



ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS COMMISSION

REPORT OF THE STUDY TEAM

ON

SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS

A.2, w-N7t
L0-1
141276

JANUARY 1970



**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS COMMISSION**

**REPORT OF STUDY TEAM
ON
SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS**

January, 1970

STUDY TEAM ON SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS

Chairman

SHRI D. K. KUNTE

Members

DR. ATMA RAM

DR. S. BHAGAVANTAM

SHRI ARVIND MAFATLAL

SHRI K. P. MATHRANI

PROF. M. G. K. MENON

DR. VIKRAM A. SARABHAI

SHRI H. N. SETHNA

DR. M. S. SWAMINATHAN

DR. K. L. WIG

Secretary

SHRI RAJENDRA PAL SINGH

D. K. KUNTE, M.P.
Chairman,
Study Team on
Scientific Departments.

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS COMMISSION
SARDAR PATEL BHAVAN,
NEW DELHI,
Dated : January 3, 1970

Dear Shri Hanumanthaiya,

I am presenting herewith the report of the Study Team on Scientific Departments; report as presented faithfully represents the outcome of our deliberations as a team. Shri K. P. Mathrani agrees with the report and the format in which it is presented. The other members have chosen to be absent at the final meeting held expressly for the purpose of signing the draft report, either because they had objection to the format or because they chose just to be absent. It might be that the reason for all of them is the format of the report, though it faithfully records the view of all of us. A word, however, is needed to explain how the situation developed and left me with no option but to submit the Team's report without the signatures of the members as I have done.

You will recall that I was appointed Chairman of this Team in place of Prof. M. S. Thacker, who had resigned. After this appointment I learnt that under Prof. Thacker's chairmanship, the Team had already submitted Part I of their report. The persual of this report led me to address a letter to you on August 23, 1968* stating that the report submitted by Prof. Thacker had certain serious gaps, was not study-based and objective, and had not taken full note of the policies and pronouncements of the Government of India and its Ministers made from time to time since Independence and that, therefore, the report had to be revised to make it more cogent, comprehensive and study-based. Agreeing with my suggestion you wrote back to me on September 4, 1968 saying that no limitations were imposed on the work of the Study Team and all the aspects of administration of scientific institutions could be looked into by the Team. This view-point of yours was formally put by you to the Team at its first meeting under my chairmanship on 17th October, 1968. The report submitted by Prof. Thacker, therefore, was treated as withdrawn from the Commission and I took steps to work for a fresh

*Copy of the letter available on pages 125—130 of the report .

(ii)

report with the cooperation of my colleagues in the Team. Before initiating any concrete action towards collective deliberations and the preparation of the report, I had informal meetings with individual members to ascertain their reaction to my proposal of revising the report already submitted to the Administrative Reforms Commission. Agreeing with my suggestion every member promised to cooperate in this revision of the report.

In a study of this type, it is always necessary to expose the subject to a fresh look and also consider all possible aspects of the issues before striking at correct perspectives; this necessitated up-to-date information as well as a dialogue with knowledgeable people in the relevant fields for the purpose of gathering useful views. I, therefore, had a series of discussions with the cross-section of scientists and other relevant persons on the problems of the scientific institutions and the suggested remedies. With my background as a public-man who has been watching the progress of our scientific institutions with interest and anxiety, these discussions educated and equipped me with intimate information and possible answers to the problems as held by the scientific community at various levels and various other persons involved in the administration of our scientific institutions.

Before arriving at conclusions included in this report, the Study Team had free and frank discussions at its various meetings. Whereas consensus was arrived on most of the matters, there are four vital areas of administration in regard to which the Team was divided; they relate to the (i) role of the Committee on Science and Technology in the allocation of financial resources to the different sectors of science and the evaluation of the scientific and technological performance of the organisations; (ii) role of the Union Public Service Commission in the recruitment of scientific personnel, (iii) role of the Directorate General of Supplies & Disposals, and (iv) the chapter laying down certain general principles for administration of scientific institutions. In my anxiety to appreciate the view-point held by the scientist members and Shri Mafatlal in regard to these areas, I had not only repeated discussions in the meetings of the Study Team but also discussed these matters with other knowledgeable persons, many of whom being those involved directly or indirectly in the management of these aspects. My colleagues dissenting from my views in these matters, however, based their suggestions mainly on their own experience and belief and did not consider any need for similar discussions. I have all respect for their views, but I am unable to concur with their approach for evolving recommendations only on personal opinions and asking for those to be accepted on faith rather than after scientific dialogue and scrutiny; in my view.

(iii)

this is neither appropriate for any Study Team, nor does the Administrative Reforms Commission expect a report based merely on the personal faith of the members of the Team. However, both these view-points are there in the report for consideration by you and your colleagues in the Commission.

For presentation of these divided views on quite a few of the significant aspects, I thought it better to put alternative suggestions held by different members of the Team in juxtaposition to each other in the main body of the report at appropriate places than to divide the report into two parts—the main report and the dissenting notes. This format of the report, in my view, is also to be preferred, among others, for the purpose of facilitating appreciation of alternative views by the Administrative Reforms Commission. Unfortunately, some members did not like this format and expressed their intention to abstain from signing it. Before taking this decision of sending to the A.R.C. this report I devoted three meetings to the discussion on the format; on my finding no logic for their objection, I decided to send this report without any signatures except my own.

Some of the members who have not signed this report, however, state that the report submitted to the Administrative Reforms Commission by Prof. M. S. Thacker in March, 1968 may be treated as their dissenting report. I do not wish to express my views on whether this can be regarded as a dissenting report. It is for you and your colleagues in the Commission to decide the status of both these documents and utilise them appropriately.

Under the chairmanship of Prof. M. S. Thacker the Team had decided to submit their report in two parts—Part I dealing with major scientific departments/organisations, namely, Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, Atomic Energy Commission, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Indian Council of Medical Research and Defence R. & D. Organisation, and Part II dealing with 'isolated' scientific departments, like, Geological Survey of India, India Meteorological Department, Survey of India, etc. Later we decided in the Team that there was no necessity for submitting the report in two parts and that the administrative problems of the 'isolated' departments of science could better be included in this report as a separate chapter. Accordingly, this report covers the administration of both major and 'isolated' scientific departments.

I regret the inconvenience caused to the Administrative Reforms Commission on account of a delayed submission of this report. But for the controversy which arose in the Team on some of the issues including the format of the report, I could have completed the work and submitted the report in early 1969.

(iv)

I take this opportunity to thank Shri T. N. Singh, Member incharge of this area in the Commission for the keen interest which he took in the work of the Study Team and his valuable guidance and advice made available from time to time. I am also grateful to my colleagues in the Team who gave their valuable time for attending the meetings of the Team despite their heavy pre-occupations. Last but not the least I must thank all those who gave me the benefit of free and frank discussion when I sought enlightenment from them.

Allow me to mention that it would not have been possible for me to finish my labour successfully without the able assistance of Shri Rajendra Pal Singh, the Secretary of the Team, and those who worked under him.

With best regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/- D. K. KUNTE

Shri K. Hanumanthaiya, M.P.
Chairman,
Administrative Reforms Commission,
New Delhi.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER NO.	SUBJECT	PAGES
I	Introduction	1
II	Administrative Re-organisation: Major Scientific Departments	8
III	Administrative Reorganisation: Isolated Scientific Departments	26
IV	Administrative Reorganisation: Supra-Ministerial Level	31
V	Personnel Aspects	44
VI	Financial Administration	65
VII	Procurement of Stores & Equipment	70
VIII	Industrial Research	79
IX	Summary of Recommendations	91
APPENDIX I	Scientific Policy Resolution	109
APPENDIX II	List of Institutions engaged in Scientific & Technological Research functioning directly under the control of the Minis- tries of the Government of India	112
APPENDIX III	Committee on Science & Technology	114
APPENDIX IV	Scheme of Automatic Promotions	116
APPENDIX V	Confidential Report Form	119