

Evaluation Study on Protection of Historical Monuments and Development of Museums

Department of Archaeology and museums

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- i. Heritage and culture reflect the status of human societies across the globe. History is replete with innumerable monuments, sites, museums, statues, forts and other structures that have been attracting local, national and international tourists across the globe.
- ii. Patronage from rulers was made available during earlier centuries for conservation, maintenance and protection of such archaeological monuments and now Governments have taken over this responsibility to maintain and sustain structures that spell marvel.
- iii. Being one of the oldest civilizations, India houses large number of mythological and historical monuments and archaeological and heritage sites that stand as testimony to the glory of the by gone era. They remind us of our heritage and our civilization and deserve special consideration for protection, maintenance and conservation. These monuments convey rich heritage and provide tremendous scope to the communities to understand Indian Heritage and culture. Their Artistic and architectural work have been capturing the imagination of tourists both young and old across the globe. The technological advancement and economic growth, coupled with enhanced communication network have boosted tourism of all kinds. Indian Archaeological Policy dates back to over 150 years that spells out responsibility of conservation, protection and maintenance by the State and Center has, apart from setting up of a national agency, has been supporting maintenance and conservation of important monuments and

archaeological sites and museums in all the states of the country. The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) is vested with responsibility of identification, documentation, conservation, maintenance and management of such heritage sites and monuments.

Karnataka is among most popular state in the country for heritage sites and monuments. It is home to 608 of the 3600 centrally protected monuments in India; The State Directorate of Archaeology and Museums protects an additional 758 monuments and another estimated 25,000 monuments are identified. Constitution of an exclusive Department for this purpose in 1885 paved way for consolidation of earlier efforts made under the patronage of rulers of the time. In recent years the State is attracting large number of tourists-both national and international, who frequent well known tourist destinations comprising World heritage centers, historical locations like Chalukya, Rashtrakuta-Dynasty, Kadamba-Dynasty, Deccan Sultanate Rattas, Forts, Places of worship such as Jain Basadis, Buddhist temples, Shiva temples, Shakti Sthal & Temple tanks (Pushkarnis). The Tourism Department also is promoting tourism by educating prospective visitors about the heritage and culture of the state.

- v. The Karnataka Archaeology Department (KAD) is vested with the task of identification of new monuments and sites, and their conservation and maintenance. The GOK has a policy for conservation of such monuments by allocating resources and also by drawing upon assistance from other sources and GOI. Public Private Partnership in conservation and maintenance also is gaining momentum.

2. Genesis of the study: Among others, KAD implemented a project for renovation and restoration/conservation of 74 historical monuments/sites and 16 museums with financial assistance from 12th Finance Commission during four year period from 2006-07 to 2009-10. An amount of Rs 2250 lakhs was received by GOK for this purpose. This study aims at assessing the quality of works carried out and impact of the same on the monuments/sites felt needs of the tourists, enlisting major, technical, management and related problems and issues of short term and long term nature.

The Terms of Reference cover broad frame for an analytical study such as; i) To ascertain whether or not any inventory has been prepared in respect of heritage sites and monuments (ii) To check whether there is any process of prioritization of the protected sites (iii) To check whether the KAD has evolved and put in place any cost norms for the works in the state (iv) Ascertain on whether or not the financial resources and programmes are equitably distributed across the divisions (v) To study and analyse procedures followed in awarding contracts (vi) To ascertain whether KAD has any long term plan for sustainability of the protected sites.

The second aspect deals with operational aspects of the works namely (i) Principles and criteria for selection of sites for conservation and maintenance. (ii) Ascertain whether the works are completed within cost and time and whether such works are adequate, complete and seamless (iii) Involvement of local communities in protection and conservation of the monuments (iv) Assess overall impact of the works on the protected monuments

3. Methodology:

3.1 The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the study stipulate 50% works carried out under 12th Finance Commission grant. Works are classified into 4 categories i) Temples, Mutts, Places of worship, Jain Basadis, Forts, other monuments and Museums. Again, final selection of sites is based on (i) Sites by types (ii) Sites by cost (iii) Sites by spatial representation (iv) Sites by status (complete/incomplete). Using the above criteria, 45 sites comprising 36 temples, basadis, forts and 9 Museums are selected for detailed study.

3.2 Secondary data was collected from KAD through a checklist (details in Annexure-VI). In doing so, many gaps were observed, mainly relating to policies, priorities etc.

3.3 The consultant met a number of local opinion leaders and persons of eminence in the field of history. Archaeology, Architecture and Archaeological engineering, who had contributed to the field of archaeology in the state and elsewhere in the country during the course of the study and gained qualitative knowledge and understanding who shared their experiences. Their valuable views and suggestions were recorded. Major focus of team's discussions with such persons was on retrospective and prospective aspects and ways and means of managing the precious heritage, culture of the state.

Findings: I: General

4.1 Inventory of Monuments, Heritage sites and Museums During 2003 KAD carried out documentation and brought out a Directory of 752 historical sites and monuments under the State control. As per information as many as 25,000 such sites have been identified, but final list is yet to be prepared and

documented/ published. In addition, 608 monuments and sites are under the control and management of ASI.

4.2 As per KAD identification of heritage places through subject wise analysis & land survey of important places the report is being prepared in respect of identified monuments. The documentation of protected monuments spread over in Bangalore, Mysore, Belgaum Divisions have been completed. In Gulbarga Division totaling 196 State protected monuments have been included in the declared list out of which the documentation of 116 monuments has been completed. The documentation of the remaining monuments is expected to be completed shortly. KAD has identified as many as 577 monuments in six heritage cities.

The documentation of the Heritage areas of Mysore, Srirangapatna, Bidar, Gulbarga, Bijapur and Kittur has been carried out.

4.3 The Archaeological Survey of India is also carrying out the documentation of protected and unprotected monuments in Karnataka so as to prepare National registry.

4.4 It was also understood that documentation of approximately one lakh unprotected monuments in the State is pending. KAD is contemplating outsourcing this work to some agencies.

4.5 For declaring such buildings with Heritage feature as Heritage buildings there is no such Act or Rules. In the existing Karnataka Town and Country Planning Act, 1961 only City Municipal Corporations, Urban Development Authorities and Local Boards can declare the Heritage Buildings. In this background the department is not in a position to declare Heritage buildings as State protected buildings.

4.6 Prioritization: KAD has not formulated any specific policy on prioritization of the sites and monuments to be taken up for conservation

and maintenance and as such there are no specific criteria for such prioritization. Field offices prepare list of monuments to be covered under conservation and maintenance on physical verification of status of protection works taken up randomly based on proposals/requests from the field units and funds are allocated for maintenance and conservation of such sites and monuments. In some cases local/community leaders' legislators also suggest some monuments/sites to be included which is done after studying feasibility and availability of resources.

4.7 Maintenance: KAD does not have any provision for regular maintenance and up keep of the monuments and site. This has resulted in poor state of the protected monuments and sites. Absence of such an effective system has given rise to encroachment, trespassing and misuse of the precious structures.

4.8 Protection: KAD has been implementing schemes aimed at protection of monuments by resorting to interventions that have least risk of damage to the structures. However, in a number of cases such interventions did affect original status. This is stated to be inevitable in the larger interest of preserving the monument and preventing further deterioration.

4.9 Conservation: Conservation of selected sites and monuments is through a process of;

(a) Identification of the need for repairs/conservation (b) Assessment of technical feasibility of works (c) Estimation of cost of such works to be taken up (d) Awarding contracts to private contractors, (e) Concurrent monitoring and supervision of work

(f) Final technical inspection and verification of quality and quantity of works and release of payments to the contractors.

4.10 Cost norms: KAD is following the GOK PWD rates with minor modifications wherever necessary. KAD has not evolved any specific and exclusive cost norms for works and maintenance. Estimates are initiated

at Division level and forwarded to the commissioner and they are scrutinized for technical and financial accuracy and finalized. The final budget then is put to the Technical Committee for approval for technical component. Once it is cleared by this committee, the Commissioner accords final approval for the proposed works/ interventions. As of now, no cost norms are developed by KAD. These norms vary with ASI norms which are based on CPWD rates.

4.11 Equity: Works are selected for renovation/repairs on the basis of recommendations and proposals from the field/district units. Budgets are prepared for selected works and proposals are considered by the Commissioner/Director of Archaeology Department on an annual basis. In doing so, no consideration is given to equitable allocation of funds since priority is assigned to the expediency and need for repairs/conservation. However, efforts are made to ensure some amount of equity in distribution of funds for this purpose. However equitable distribution of financial resources has not been ensured in the 12th Finance Commission works to the extent feasible. However, in so far TFC funds are concerned, Bangalore and Mysore Divisions received higher share while Belgaum and Gulbarga with almost three-fourth of monuments and sites got comparatively smaller percent of allocation. It was seen that monuments and sites in Bangalore and Mysore divisions collectively accounting for about 26% of total had received 53.40% of the total amount used under 12th Finance Commission.

Discussions with KAD officers indicated that allocation of resources on prorata basis was not contemplated. This may be due to higher weightage given to works in the two divisions. The rule of equity may be difficult to follow without considering the status and age of the structures. Some monuments being quite older might deserve to be tackled on a priority basis. But in general, KAD is expected to ensure that given all things equal, proportionate allocation is made for all the four regions.

4.12 Procedural aspects: For all programmes, KAD has evolved established norms and procedures some of whom also coincide with ASI procedures.

Procedures involved are (i) Ascertaining Eligibility criteria (ii) Budget preparation (iii) Administrative and Technical Approvals (iv) Contracting (v) Execution supervision.

i) Eligibility criteria -The structure should have been covered under the definition of Karnataka Ancient and historical monuments, Archaeological sites and Remains Act 1961; (a) The structure should be more than 100 years old. (b) Should be archaeologically good (c) Monuments should provide attraction to the tourists and visitors.

ii) Approvals: a) Work whose cost is in excess of Rs 1.00 lakh, but less than Rs 5.00 lakhs should be taken up through short/ tender; b) For works whose budgeted cost is in excess of Rs 5.00 lakhs, the rules governing Transparency rules 1999 should be followed strictly, c) Such budgets should be scrutinized by the Deputy Director Archaeology for conformity with the rules and forwarded to the Director or to the committee as the case may be, for final approval.

iii) Execution: a) During execution of works, the KAD should exhibit a Board detailing the cost, contractor's name and address etc on the site (b) List of works under execution should be compiled and sent to the DC, CEO, ZP and Department of Kannada and Culture (c) Videography of the conservation site should be done before, during and on completion of work for record and verification (d) Photographing of the structure before, during and after completion of works should be taken for record (e) The Director KAD has to physically check-measure the work to the extent of 20% before passing the final bill in favour of the contractor/agency.

An Action plan is to be prepared before commencement of each financial year in respect of works proposed or to be continued and such Action plan should be sent for approval from the concerned authorities.

- a) The procedures followed by Archaeological Survey of India in respect of monuments under the ASI jurisdiction should be followed by KAD.
- b) In cases where ASI procedures cannot be followed, the KAD should bring such cases to the notice of the committee for administrative and technical approval.

4.13 Budget preparation: Technical officers of the KAD are responsible for preparation of the budgets for various works proposed to be taken up by the department. It was observed that cost estimates are not routed through the Divisional Engineer as a matter of routine but in some cases, are directly forwarded to the Commissioner for approval.

4.14 Administrative and Technical Approval: As per KAD rules, works with a cost up to Rs 5.00 lakhs can be approved by the Director KAD.

For works involving expenditure in excess of Rs 5.00 lakhs, a committee is constituted comprising Secretary Kannada and Culture, Director KAD, Retired Chief Engineer, PWD, Retired Structural Engineer or Archaeologist, Retired Superintending Engineer KAD.

4.15 Sustainability Aspects: It is necessary to ensure that the works carried out have long term impact on the status of the sites and monuments. Discussions with KAD indicated that as at present no long term strategy is put in place to ensure

sustainability of the works carried out mainly due to inadequate financial allocation. In many cases funds earmarked also are likely to be diverted to purposes other than originally meant/proposed to be spent. In the absence of any specific long term plan, KAD tries to balance the expenditure for maintenance of the structures to the extent possible and within available resources. Main constraint being financial as also man power availability, the KAD is unable to ensure effective maintenance as also sustainability of the works carried out year after year.

5. Findings: 12th Finance Commission Works:

5.1 The KAD identified as many as 73 monuments, 1 Historical (Archaeological) site and 16 Museums across the State (90) and had taken up repairs/maintenance to be implemented in four years from 2006-07 to 2009-10. These comprised 59 temples including Mutts 6 Jain Basadis, 1 Mosque and 7 Forts. 1 site at Kamalapur (Hampi) and as many as 16 museums. There are 560 temples, Mosques and Basadis out of 758 historical monuments and heritage sites maintained by KAD.

5.2 GOK availed an assistance of Rs 2250 lakhs for renovation, restoration and protection of selected 74 identified sites and 16 Museums (Rs 1650 lakhs for monuments and sites Rs500 lakh for Museums and Rs 100 lakh for Art Gallery at Bangalore).

5.3 **Nature of works:** In majority of cases, the works were classified as “conservation and restoration of monuments, including dismantling of the structure, supply of materials, strengthening of foundation, re-setting of the structure and chemical cleaning”.

5.4 Though no specific norms for prioritization were applied, KAD followed general principles of need and urgency of carrying out works in order to save the structure from further deterioration and

damages. Since temples constitute large majority (around 80%) of monuments and sites, naturally adequate weightage was given to temples while the others like forts, basadis and museums account for small number.

5.5 Study of original estimates and discussions with KAD officers implementing the works showed that in some cases works could not be completed within the provision, alternative sources of funds are to be tapped for completion of the works.

5.6 Completion: Out of 90 sites, monuments and museums taken up, 62 were completed in all respects while in case of only 4 works; they were under progress by the end of 2010-11 (and were completed during subsequent years).

It was seen that around 67% of the 90 works taken up were completed within the estimated costs. It was also seen that in a few cases use of funds from more than one sources had to be used to complete the work and restore the monument/site to its original status.

5.7 Dropped works: After observing all essential formalities of selection, estimates preparation and approval, works in as many as 11 sites, monuments and museums were dropped or diverted to other sites. Of them, 3 sites had encroachment as major reason while in 3 cases works were dropped due to ASI take over. In respect of other 5, no specific reasons were assigned for dropping/ diverting of works as indicated in the following table no-6.

5.8 Completed works: It was seen that among works shown as completed were yet to be completed. Discussions with KAD officers revealed that the definition of “ WORK COMPLETED” meant when money spent 100% of allocation, it is taken as completed.

5.9 Museums: The largest amount spent was in respect of Venkatappa Art Gallery Bangalore, (Rs. 223.00 lakhs) Three museums (i)

Gulbarga (Rs 80.00 lakhs) (ii) Kittur (Rs.30.00 lakhs and (iii) Gadag (Rs. 30.00 lakh) also were covered at costs ranging from Rs.30-80 lakhs while rest of them had small to moderate expenditure. Of the 17 works only in respect of 11 museums works were completed in all respects while in case of another 3, works were in progress at the close of the period. In case of 3 museums, works were dropped and amounts originally approved were transferred to others.

5.10 Social Aspects: Community participation has become an essential ingredient of all programmes to ensure that scarce resources are used to the best advantage of the society. Consultations with communities assumed least significance and importance for the KAD since their major focus was on technical feasibility and adherence to rule book. In a limited way, communities were kept informed of the works and wherever possible, their involvement was solicited. By and large, active involvement of community in conservation was observed to be location-specific and cannot be generalized as positive or negative. Community also thinks that conservation and maintenance are exclusively Government responsibilities and the society has little role or say. The KAD has been implementing a number of awareness programmes, some of them very innovative with a view to motivate community about the need for conservation of heritage and their protection. Publications, Heritage Days, Heritage walks and other programmes are being organized.

5.11 Findings: III: Selected Monuments and sites

1. In majority of cases conservation works have been carried out with least changes/deviations. Only in 5 cases major changes were made with the main objective of protecting the monument and checking further deterioration.
2. By and large, 90% of works were completed as per plans and

cost norms; Principles and Norms governing conservation and maintenance of archaeological monuments and sites have been followed in respect of all but 3-4 cases; ASI norms and guidelines together with GoK guidelines also have been followed; Such deviations were considered to be inevitable in the larger interest of protecting the monuments and check further damages and deviations.

3. In majority of cases surroundings of monuments remained untouched giving rise to growth of wild vegetation and thus exposing the structure to multiple risks of damages on account of breeding of reptiles and other vegetation borne species like rats etc which can be potential damagers of plinth and foundation areas.
4. Efforts to locate old members were not made while executing works. It was observed that in number of places such old members were lying half- or fully buried in the soil.
5. Maintenance of the renovated/repared monuments is missing for want of funds. In many temples only structures were tackled without making any efforts to locate the presiding deity which was adorning the temple earlier it was learnt that locating and re-installation of the Deity was not in their agenda.
6. Finally, the works completed have certainly helped restore original status of the monuments in majority of cases notwithstanding certain other limitations. However, there are a number of monuments/sites covered under this programme where further and additional works are necessary as the amounts earmarked was not adequate to restore a monument to its original status. Especially in respect of high value works the estimates went awry resulting in mid-course revision /amendments to the works.

7. Major conservation works executed have certainly helped, in bringing back the original status and grandeur of the monuments by protecting them from natural threats and Human Vandalism is yeoman service done to the 'National Heritage' in Karnataka region stands exemplary for the country to be followed. Realizing the significance of these monuments which once upon a time were nerve centers of Religion, Administration, Education, Literature, Art, and Architecture, Music, Dance, Painting etc with preaching religion, peace and prosperity would benefit entire mankind, along with cultural activities.
8. Under the circumstances, the Noble service rendered by these 'Cultural Heritage', monuments cannot be neglected by any pretext or excuse. "If The Monuments Lost, More of the Nation's Lost". It is the Government/Administration to think and ink a drop of ocean of sanctions for the cause of strong heritage nation/Karnataka under building a Sanskratika Brihatbharata Karnataka.
9. The overall performance of the project is satisfactory. Protection of monuments from damage, vandalism and encroachment has received positive response and attention of the villagers/communities. There is still a sense of indifference among the communities to take lead in preventive measures. Protection works have immensely contributed to overall status of the structures.
10. Sustainability of the works depends on regular maintenance. There are chances of deterioration of the status of these monuments in case adequate resources are not made available for regular maintenance.

Recommendations:

Short Term Practicable Recommendations:

1. The department of Archaeology should list all monument sites and put in public domain and ask for additions/corrections wherein each monument's description may be made in a standard format. Listing of monuments should be based on historical, architectural, archaeological and cultural significance. A senior officer may be made responsible for inspection of all additions and corrections and reporting to Commissioner. This will ensure that a complete data base of all monuments of archaeological importance is available with the State and with the participation of people.
2. Classification of monuments and sites on the lines of ASI (in order of importance from tourism, economic and social points of view) may be done by the department.
3. KAD should spell out criteria for prioritization of conservation and maintenance while drawing annual/action plans.
4. For clearing of encroached sites/monuments/surroundings of monuments, KAD should approach the Deputy Commissioner concerned and with him to work together to evict encroachments.
5. KAD should explore the feasibility of increasing its revenue through collection of fees for major monuments sites and museums with a very small and token entrance fee of Rs 2/- or Rs 5/-.

6. Heritage sites should be got surveyed and marked to prevent encroachments.
7. KAD may explore involvement of school teachers in creating awareness about the need for protection and maintenance of sites and mounuments. For this purpose the programmes being implemented for teachers training in Tamilnadu could be studied and adopted with minor changes to suit Karnataka conditions.

Long Term Practicable Recommendations:

1. The funds earmarked for each and every monument is insufficient as they are many archaeological sites and monuments needing restotration. To restore these monuments KAD may draw a perspective action plan for planned maintenance.
2. All entry fee collected for a particular archaeological site/monument may be kept as a corpus fund and used to maintain the site/monument as convergence with funds of 12th Finance Commission.
3. Age of the structure, its special value in terms of architecture and archaeology and cultural significance, relevance to the history and also tourism, should be given weightage in protection and conservation;
4. In addition to repairs to the structures, it is also important to develop surrounding area with landscaping and have facilities for tourists (particulary toilets, vehicle parking and food), so that they come in more numbers and thus may add to revenue.
5. Community involvement should receive adequate consideration at every stage of planning, execution, supervision and protection of monuments and sites.

6. Efforts should be made by KAD to dovetail protection and conservation and maintenance ensuring convergence with other programmes, more importantly, departments involved in roads and connectivity development so as to ensure easy access to visitors and tourists.
7. KAD should work with Departments of Tourism, DC, RTO, SP, PWD, ZP, KSRTC, etc. to promote visits by tourists to Archaeological monuments and sites.
8. KAD should contemplate having an Archeological Tourism Board in each district.
9. The Karnataka Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act 1961 may be suitably amended so that offences related to damaging an archaeological site/monument, its encroachment and theft of antiques has a more deterrent punishment than presently available in law.

Recommendation required in change in Policy

1. Seeing the importance of safeguarding the heritage and in the better interest of protecting the Monuments, KAD can explore an option of going for PPP mode of understanding.
2. Maintenance and protection of sites and monuments should not be responsibility of KAD only. Instead, a group of concerned departments like PWD, Transport, Tourism and others may also be involved with KAD taking the lead.

Summary of the works taken up, norms maintained, originality restored and objectives fulfilled is given in the following table-

Sl. No	Division	Work & District	Norms followed	Originality restored	Standard of work	Any Adverse impact
1	Bangalore	Temple - Nirthadi Davangere	Yes	New members used	Satisfactory	No
2	Do	Govt Museum Chitradurga	Yes	New members used	Work not complete	No
3	Do	Parshwanath temple Heggere, Chitradurga	Yes	New members Partly used	Work fully completed and satisfactory	No
4	Do	Balalingeshwar temple, Vignasanthe, Tumkur	Yes	New members used	Completed satisfactorily	No
5	Do	Rameshwar temple, Chittoor Shimoga	Yes	New members used	Satisfactory	No

6	Do	Govt Museum, Shimoga	Yes	New members used	Work fully completed and satisfactory	No
7	Do	Venkatappa Art Gallery, Bangalore	Yes	-	Completed satisfactorily	No
8	Do	Govt Museum Bangalore	Yes	-	Completed satisfactorily	No
9	Do	Someshwara Temple- Magadi	Yes	Some new members used	Completed satisfactorily	No
10	Do	Ishwara temple outer Prakaara Wall, Kolar	Yes	Yes	Satisfactory	No
11	Do	Ishwara temple inner premises, Kolar	Yes	New members used	Completed and satisfactory	No
12	Belgaum	Adakeshwara and Nandishwar temple Badami	Yes	Some new members used	Completed and satisfactory	No

13	Do	Bhairaweshwar Temple Nandikeshwar, Bagalkot	Yes	Some new members added. Some scratched developed but negligible	Completed and satisfactory	No
14	Do	Shrimanthgarh Fort, Devihal, Gadag	Yes	New members used	Completed satisfactorily.	No adverse impact
15	Do	Someshwar temple Laxmeshwar - Gadag	Yes	New members used	Satisfactory but inadequate funds	No adverse impact
16	Do	Kalia Masjid Lakshmeshwar , Gadag	Yes	Many new members introduced	Satisfactory	No adverse impact.
17	Do	Kere Someshwar temple, Kalkeri, Haveri	Yes	-	Satisfactory	No adverse impact is observed
18	Do	Someshwar temple, Ablur, Haveri	Not fully	-	Works not as per archaeological work codes, principles and	No adverse impact observed

					guidelines.	
19	Do	Gaddige math and Mahantesh Math Sonda, Sirsi	No	Work is partially completed and abandoned	Work stopped due to dispute	NA
20	Do	Surya Devaraseegehalli Belgaum	No	Work not as per archaeological work codes, principles and guidelines.	Not fully satisfactory but imperative	No major adverse impact but
21	Do	Rani Chennamma Museum, Kittur	Yes	Satisfactory	Works executed as per estimate and found satisfactory	No adverse impact observed

22	Do	Kittur Fort	Yes	Complied with	Satisfactory	Some more work needs to be taken up
23	Do	Ishwar Temple Hebbal, Basavanbageswadi , Bijapur	Yes	Complied with	Work executed as per archaeological work codes, principles and guidelines and satisfactory.	No adverse impact observed
24	Do	Jain Basadi, Aratal, Haveri	Yes	Complied with	Satisfactory	No adverse impact.
25	Do	Parasgarh fort Kadasiddeshwar temple, Savadatti, Belgaum	Yes	Completed	Work in accordance with archaeological works code, principles and guidelines.	No adverse impact is observed
26	Gulbarga	Balakrishna Temple, Kamlapura,	Yes	Major work done using new	Work found to be as per archaeological	No adverse impact observed.

		Bellary		members.	works code, principles and guidelines.	
27	Do	Chikkammanagud i, Kamalapur, Bellary	Yes	Yes but new members used	Work as per archaeological work codes principles and guidelines satisfactory.	No adverse impact seen
28	Do	Green Law Gallery Hampi, Bellary	Yes	Yes	Work in accordance with Archaeological codes satisfactory.	The work has resulted in a better look
29	Do	Ancient Fort Gate, Anegundi	Yes	Yes	Works carried out as per archaeological codes, principles and guidelines.	No adverse impact was observed

30	Do	Jain Basadi, Anegundi, Bellary	Yes	Yes	Work carried out in accordance with the archaeological work codes , principles and guidelines and considered good	-
31	Do	Navarang Darwaza Museum Raichur	Yes	Partly yes	Works, full shape has been restored to the monument /museum as per original style	No adverse impact observed
32	Do	Venkateshwara Temple Gabbur Raichur	Yes	Yes	Work carried out without harming the structure.	No adverse impact
33	Do	Mudgal Fort , Raichur	Yes	Yes	Work carried out as per the archaeological work codes and guidelines	No adverse impact

34	Do	Uma Maheshwar	Yes	Satisfactory	The work	No adverse
		Temple Umapur, Bidar			executed in accordance with the archaeological work codes, principles and guidelines.	impact
35	Mysore	Yoganarashimha	Yes	Satisfactory	The work in accordance with the archaeological work codes and guidelines.	Violation of Archaeological codes and principles
		temple, Srirngapattan, Mandya				
36	Do	Varadaraja	No	Not satisfactory	Work carried out is highly objectionable in terms of	Violative
		Temple Maddur				

					archeological works code, principles and guidelines and is controversial.	
37	Do	Iswara Veerabhadreshwara temple, Asandi, Kadur Chikkamagalur	Yes	Satisfactory	Work executed with the introduction of new granite massive stone highly objectionable.	Works violate archaeological codes and norms and distort originality
38	Do	Keshava Ishwara Temple Angadi Mudigere, Chikkamagalur	No	Not satisfactory	Work executed by introduction of new granite massive stonemember is highly objectionable	Violation of Archaeological codes and principles
39	Do	Govindeshwara temple	No	Not satisfactory	The work carried out	Work was done in
		Koravangala ,			deviated by	violation of

		Hassan			using new stones, and found not-satisfactory.	codes.
40	Do	Govt Museum Madikeri	Yes	Satisfactory	Works executed as per estimate and found satisfactory.	No adverse impact observed
41	Do	Govt Museum Mysore	Yes	Satisfactory with some deficiencies	Works executed as per estimate provisions found satisfactory.	No adverse impact observed
42	Do	Channakeshav Temple, Bhreya, K R Nagar	Yes	Satisfactory	Work executed in accordance with the archeological work codes, principles and guidelines is satisfactory.	Development of scratches affected the structure.

43	Do	Bhujangeshwar temple Umathur	Yes	Satisfactory	Work executed in accordance with the archeological work codes, principles and guidelines is satisfactory.	No adverse impact observed
44	Do	Kalyani Sri Bhuvaneshwari temple Melkote Pandavpura, Mandya	Yes	Satisfactory	The work executed is almost in accordance with the archaeological work codes, principles and guidelines	No adverse impact was observed

Findings

1. The documentation of historical sites and monuments is incomplete. In 2003 there were 752 historical sites and monuments, 25,000 are identified now, but documentation of about one lakh unprotected monuments is pending. In listing, temples predominate.
2. Archaeology department has not formulated any policy on prioritization of sites and monuments to be conserved and maintained.
3. Heritage buildings are declared under the Town and Country Planning Act by different authorities.
4. Structures and sites covered under the Karnataka Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act 1961 can be taken for restoration/ conservation. The conditions being :
 - (a) It should be more than 100 years old,
 - (b) It should be archaeologically good, and,
 - (c) It should have the ability to attract tourism.
5. Budget thus goes to tourist attractions, not historically important sites and structures.
6. Encroachment of the lands under historical sites and monuments in present.
7. Restoration generally has not affected the original structure and style.
8. During restoration, old members buried/half buried nearly were not unearthed. In case of temples, deity location and re-installation not done.

Recommendations

1. The documentation of historical monuments and sites need to be completed at the earliest. The list should be in public domain, public response/information needs to be considered and used for updating the list and effecting correction.
2. After the monuments have been documented and enlisted, they need to be listed on the basis of historical, archaeological, architectural and cultural significance.
3. Archaeology department should formulate a policy on the basis of which conservation and restoration of monuments and sites needs is be done. Tourism potential may be given a place in the policy
4. All entry/camera and other fees collected for any monument or site should go to a corpus which may be utilized only for monument restoration/conservation and providing facilities for tourists. Any surplus may be contemplated to be used for other monuments which are important, but have less tourism potential.
5. Encroachment of lands, misusing and destroying the structures that are a part of historical site or monument needs to be dealt with by –
 - ▶ Surveying and marking on ground the extent that is protected along with the monument/site, and,
 - ▶ Section 26 in specific, and the Karnataka Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act 1961 generally, may be suitably amended so that offences are punished

more severely than the Rs 2000 fine and 3 months imprisonment provision now.

- ▶ There should be a Committee formed at district level to include the DC,SP,PWD, CEO of ZP and RTO and officers of Archaeological department to conserve and restore historical sites and monuments. This Committee should be entrusted with the development of heritage cities/districts, rather than it being done by any single department.

Funds for restoration and conservation seem to be inadequate. Funds under Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) may be explored to be used for these works. Adoption of monuments too may be contemplated.

