19.1 INTRODUCTION
The economic potential of the region can be leveraged through a number of economic drivers - commercial, industrial and services - in the region, as well as the availability of qualified, educated, skilled and mobile populations. However, the NCRPB while promoting regional economic development has to uphold the federal identity of the constituent states.

The benefits of development arising from the rapid urbanisation in NCT-Delhi and the Central National Capital Region (CNCR) metros have not spread evenly to the other parts of the region. While the development of Gurgaon, Faridabad, Ghaziabad and NOIDA has been extremely visible in the cities’ infrastructure status in provision of both physical and social heads has not kept pace with the rapidly rising demand for civic services. The benefits of growth, measured in terms of provision and access to basic infrastructure, have been distributed unevenly, thereby creating environmental stresses.

In order to successfully plan for NCR, which is one of the largest metropolitan regions in the world – NCRPB needs to focus on achievable targets, to ensure its policies are effective and driven by consensus and commitment of all its stakeholders.

NCRPB has been given four key functions:

a) To prepare a Regional Plan (RP) for NCR
b) To assist the states in preparing Sub-Regional Plans (SRP) for NCR constituent areas
c) To prepare Functional Plans (FP) for one or more elements of RP such as water, transport, power, etc. depending on regional bearing
d) To arrange for and oversee the financing of selected development projects

It is time to recognize the challenges before the NCRPB now that it has reached a significant milestone in the implementation of the RP-2021. Once the state governments have prepared the Sub-Regional Plans, and the NCRPB has prepared Functional Plans, its task should be transformed. The responsibility should shift and the NCRPB should become the harbinger of a long-term vision for the region, along with efficient management and timely implementation of the RP, SRP, and FP.

In light of the above, it is time to introspect and plan for the technical, financial and management role that is required by the Board after the SRPs and FP’s have been prepared and agreed to. The NCRPB has to become, in this second phase of its mandate, a resource mobilization organization also that facilitates and assists in rolling-out the plans, monitoring the progress and providing assistance.

19.2 THE MANDATE OF NCRPB
The National Capital Region Planning Board (NCRPB) was constituted on 28th March, 1985 by the

Box 19.1: Planning for Regional Growth
Even before the creation of the Board, there was recognition of the need for a regional planning approach for Delhi, as outlined in The Interim General Plan for Greater Delhi, 1956 which suggested that ‘serious consideration should be given for a planned decentralisation to outer areas and even outside the Delhi region’. The Master Plan of Delhi 1962 also recognised the need for planning of Delhi in a regional context with a view ‘to achieve a rational growth of Delhi, which has been expanding in a more haphazard way, it is necessary to plan this whole area as a composite unit and have an integrated and balanced overall programme of development. The ring towns must be developed not only to deflect some of the population that would otherwise come into Delhi and jeopardise the planned growth of Delhi but also to help these towns to grow in a planned way’. Similar sentiments were also echoed in the first Regional Plan-2001 published in 1988.
Parliament through the National Capital Region Planning Board Act, 1985 ‘...to provide for the constitution of a Planning Board for the preparation of a Plan for the development of the National Capital Region...so as to avoid any haphazard development...’.

The Act, the Board and the Plan serve as the pillars on which regional development is envisaged. To achieve the mandate envisaged, the Plan provided for two main instruments – Metro and Regional Centres within the NCR and Counter Magnet Areas (CMAs) outside of the NCR.

While the mandate is clear on the planning role for NCR, the implementation strategy falls short in being able to ensure enforcement of the Plan. Interestingly, the Act specifies that the NCRPB can only ‘coordinate the enforcement and implementation of the Regional Plan, Functional Plans, Sub-Regional Plans and Project Plans through participating States and the Union Territory’.

The ‘coordination’ function of the NCRPB assumes that there is full commitment from all stakeholders to the aims and objectives of RP-2021, and that actions and policies undertaken by State governments and subordinate agencies and organizations would only require coordination, not ‘determination’, ‘definition’, ‘guidance’ or ‘control’. This creates an unnecessary and fractious situation for the NCRPB, which is called upon to point out violations and deviations from the plan, ironically bringing into question both its own efficacy as ‘coordinator’ as well as the commitment of the state governments towards a regional plan prepared by a Board that includes, among others, the Chief Ministers of the constituent states.

In case of violation of the Regional Plan, as per the provisions of the Section 29 (2) of the NCRPB Act 1985, the Board may direct the concerned participating State or the Union Territory to stop such activity and withhold financial assistance to the concerned participating State or the Union Territory. The inherent weakness in this enforcement mandate needs to be revisited.

Under current planning practices, land is ‘notified/reserved’ for development on the basis of a map that has 1:50,000 scale, whereas the land use planning, development and change is practiced at state level. Ideally the Regional Planning at a macro scale should be detailed out in the corresponding Sub-Regional Plans, District Development Plans (DDPs), City Master Plans, etc. Local regulations in the form of Development Control Regulations (DCR) are required to bridge the gap between planning and implementation. These should sufficiently be influenced by the needs of regional integration and common minimum standards. Regulation and enforcement need to address distortions and irregularities caused at micro level and if this is not done then it could lead to weakening of the effectiveness of ‘planning’ done at the regional level.

The financial resources available to the Board are also meagre and prevent it from leveraging its strategic position to play an effective role in the planned development of the region. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Urban Development (2008-09) observed that ‘this [corpus] could hardly benefit the satellite towns and CMAs to be able to work as pull centres which would prevent in-migration into Delhi. In that sense, we have not been able to use this instrumentality. In this context, a substantial enhancement of budgetary support to NCRPB would be of great help’. The means to enhance the NCRPB’s financial resources and leveraging of its planning function are detailed out further in Section 19.6.

19.3 OUTCOMES OF REGIONAL PLAN-2021 DURING 2007-12
One of the yardsticks used in the past to measure the success of the Plan has been to alleviate the migration pressures. In an increasingly globalizing world where cities are competing for the best of resources – physical and human – providing employment opportunities and supporting infrastructure become key considerations. Accordingly, this section attempts to assess the performance-to-date through the following parameters:

a) Population trends
b) Service delivery in NCR
c) Service delivery in CMAs
d) Project funding
19.3.1 Population trends in the NCR
The detailed analysis regarding the population trends in NCR has been done in Chapter 4.

Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are the major States contributing to the in-migration into NCT-Delhi. While the percentage of migrants from Uttar Pradesh has shown a decrease, it still constitutes the largest share (NCRPB, 2008). Bihar exerts a significant influence and seems to challenge the very logic of CMAs. The state of Bihar sends as many migrants to Delhi, as do areas within 100 km and 200 to 300 km from Delhi, yet NCRPB has held that it is far-fetched to invest in Bihar in order to stem the flow of migrants to Delhi. The idea of CMAs rests on the notion that investment in development in distant towns would reduce the ‘pull’ of the metropolitan centre (i.e. NCT-Delhi), and would reduce the ‘push’ away from the less developed town in question. As the next section will show, neither was this levelling out of standards of living achieved nor were these counter-magnets able to exert sufficient ‘pull’ on their own account to attract populations and to keep them resident.

Figure 19.1: Distance to Source of Migration and Number of Migrants to Delhi
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The five CMAs chosen earlier were expected to serve as interceptors of migratory flows into NCR and regional growth centres to achieve a balanced pattern of urbanisation in NCR and even farther afield. However, the population growth rates of CMAs have, on average, declined from 34% to 22% during 1991-2001 compared to 1981-1991. Interestingly, whereas in the case of NCTD, the growth of population in absolute numbers is significant, in the case of CMAs, the statistic that matters is the rate of growth of population. The decline in the growth rates of CMAs also becomes more important, as the majority of the in-migration to Delhi appears to be occurring from the places close to these CMAs. Therefore, there is a definite case to introspect the concept of CMAs.

19.3.2 Service delivery in NCR
A key determinant of balanced regional growth is the adequate and consistent provision of services to the population.

The detailed analysis on Water and Sewerage has been carried out in Chapter 8 and 9 respectively. The electricity coverage in NCR towns has improved significantly over the last decade but the average is below the NCTD levels. It is widely accepted that power supply and its coverage play a crucial role in the economic growth of the cities and towns. Without proper coverage and efficient supply of power, cities and towns in NCR cannot perform their role as growth engines and employment generators.

19.3.3 Service levels in CMAs
Provision of water supply in the CMAs was at an average rate of 175 lpcd (at production). All the CMA towns have been able to improve/continue the water supply service at par with the Ministry of Urban Development standards.

---
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While provision of water supply in the CMA was at par with the service standards, more than half of the population do not have access to sewerage network. The coverage of sewerage network has declined from 42% in 1991 to 31% in 2001 in the CMAs. (Fig. 19.2 and Fig. 19.3)

While CMA towns have been able to improve the connectivity and accessibility within the towns during 1991-2001, there is still 40% gap in urban road network coverage, when analyzed against the norms specified by the Isher Ahluwalia Committee (2011). These deficits in urban infrastructure do not augur well for cities that are to perform functions as Counter Magnets to NCR. The deficiencies in urban services suggest that there is an urgent need to provide and revamp the infrastructure in these cities with a view to encourage competitiveness amongst NCR cities and CMA towns.

Most importantly, once migration data is made available for Census 2011, a relook at CMA’s is necessary as existing parameters for CMA’s do not correlate with the socio-economic realities.

19.3.4 Project Funding

Till March 2013, NCRPB has approved financing for 277 infrastructure development projects with an estimated cost of Rs.18994 crore. The loan component of Rs.8704 crore has been sanctioned and Rs.6464 crore has been released. Haryana alone received 72% of the total loans sanctioned. CMA towns had loans sanctioned of about Rs.1108 crore (13% of total loan) of which Rs.670 crore (10% of total loan released) was released for 16 projects. It is however observed that receiving of financial assistance from NCRPB was directly proportional to number of Detailed Project Reports (DPR) posed to the Board by the respective State Governments.

During the XI Plan, the Government of India allocated Rs.300 crore for NCRPB (Fig. 19.4). Additionally, the Board was able to raise Rs.1100 crore through bond issue from the domestic capital market. The Board has also augmented its financial resources by recycling repayments of loans and interest earned on loans through a fund called ‘NCRPB Fund’ set up as per the provisions of the NCRPB Act, 1985.

The NCRPB and participating states together have spent more than Rs.5000 crore per plan period during the 10th and 11th Plans. Applying the service standards and Per Capita Investment Costs (PCICs) prescribed by the Isher Ahluwalia Committee for Estimating the Investment Requirements for Urban Infrastructure Services (HPEC) of March 2011, investment requirement for the region stand at Rs. 2.8 lakh crore. In comparison, estimates of NCRPB’s funding requirements stand at Rs. 1.8 lakh crore.

---
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Spending patterns thus reflect only about 2 per cent of the investment requirements, signifying high levels of under investment. Given the investment patterns and the funds made available, the resources have been spread thin and meeting the requirements of the region will require a much larger financing bucket.

**19.4 OBSERVATIONS AND LEARNING**

Three important insights stand out from observation of recent development pattern and activities in the region. First is related to planning. Cities like Gurgaon, Faridabad and Noida have been able to grow and experience high levels of economic development in recent years. These cities have become vibrant centres of economic and social activity albeit with inadequate physical and social infrastructure. As these cities evolve as additional epicentres of activity in the region, there is a case to consider new areas that are in the proximity of these cities. The new areas can then leverage from the proximity to the likes of Gurgaon and Noida. Manesar and Greater Noida are cases in point. The Sub-Regional, Functional and Master Plans need to reflect this new reality and prepare to create new continuums that are centred around multiple growth areas depicting some sort of a concentric growth pattern. This can be best achieved through developing connecting infrastructure specifically transport related and improving urban service delivery.

Investments in infrastructure in the NCR can increase the already high competitiveness of the CNCR and expand its spatial extents from a few cities – which are ranked very high, in fact Delhi, Gurgaon, NOIDA are highest ranked – in the entire region. Indicators such as economic strength, human capital, institutional effectiveness, financial maturity, global appeal, physical capital, environmental and natural hazards, social and cultural character should become part of the objectives of the regional plan to fillip the competitiveness amongst the cities and towns. Such indicators should form an integral part of the RP-2021 and all future RPs.

The second important insight is related to CMAs. The demand of states to increase the NCR jurisdiction as well as to include more CMAs must be viewed in light of the performance of the sub-regions and CMAs to date. This, in fact, brings into question the very concept of ‘counter-magnets’. Whether a particular city functions as a counter magnet or not cannot be completely engineered. Livelihoods are the only real ‘magnet’, as even without infrastructure, people may be drawn to a city offering livelihood e.g. Gurgaon.

The third learning, from an implementation standpoint, is that since NCRPB is limited by the structure of the federal polity, it is important to put in place incentive mechanisms that will create a pull factor for participating states to reach out to the NCRPB. An appropriately designed incentive mechanism becomes even more important as NCRPB takes on projects that involve the participation of multiple states.
Any future course of action must take into account these learnings. The following section sets out the implementation strategies to strengthen the outcomes indicated in the Plan, and the financial and human resources needed to implement the same.

19.5 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

There is clearly a need to design a new strategy that could enable the implementation of the Plan, with NCRPB playing the role of main custodian of agglomeration strategy for the region.

NCRPB’s focus should be on improving the level of urban infrastructure/services as well as the rest of social infrastructure to make the cities vibrant and truly liveable and capable of offering employment opportunities.

The foundation of implementation strategy have to be clearly stated policies that spell out the rules and framework guidelines for achieving the vision of the RP-2021 in overall as well as sectoral terms. It would be the responsibility of the respective state governments, their municipal and other para-statal bodies, to work out the detailed strategies for achieving this plan objectives. The policies for each sector such as settlement pattern, economic base, rural development, regional land use, environment, disaster management, heritage and tourism, transportation, power, water, sewerage, solid waste management, should be detailed out in the respective Sub-Regional Plans.

In addition, some of the measures which are already in the Plan like rationalisation of tax structures, removing restrictions on inter-state movement of taxis and auto rickshaws, uniform telecom and power supply and inter-state transport connectivity should also be pursued.

A key component of the RP-2021 needs to be its linked with the JnNURM, an initiative that could play a crucial role in achieving the balanced urban growth in NCR. JnNURM is critical also because it is directed towards achieving some essential reforms in municipal governance, especially the ones focused on increasing the financial health of the urban local bodies and ensuring sustainability of infrastructure and basic services provided under the said programme. The overall management and creditworthiness of urban local bodies and service providers ultimately determine the sustainability of infrastructure development. Central and State fiscal transfers into the urban sector are dependent on the efficiency of utilisation of funds by the beneficiary cities. Municipal governance and systemic reforms in the delivery of critical services like water supply and sanitation should be the ‘bottom line’ benefits that the NCRPB must work to ensure. In brief, the JnNURM offers a key instrumentality that can enable the NCRPB to leverage its position in attaining its main objective of sustainable development of NCR in a regional context. Alongside, it shall be helping the participating states in getting the requisite resources for investment in infrastructure and urban services for achieving the said objective, through its advocacy role.

The following 3-pronged implementation strategy is therefore recommended to enable the NCRPB in playing a meaningful role in discharging its statutory obligation of ensuring balanced growth of the region:

i) Advocacy
   a. For funds under JnNURM: Given the quantum of investment required for the region, JnNURM provides an ideal platform/financing source to drive the agglomeration agenda – this should help narrow down the existing funding gap. It needs to be recommended that sanction of urban infrastructure/services projects of the region under the JnNURM should be only if they are in accordance with the NCRPB’s approved Regional Plan and the Functional Plans. These should also be as per the investment prioritization duly approved by the concerned Urban Local Body/Urban Development Authority/State Government. On this endorsement by the NCRPB, funds from the JnNURM bucket will be available for projects in the Region. This will be an additional task mandated to the NCRPB. Once this is done, NCRPB could then take up the advocacy, on behalf of the participating states, for approval of these projects by the Government of India. At present only two cities namely Faridabad in Haryana Sub-region and Meerut in U.P.
Sub-region qualify as a city for grant under UIG and BSUP component of JnNURM. Under UIDSSMT, 9 cities namely Rohtak, Bahadurgarh in Haryana Sub-region and Baghpat, Ghaziabad, Hapur, Loni, Bulandshahr and Khurja in Uttar Pradesh Sub-region of NCR have been covered.

Under the New JnNURM, a window has been made available to all cities which provides opportunities to cities and towns in NCR to improve the service delivery and take up the much required urban reforms.

b. For promotion of investment climate in the Region: Another important advocacy role for NCRPB should be the promotion of investment climate for economic activities in the region. In discharging this function, NCRPB could follow the example of Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) of the UK or SIRs in Gujarat. RDAs are departmental public bodies established with the charge of driving economic development, business efficiency, investment and competitiveness, employment, skills and sustainable development in their respective regions. They are also expected to contribute on public policies pertaining to transport, planning and land use, higher education, crime prevention, housing, public health, tourism, culture and sport. A similar model is also available in the form of some Special Investment Regions (SIR) in Gujarat, now being replicated by some other states also. These SIRs are conceived ‘to create and enable environment to protect local industries, enhance investment climate, improve quality of life, upgrade human skills, create world class infrastructure and attract global investment’. These SIRs are provided statutory institutional and regulatory framework. For operationalisation of this concept, an institutionalized mechanism is provided which allows governance interventions at various levels. It could, for instance, include the Infrastructure Development Board of the state to provide for a single window for the SIR; a Development Authority for the Region to address ground level issues of development and regulation and for ensuring its planned development; and creation of Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to drive the implementation of projects in the region. The Unique Selling Proposition (USP) of SIR model is that it is able to promote integrated development of the area.

c. For building new and smart cities in NCR: NCRPB should promote the development of Smart Cities in NCR (one in each constituent state, except NCT - Delhi). The Board should identify world class consultants to prepare studies, develop concepts, etc. to meet the overall objective of building new smart cities in NCR constituting states. NCRPB’s own funds should be leveraged for (i) preparation of development strategy and action plan for developing smart cities, (ii) preparation of detailed project reports compliant with NCRPB appraisal criteria, (iii) undertaking project monitoring and supervision of projects (iv) any other as may be deemed appropriate by NCRPB.

d. State Government’s support, involvement, agreement and finally adoption shall be pre-requisite for such initiatives.

ii) Capacity Building: Since there is an overall capacity constraint in the urban local bodies, NCRPB could become a nodal agency for capacity building programme for the urban local bodies, para statals and other service providing public agencies/authorities within the Region. In particular NCRPB should provide capacity building assistance for development of new cities and setting up of SPV’s. Needless to add, overall capacity building for the ULBs should also be an important charter for NCRPB.

iii) Inter-State Project Coordination: NCRPB could also conceptualize, catalyze, coordinate and in some cases even finance inter-state projects (not necessarily limited to urban infrastructure). Examples of some such projects could be in the sectors like Power, Regional Transport, expressways, carriage of drinking water, sewage treatment plants etc. NCRPB is already funding projects in these sectors but these are intra-state projects only. Increased financial allocations for the Board would effectuate more inter-state projects in the region. The Planning Commission/ Finance Ministry or the
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Concerned administrative ministry could allocate the requisite funds for such projects. Given the multi-state partnership and coordination requirements at various levels, NCRPB would be ideally placed to help and coordinate the implementation of such projects of organisations like DMIC.

**19.6 RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

At present, the funds available with the NCR Planning Board are from the following sources:

- i) Grant from the Ministry of Urban Development
- ii) Contribution from Delhi Government
- iii) Market borrowings (Taxable and Tax-free bonds)
- iv) Internal accruals (Interest income)
- v) Multilateral/bilateral funds

NCRPB’s resource pool should be augmented to enable it to truly play the role of an agency responsible for coordinating the development of the region as an agglomeration. This would require a significant enhancement of the current grants from the Ministry of Urban Development and the Planning Commission.

Set out below are the potential sources and utilization of funds for the implementation of the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Fund</th>
<th>Uses of Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own funds (Grant from the Ministry of Urban Development, Contribution from Delhi Government, Market borrowing (Taxable and Tax-free bonds), Internal accruals (Interest income), multilateral/bilateral funds)</td>
<td>▪ Capacity building&lt;br▪ Support for building new and smart cities in NCR&lt;br▪ Loan to participating states for infrastructure projects&lt;br▪ Promotion of PPP projects (with or without Viability Gap Funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access window of JnNURM funds</td>
<td>▪ Endorsing eligibility and assisting state governments in seeking funds from JnNURM for urban infrastructure/basic services projects in the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds from the Planning Commission/administrative ministries</td>
<td>▪ For inter-state/inter-regional physical/social infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For managing its funds in an optimal manner, NCRPB could also set up an appropriate agency, possibly a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) with professional expertise from the market. Through this SPV platform, NCRPB could incentivize/dis-incentivize investments in different urban infrastructure projects to ensure properly balanced and harmonized growth of infrastructure and services in the Region. SPV platform would provide flexibility in approach, both in terms of broader eligibility of expenditure on projects as well as in the use of NCRPB funds by way of equity, debt or guarantees.

NCRPB could also levy differential rates of interest for the loans advanced by it for different types of projects and different types of cities and sub-regions. Of course in doing so, requirements of the city should also be taken into consideration. NCRPB funding over the years has shifted from land development to infrastructure projects in transport, water supply, sewerage, power sectors, etc. However, there is an urgent need to focus on inter-state regional physical & social infrastructure projects.

The funding pattern also reveals that most loans are used to provide around 75% of the project costs. Given that the state government and ULBs would be the beneficiaries of this scheme and would cover a proportion of project cost from their budgets, it would appear that there is sufficient scope for promoting PPP projects (with or without VGF), particularly those sectors/projects that, prima facie, indicate revenue generating potential. There could be different rates of interest for projects involving PPP.

A significant implied advantage of NCRPB in accessing private capital is its potential ability to engage the private sector and its unique mandate under the statute to form partnerships. This could be further leveraged to attract private investment and perhaps more critically its efficiency in project implementation and management. NCRPB would, of course, need to be suitably strengthened for this purpose, especially in terms of specialized manpower.
The model of NCRPB partnering with bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies as well as the private sector to seed new projects and provide state governments with pre-sanctioned funding for projects could then become a successful route for resource mobilization. NCRPB has experience in managing extra-budgetary resources since it has been managing and servicing loans taken from ADB and the KfW. The off take of ADB and KfW funds has already reached 99.64 Crore and 108.45 Crore up to March 2013 respectively.

19.7 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

For discharging its enhanced role in securing balanced growth of the Region and managing its finances as outlined in the preceding paragraphs, NCRPB would require substantial up gradation of the existing manpower and their skill sets. The NCRPB management only can actually articulate these requirements. However, some suggestions are given in the succeeding paragraphs for consideration:

i) NCRPB’s secretariat needs to be re-structured, strengthened and up graded to discharge its remit as outlined in this Chapter. Particular attention would need to be given to strengthen the organization for more efficient utilization of its funds and providing assistance to participating states in preparing Plans and projects and securing market capital.

ii) More than increasing the manpower strength of NCRPB and state NCR Cells, there is a need to undertake capacity building program for the staff of all these bodies on a large scale to deal with the issues that need to be tackled at both macro and micro levels for balanced regional development.

iii) Strengthening of Project Monitoring Cell at NCRPB for formulation of inter-state projects and their monitoring. E-governance should be promoted in the designing, implementation and monitoring of RP/SRP/FP/projects of the Region.

iv) Restructuring the NCR Planning & Monitoring Cells at the state level in a manner that facilitates single line command and control.

v) States should designate a nodal department to liaise with NCRPB for all matters connected with it. Ideally this department should also be dealing with JnNURM-II matters and other similar missions & schemes.

vi) A Standing Committee (SC) of Principal Secretaries of the Departments dealing with Urban development of the member states should be constituted so that the progress in the implementation of RP-2021 could be monitored and impediments, if any, could be removed. Planning Committee stipulated by the NCRPB can perform the above mentioned role.

vii) The performance indicators with respect to the urban services and other infrastructure should be institutionalised so that the monitoring of the projects is benchmarked against these indicators. NCRPB should enhance the participatory processes, such that there is buy-in from all stakeholders. Greater effort is required to increase awareness about the Regional Plan amongst the elected representatives of the urban local bodies and citizens of these communities.

19.8 WAY FORWARD

Unless sufficient funds are made available to NCRPB and institutionalized mechanisms put in place to adequately incentivize the participating states, the concept of Regional Planning is likely to remain only a statement of good intent. The following steps may enable effective implementation of the Plan:

- Setting up an MIS to track and monitor/evaluate the implementation and report the progress periodically to the Board.
- Conducting Impact Assessments of projects/development works and undertaking corrective measures, where necessary.

The NCRPB is a unique institutional arrangement, which attempts to bring together four states of the country (i) to show case a model of guided urbanization (a concept yet to evolve in India); and (ii) for balanced regional growth involving the agglomeration of the National Capital Region.