount of less than Rs.50000/= is shown to be spent on old age care.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	---

WEST BENGAL

S. No.	Name of the NGO	Project	Location	Year	Observations
1.	Child and Social Welfare Society, West Bengal	DCC	Bishnupur Bazar, Paschim Medinipur	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The address of the organization is vague.</li> <li>2. The rent agreement is not in original. It is photocopy not duly attested.</li> <li>3. Annual Report for only for one year is enclosed. There is no way in which the Committee can find out about the activities of the NGO or specifically for the older persons</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>
2.	Navadiganta, Bankura, West Bengal	OAH	Bankura	2011-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The aim and objective of the organization is the welfare of the elderly.</li> <li>2. The proposal is for the FY 2011-12. If the proposal for current FY i.e. 2012-13 is not received from the State Government before 31st March, 2013, it will not be valid for consideration. However, the Committee is of the view that this proposal may be processed.</li> </ol> <p><b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b></p>