

7

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(1998-99)**

**TWELFTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT)**

**INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECT SCHEME**

**SEVENTH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*July, 1998/Shravana, 1920 (Saka)*

L  
8.3657 R  
8.7;1

# SEVENTH REPORT

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT)

### INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SCHEME

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 28.7.1998  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 28.7.1998*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*July, 1998/Shravana, 1920 (Saka)*

**C.U. & R.D. No. 057**

Price : Rs. 25.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
Centre Publications  
Acc 994276  
Date

LC  
328.365  
N8.7:1

© 1998 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Ninth Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, 13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110 005.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(1998-99)

CORRIGENDA TO THE 7TH REPORT (12th LOK SABHA)

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>PARA</u>	<u>LINE</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>READ</u>
15 28	- 6.8	3 from top 2 from bottom	Project entrusted	Programme entrusted
43	-	3 from top	Urban Development	Rural Development & Wastelands Development
44	-	3 from top	Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme	Rural Development & Wastelands Development
44	-	8 from top	Annexure	Annexe
48	-	1st line on top	Appendix XIII	Appendix VIII
48	-	13 from top	Dr. Shaifiqu Rahman Barq	Dr. Shafiqu Rahman Barq

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1998-99) .....	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1997-98) AND (1996-97) .....	(v)
COMPOSITION OF SUB-COMMITTEE II (1997-98) AND (1996-97) .....	(ix)
INTRODUCTION .....	(xi)

### REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory .....	1
CHAPTER II	Definition, Extent of Wastelands and Structure to develop the Wastelands in the country .....	2
CHAPTER III	The Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) Scheme .....	11
CHAPTER IV	Budgetary provision for Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) Scheme and Physical Achievement .....	15
CHAPTER V	Monitoring of IWDP .....	24
CHAPTER VI	People's participation .....	27
CHAPTER VII	Research and Training .....	33
CHAPTER VIII	Strategy of the Government to develop Wastelands during 9th Five Year Plan .....	35

### APPENDICES

I.	Wasteland Area of 241 Districts .....	37
II.	Category wise Wasteland Area .....	39
III.	Statement showing the amount released and expenditure under IWDP .....	40
IV.	Minutes of the 1st sitting of Sub-Committee-II held on 30.9.1996 .....	43
V.	Minutes of the 2nd sitting of Sub-Committee-II held on 14.10.1996 .....	44
VI.	Minutes of the 3rd sitting of Sub-Committee-II held on 27.5.1997 .....	45
VII.	Minutes of the 4th sitting of Sub-Committee-II held on 28.11.1997 .....	47
VIII.	Minutes of the 15th sitting of Sub-Committee-II held on 22.7.1998 .....	48

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri D.S. Ahire
- \*3. Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay
4. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
5. Shri Padmanava Behera
6. Shri Sriram Chauhan
7. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
8. Shrimati Malti Devi
9. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
10. Shri Mitha Lal Jain
11. Shri Akbar Ali Khandokar
12. Shri Vinod Khanna
13. Shri Subhash Maharia
14. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
15. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
16. Shrimati Ranee Narah
17. Shri Chandresh Patel
18. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
19. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
20. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
21. Shri Gaddam Ganga Reddy
22. Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhhar Reddy

---

\*Nominated w.e.f. 11.6.98

23. Shri Ramjidas Rishidev
24. Shri Chatin Singh Samaon
25. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
26. Shri I.M. Jayaram Shetty
27. Shri Daya Singh Sodhi
28. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
29. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
30. Shri K. Venugopal

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
32. Shrimati Vyjayantimala Bali
33. Shri Nilotpal Basu
- #34. Shri Jhumuklal Bhendia
- #35. Dr. M.N. Das
36. Shri N.R. Dasari
37. Shri John F. Fernandes
38. Shri C. Apok Jamir
39. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
40. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
41. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
42. Shri O.S. Manian
43. Dr. Mohan Babu
44. Shri N. Rajendran
45. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

- |                           |   |                             |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri G.C. Malhotra     | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri S.C. Rastogi      | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1997-98)

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
3. Shri L. Balaraman
4. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
5. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
6. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
7. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
8. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
9. Shri B. Dharmabiksham
10. Shri Kishanlal Diler
11. Shri Anant G. Geete
12. Shri T. Govindan
13. Shri Jai Prakash
14. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
15. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
16. Shri Prahalad Singh Patel
17. Shri Chayyanna Patrudu
18. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
19. Shri Ramsajeevan
20. Shri Basavaraj Rayareddi
21. Dr. B.N. Reddy
22. Shri Nand Kumar Sai
23. Shri Maruti D. Shelke



24. Shri Ashok Singh
25. Smt. Ketki Singh
26. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
27. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
28. Shri D. Venugopal
29. Shri Chintaman Wanaga
30. Shri Ramakant Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri R.N. Arya
- \*32. Shri Gandhi Azad
33. Shri Sushil Barongpa
34. Shri Nilotpal Basu
35. Shri V. Rajan Chellappa
36. Shri Sitaram Kesri
37. Shri O.P. Kohli
38. Shri Bhagaban Majhi
39. Shri Radhakishan Malaviya
40. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
41. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
42. Shri V. Rajeshwar Rao
43. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
44. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
- \*\*45. Shri Khan Gufran Zahidi

SECRETARIAT

- |                           |   |                             |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.N. Mishra       | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri John Joseph       | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 3. Shri S.C. Rastogi      | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |
| 5. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy   | — | <i>Assistant Director</i>   |

---

\*Nominated w.e.f. 6.8.1997.

\*\*Nominated w.e.f. 5.9.1997.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1996-97)

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Nand Kumar Sai
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
4. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
5. Shri Prahalad Singh Patel
6. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
7. Smt. Ketki Singh
8. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
9. Shri Chintaman Wanaga
10. Shri Ashok Singh
11. Shri Kishanlal Diler
12. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
13. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
14. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
15. Dr. B.N. Reddy
16. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
17. Shri Maruti Patil D. Shelke
18. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
19. Shri Basavaraj Rayareddi
20. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
21. Shri T. Govindan
22. Shri L. Balaraman
23. Shri Ramakant Yadav

24. Shri D. Venugopal
25. Shri Chhayana Patrudu
26. Shri Anant G. Geete
27. Shri B. Dharmabiksham
28. Shri Ramsajeevan
29. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
30. Shri Jai Prakash

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
- \*32. Shri Sushil Barongpa
33. Shri V. Rajeshwar Rao
34. Shri Radhakishan Malaviya
35. Shri Sitaram Kesri
36. Shri O.P. Kohli
37. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
39. Shri Bhagaban Majhi
40. Shri Nilotpal Basu
41. Shri V. Rajan Chellappa
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
- @43. Shri Joy Nadukkara

SECRETARIAT

- |                         |   |                             |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.N. Mishra     | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Smt. Roli Srivastava | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 3. Shri S.C. Rastogi    | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 4. Shri G.R. Juneja     | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i>     |
| 5. Smt. Sudesh Luthra   | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |
| 6. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy | — | <i>Assistant Director</i>   |

---

\*Nominated w.e.f. 5.11.1996 *vice* Shri Ajit P.K. Jogi ceased to be member of the Committee.  
@Ceased to be member of the Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 21.4.1997.

COMPOSITION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE-II OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1997-98)

1. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*
2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan — *Alternate Convenor*
3. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
4. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
5. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
6. Shri Prahalad Singh Patel
7. Shri Ashok Singh
8. Smt. Ketki Singh
9. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
10. Shri Ramakant Yadav
11. Shri Gandhi Azad

COMPOSITION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE-II OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1996-97)

1. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*
2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan — *Alternate Convenor*
3. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
4. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
5. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
6. Shri Prahalad Singh Patel
7. Shri Ashok Singh
8. Smt. Ketki Singh
9. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
10. Shri Ramakant Yadav

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Seventh Report on Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) Scheme. The subject was entrusted to a sub-Committee of Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1996-97).

2. The sub-Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (Department of Wastelands Development) on 27.5.1997.

3. The Report was considered and approved by the sub-Committee of the Committee (1997-98) on 28.11.1997. The Report as approved by the sub-Committee could not be considered and adopted by the main Committee due to the dissolution of the 11th Lok Sabha on 4th December, 1997.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee (1998-99) at their sitting held on 22nd July, 1998.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Department of Wastelands Development (Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment) for placing before them the requisite material in connection with the examination of the subject. They also wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry/Department who appeared before the sub-Committee and placed their considered views. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the work done by the sub-Committee of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1996-97) and (1997-98).

6. The Committee would like to place on record their sense of deep appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;  
*July 24, 1998*  

---

*Shravana 2, 1920 (Saka)*

KISHAN SINGH SANGWAN,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Urban and Rural Development.*

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTORY**

The Committee on Urban and Rural Development while examining the Demands for Grants of the Department of Wastelands Development for the year 1996-97 and 1997-98, in their 3rd and 9th reports respectively, noted that the land degradation was creating a serious ecological and socio-economic crisis in the country. The Committee further noted that out of the total geographical area of the country (328.73 m. ha.) various estimates have reported that 38 to 187 million hectares of land was degraded wastelands.

1.2 Responding to the gravity of the situation and to take necessary steps for the development of wastelands in the country, the Government of India on 2nd July, 1992 constituted a new Department of Wastelands Development (DoWD) in the then Ministry of Rural Development (now redesignated as Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment).

1.3 The Department of Wastelands Development has taken up several schemes for the development of wastelands in the country. One of the biggest schemes undertaken by the Department to develop the Wastelands is Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) scheme. For implementing this scheme the Department were releasing major portion of their allotted funds.

1.4 In view of the magnitude of the wastelands in the country and in view of the fact that the major portion of their allocation was being spent by the Department on the IWDP Scheme, the Committee decided to examine the various aspects of the scheme like Budget allocation, monitoring, people participation, research and training, etc. and to make suggestions/recommendations for the better implementation of the scheme. The present report deals with the subject of IWDP Scheme.

## CHAPTER II

### DEFINITION, EXTENT OF WASTELANDS AND STRUCTURE TO DEVELOP THE WASTELANDS IN THE COUNTRY

Before examining the different aspects of the IWDP Scheme it is desirable to know the definition, magnitude and the existing structure to develop the wastelands in the country.

#### Definition of Wastelands

2.2 Since the written material furnished to the Committee did not contain any definition of the term 'wastelands', the Committee during the course of oral evidence asked the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development to define the term. He stated that there were two definitions of the term 'Wastelands'. According to one definition, which has been adopted by the Revenue Department of State Governments, the land though cultivable but not being cultivated was called as wastelands. The other definition which has been laid down by an Expert Committee appointed by the Planning Commission in 1987 to go into the definition of wastelands was that the degraded land which can be brought under vegetative cover with reasonable effort and which is currently under-utilized and the land which is deteriorating for the lack of appropriate water and soil management or on account of natural causes is wastelands. So far as the development of wastelands was concerned, the Department has adopted the definition laid down by the Planning Commission.

2.3 When the attention of the witness was drawn to the fact that according to common usage, the land which inspite of irrigation could not be cultivated was called as *wasteland* (Barren/*Usar*), the Secretary while admitting that such land which could not be cultivated was called as barren land, however, reiterated that for the purposes of development of wastelands they have selected only those lands which are cultivable but their potential was not being fully realised. He further added that if the potential of a land could be increased after incurring a reasonable expenditure, that land was being treated as wasteland. As regards, development of *Usar* (barren land), that subject falls within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Agriculture. He also stated that there were 12 to 13 categories of land which come under the definition



of "Wastelands". That Department was developing only those wastelands which could be made cultivable by incurring an expenditure of Rs. 4000/- per hectare.

2.4 It was further stated that Dr. C.H. Hanumanth Rao Committee (1995) which was appointed to go into the working of Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) also recommended that all area development schemes should be implemented on the basis of watershed approach.

### **Extent of Wastelands**

2.5 According to the written information furnished by the Department about the extent of wastelands in the country, various agencies have estimated that the degraded land in the country ranges between 38 and 187 million hectares. The Department in their written reply has further stated as under:—

"National Commission on Agriculture (1976) has estimated land affected by soil erosion and degradation at 175 million ha. The Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development (1984) has endorsed the same figure. On the basis of land productivity/soil health, ICAR has estimated at 187 million ha. Department of Space, (NRSA) on the basis of the study commissioned by Central Planning Commission on the basis of one crop season through land use/land cover has reported the wastelands in 1995 at 75.5 million ha."

2.6 As, regards, exact information about the area of land in the country which was wasteland, the Department in its note admitted that so far the quantification of magnitude and kind of wastelands has not been assessed on scientific basis covering the entire country. However, the information on the estimated area of degraded/wastelands in the country is available as may be seen from the statement (Appendix-I).

2.7 The Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development during the course of his evidence stated that out of 305 million hectares of land in the country, 42 million hectares land is not fit for agriculture. Out of the remaining 260 million hectares, 142 million hectares is being cultivated at present, leaving a balance of 120 million hectares land which is not being cultivated at all.

2.8. When asked about the steps taken by the Department to collect authentic data regarding wastelands in the country, the Department in its note stated that they had commissioned a study in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Department of Space (DoS), Hyderabad on the identification of wastelands using remote sensing satellite images. NRSA, Hyderabad has so far completed the district level mapping of wastelands of 241 Districts against the total number of 521 Districts in the country. Department of Wastelands Development is endeavouring to cover the remaining Districts by NRSA during the Ninth Plan. Department also furnished a statement which shows category-wise extent of wastelands in 241 Districts which were mapped by NRSA (Appendix-II). According to this study, the total area of wastelands in these 241 Districts is 35.467 million hectares which comes to 17.49 per cent of the total geographical area of these Districts. The study also revealed that Madhya Pradesh which has 69.714 lakh hectares, has the largest area of wastelands in the country.

2.9 It was further stated by the Department that on the completion of District level mapping of wastelands covering all the Districts in the country and quantification of various kinds of wastelands through NRSA. Department of Wastelands Development (DoWD) will be able to develop reliable database regarding wastelands in the country.

### **Perspective Plan for the Development of Wastelands**

2.10 In reply to the question whether the Department has chalked out any perspective plan to develop the degraded and wastelands in the country within a time frame of 10 to 15 years, it was stated that a High Level Committee on Wastelands Development under the Chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia which was set up by the Department of Wastelands Development, in one of its recommendations has emphasised the need for perspective plan for wastelands development. The Mohan Dharia Committee has also suggested that entire wastelands in the country should be tackled over a period of 10 to 15 years.

It has further been stated that the recommendations of the Mohan Dharia Committee are under consideration of the Government.

2.11 When the Ministry was asked to state whether it would not be difficult to have a perspective plan without having any realistic data about the area of wastelands in the country, they in their written reply stated that:

“Perspective Plan (PP) is essential to have deep understanding and better management of wastelands resources. Perspective Plan encompasses different spheres of human activity and would set the tone for the development thrusts in an integrated framework ensuring judicious allocation of land for different purposes having regard to the suitability and capability leading to sustainable development of wastelands. As database on Wastelands provides basic information for Perspective Plan, this Department is attaching priority for completing district level mapping of remaining districts.”

### **Structure to Develop Wastelands in the Country**

2.12 According to the written information furnished to the Committee a National Wastelands Development Board was set up by the Government in 1985 for the development of wastelands in non-forest areas aimed at checking land degradation and putting such wastelands in the country into sustainable use and increasing biomass availability, especially fuel wood and fodder. Presently the Board is placed under the Department of Wastelands Development.

2.13 For harnessing science and technology for planning and implementation of wastelands development in the country, the Department of Wastelands Development is implementing the following scheme/programmes:

- (i) Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) Scheme;
- (ii) Support to NGOs/VAs;
- (iii) Technology Development Extension and Training Scheme;
- (iv) Investment Promotional Scheme; and
- (v) Wastelands Development Task Force

2.14 In addition to these schemes of the Department of Wastelands Development, the Department of Rural Employment and Poverty

Alleviation under the same Ministry was also implementing the following schemes:

- (i) EAS
- (ii) JRY
- (iii) IRDP
- (iv) DWCRA
- (v) DPAP
- (vi) DDP

The other Ministries/Departments namely, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Department of Women and Child Development (Ministry of Human Resource Development) and the Planning Commission were also implementing several schemes for the development of wastelands in the country. In addition to the Ministries of the Government of India, Organisations like CAPART and NABARD were also involved in the development of wastelands.

2.15 During his evidence before the Committee, the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development also stated that several Departments of Government of India were operating various schemes for the development of wastelands.

2.16 When the Committee desired to know the mechanism through which coordination between different schemes for the development of wastelands was ensured, the Department in its written reply stated that:—

“The coordination between other programmes of wastelands development such as DPAP, DDP, EAS and IWDP is being maintained at the level of District Rural Development Agency/ Zila Parishad for implementation of the project in the field level under different schemes.”

2.17 It was also stated that in order to ensure better coordination among the various Ministries/Departments at the Central level there

is an urgent need of a Central Coordination Agency. According to them, their views in this regard were also shared by the Mohan Dharja Committee who had recommended as under:—

“That there should be suitably constituted an empowered Central Land Use Authority as well as similar bodies in the States so that adequate attention can be given to the country’s land resources in their totality.”

During his evidence before the Committee, the representative of the Department stated that different schemes of the Government of India which were being implemented by State Governments, were being supervised by different Departments of State Governments. He further pointed out that in some States all the area development programmes like IWDP, are being supervised by one Department only. Agreeing to the need of a single supervising authority at the Centre as well as State level, the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development stated that all such programmes should be entrusted to a single Department at the Central as well as at State level. At the District level the D.R.D.A. should have overall supervision on all the development schemes and they should have better coordination with the concerned Deptt. He also informed the Committee that with a view to having better coordination in different schemes, they have placed the matter before the Cabinet Secretariat so that common guidelines for all the schemes could be issued.

2.18 When the attention of the Department was drawn to the observations of the sub-Committee which visited Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat during 1996, that separate targets for developing watershed were fixed by the Ministry of Rural areas and Employment each year under DPAP, EAS and IWDP which resulted in the lack of coordination between the different schemes and also about their implementation as all the schemes were being implemented at the State level by one Department only, the Ministry in its written note stated as under:—

“Under IWDP scheme the thrust is on development of wastelands having preponderance of common lands and watershed having acute shortage of drinking water etc. while under the scheme of Ministry of Agriculture the thrust is on cultivated lands mostly under individual ownership.

Under the IWDP scheme, coordination at State level is done by State Watershed Programme Implementation and Review Committee under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary/Additional Chief Secretary, etc.

While sanctioning the projects to the DRDAs, it is ensured that there is no over-lapping with any other project/scheme."

### **Impact of Development Scheme**

2.19 When the Department was asked to state the area of land actually developed under the I.W.D.P scheme, it was stated by them that upto 1995-96 an area of 1.83 lakh hectare has been developed under the scheme though they have released funds for the treatment of about 2.38 lakh hectares of wastelands in the country. In reply to a further question as to the total area of land actually developed under several schemes of the Government it was stated by them that they were not having information in this regard.

### **Measures to prevent Developed Land from Degradation**

2.20 When the Committee desired to know about the policy of the Government with regard to preventing developed land from degradation, the Department in its written reply stated that there was no specific policy for preventing developed land from degradation.

2.21 The Committee note that though the definition of the wastelands as laid down by the Expert Committee of the Planning Commission does not connote to the barren land as the term is commonly understood, however, the said definition was held as most appropriate and proper by the Mohan Dharia Committee. The Committee therefore, feel that for the purposes of identifying wasteland for development, the definition laid down by the Expert Committee of the Planning Commission should continue to be used by the Department.

2.22 The Committee note that the Department of Wastelands Development in collaboration with NRSA has undertaken a study to identify the wastelands by using remote sensing satellite images. They further note that the NRSA have so far completed the District level mapping of wastelands of 241 Districts against a total number of 521 District in the country. The Committee recommend that the

**Department of Wastelands Development should urge upon the NRSA to complete the work of mapping of wastelands in the remaining Districts of the country on priority basis.**

**2.23 The Committee note that The Department has not yet prepared any perspective plan for the development of wastelands in the country as the exact data about the extent of wastelands was not available. The Committee recommend that while every effort should be made to have the complete data at the earliest, the Government instead of waiting for data should prepare a plan to develop 175 m ha., wastelands, as estimated by National Commission on Agriculture, over a period of next 10-15 years.**

**2.24 The Committee observe that at present several Ministries/ Departments of the Government of India are engaged in the development of wastelands in the country. However, there was no agency at the Centre to coordinate their activities. The lack of proper coordination has resulted in over lapping of different schemes. The lack of coordination between different schemes of different Ministries/Departments of Government of India could be gauged from the fact that the Department of Wastelands Development in its written reply has stated that they do not have information about the area of wastelands actually developed under several schemes of the Government of India.**

**The Committee note that the high level Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia had recommended the establishment of a Central Land Use Authority and also the creation of a separate Department of Land Resources at the Centre.**

**As has been admitted by the Secretary, Department of Wastelands during his evidence and also in the written information furnished to the Committee the need for a central coordinating agency was being felt by them very badly, with this background in view, while the Committee would like to know the action taken by the Government on these recommendations of the Mohan Dharia Committee they feel that these recommendations of the Mohan Dharia Committee merit serious consideration by the Government. They also hope that in the larger interest of the country the Government will accept these recommendations of the Mohan Dharia Committee and will take immediate steps to set up a Central Land Use Authority and for creation of a separate Department of Land Resources at the Centre.**

**2.25 The Committee also urge the Government to impress upon the State Governments that they should bring all activities relating to the development of wastelands under the control of one Department with a view to avoiding overlapping of different schemes and to have better coordination in their implementation.**

**2.26 The Committee note that though the Department was created in July, 1992 it could develop only 1.82 lakh hectares of wastelands under the IWDP, while funds were released by them for the development of about 2.38 lakh hectares of wasteland. The Committee feel that adequate attention has not been paid by the Government towards the challenging task of development of wastelands in the country.**

**2.27 The development of wasteland in the country is an important weapon in the country's war against poverty. As observed by the Mohan Dharia Committee in its report that even if 120 m. ha. of wastelands could be made productive, it could generate employment to about 30 million families. With an average income of Rs. 10,000/- per ha., the national income of the country could go up by Rs. 1,20,000/- crore every year.**

**The Committee, therefore, urge that all out efforts should be made by the Government by pooling all the available resources under different Centrally funded/sponsored schemes to develop the wastelands in the country over a period of 10-15 years.**

**2.28 The Committee are constrained to note that the Government have no policy for preventing developed wasteland from degradation. They recommend that while developing wastelands, the Government should also pay adequate attention to prevent developed land from degradation.**



**CHAPTER III**  
**THE INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT**  
**PROJECT (IWDP) SCHEME**

**The Scheme**

As stated earlier IWDP is one of the schemes being implemented by the Department of Wastelands Development especially because a major portion of allocation of that Department is being spent on this scheme.

3.2 The Scheme envisages implementation of the Wastelands Development Programme by adopting an integrated approach to land management and wastelands development based on the village/watershed level plans prepared after taking into account land capability, site conditions and local needs, so as to promote optimum land use both for fulfilment of ecological and socio-economic needs.

**Objectives of the Scheme**

3.3 The scheme aims at fulfilment of the following immediate and long-term objectives.

(a) The immediate objectives are:—

- (i) Augmenting the availability of wood and non-wood forest products, specially fuelwood and fodder.
- (ii) Employment generation to the most needy sections of society, particularly those belonging to Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and landless rural labourers.
- (iii) Demonstration of micro-planning methodology for preparation of village level action plans and implementation of wastelands development programme.
- (iv) Extension and dissemination of proven technologies in various categories of problem lands.

- (v) Ensuring people's participation at all stages in the Wastelands Development Programme through various mechanisms intended to ensure equitable distribution of intermediate and final forest products.
- (b) The long-term objectives are:
- (i) Checking land degradation.
  - (ii) Fulfillment of the broader objectives of sustainability, equity and environmental conservation for the general good of the people.

### **Elements of the Scheme**

3.4 The scheme, which aims at integrating various activities with a view to preparing a plan of development keeping in view the local conditions at the micro-level, covers the following main elements:—

- (i) Preparation of integrated wastelands development plan at the micro-level on watershed basis in the Districts for which detailed wastelands maps have been prepared and on the basis of available thematic information in the other Districts.
- (ii) Conservation of selected ecologically fragile watersheds of the upper catchments and areas subject to shifting cultivation, through protection, afforestation, pasture land development including alpine pastures, soil and moisture conservation measures, etc. Catchments in the Himalayas will receive special attention.
- (iii) Extension of technologies for special problem lands like saline/alkaline soils, ravines, arid and desert areas, mined areas, marshy and water-logged areas, the Aravallis, the Western Ghats, the Eastern Ghats, the Himalayas, shifting cultivation areas, etc.
- (iv) Regeneration of degraded forest areas principally through natural regeneration and supplemented by afforestation, where necessary. Focus will be on raising diverse and indigenous species as well as on providing fuelwood, fodder, small timber, fruit and other minor forest produce, for the benefit of communities.

- (v) Improvement of pasture conditions in the alpine pastures and grazing conditions along migration routes and in the lower ranges for winter graziers. Survey of factual position regarding migratory grazing, the condition of graziers, intensity of grazing, availability of alpine pastures, etc., shall be carried out in order to draw a plan for taking up ameliorative programme for tackling the problems of migratory graziers.

### **Project Activities**

3.5 The major activities to be undertaken under IWDP, should include the following:

- (i) *In-situ* soil and moisture conservation measures like contour furrows, staggered trenches, mulching, box trenches, bench terracing, bunding, and vegetative barriers, etc.
- (ii) Soil and moisture conservation by adopting small scale engineering structures and vegetative measures like gully plugging, check dams, retaining and breast walls, toe walls, spurs and torrent control measure, small water harvesting structures etc.
- (iii) Planting and sowing of multi-purpose trees, shrubs, grasses, and legumes, as well as fodder production and pasture land development including seed and seedling production.
- (iv) Cultural operations like cutting back to encourage coppicing/pollarding, climber cutting, weed removal, etc. to encourage natural regeneration.
- (v) Promotion of agro-forestry and horticulture, sericulture, scientific animal husbandry etc. as appropriate.
- (vi) Wood substitution and fuelwood conservation measures, etc.
- (vii) Measures needed to disseminate technology.

3.6 Explaining the activities being undertaken under I.W.D.P., the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development, during his evidence before the Committee stated that under the scheme, work regarding soil conservation of agricultural land, plantation on incultivable land etc, is done. Emphasis was being laid by them on planting such trees

which could mature early and local people could reap the benefit. Under I.W.D.P. they select such lands whose productivity could be increased with reasonable expenditure. After selecting the land, they grow fodder, plants and also use it for agricultural purposes, depending upon the local need and nature of land.

3.7 When the attention of the witness was drawn to the impressions of the sub-Committee which visited Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh during October 1996, that on the lands which are being developed, wild growth was not being replaced by planting fruit bearing trees which could be more useful and profitable to the local people, the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development stated that though instructions have been issued to the implementing agencies for planting fruit bearing trees, it creates some problems in actual implementation. Explaining the problems being faced by them in this regard he stated that the tree plantation being different from agriculture, they were not able to protect the fruit bearing trees from animals, etc. Sometimes even the wild growth regenerates itself thereby affecting the growth of fruit bearing trees. According to instructions issued by them selection of variety of trees to be planted on a wasteland should be such as would encourage local people's participation in the scheme.

3.8 The Committee note that though the guidelines under the scheme provide for planting fruit bearing trees on the wastelands, these guidelines are not being followed by implementing agencies. The Committee, therefore, recommended that while sanctioning funds for a project, the Department should ensure that guidelines laid by them are followed by the implementing agencies. They also recommend that while selecting a variety of trees to be planted under I.W.D.P., emphasis should be given to such varieties which suited the requirement and need of the local people.

## CHAPTER IV

### BUDGETARY PROVISION FOR INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT

#### Financing Pattern

According to the written information furnished by the Department, Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) scheme is a Plan Scheme of the Department of Wastelands Development in which the funds are released on project-wise basis. No allocation of Central funds is made on State-wise basis. The funds are released to DRDAs/PIAS through bank draft on project-wise basis.

#### Contribution by the State Governments

4.2 It was further stated in the written reply as well as during the evidence before the Committee that the IWDP is a flagship scheme of the Department of Wastelands Development and projects are sanctioned on the basis of 100 per cent Central Assistance. As such State Governments are not required to contribute any amount towards this scheme.

4.3 In response to a query from the Committee as to the funds allocated and expenditure incurred under the scheme since 1992-93 till date, the Department in its written reply stated as under:—

Year	Allocation	Expenditure
1992-93	16.83	16.83
1993-94	40.72	44.49
1994-95	49.20	53.04
1995-96	49.50	51.00
1996-97	50.50	—
Projected outlay during 1997-98	—	Rs. 220.00 crore.
Approved outlay during 1997-98	—	Rs. 74.50 crore.

4.4 When asked whether any assessment has ever been made of the financial outlay required for development of total wastelands in the country, the Department in its written reply stated that the requirement of financial outlay depends on the extent of wastelands. At present the unit cost of Rs. 4000/- has been adopted in DOWD. As per the report on Area Statistics of Land Use/Land Cover Generated Using Remote Sensing Techniques by NRSA, Hyderabad, the total extent of wastelands in 1995 has been assessed as 75.5 million ha. in the country. At 1997-98 level, @ Rs. 4000 per ha. the total requirement of funds would be of the order of Rs. 30,200 crore.

4.5 In reply to the question whether the provision of Rs. 95 crore in the budget for the scheme was sufficient for the development of wastelands in the country, the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development, during his evidence before the Committee stated that they would require 1,40,000 crore of rupees for development of all the wastelands in the country.

4.6 It was further stated by him that the Department were mainly working on those projects where the productivity of the land could be increased by spending Rs. 4000/- per hectare. However, the cost of development of wastelands would depend upon the nature of wastelands to be developed. For example, if a waterlogged wasteland was to be developed it would involve an expenditure of Rs. 50 to 60 thousands per hectare whereas in the case of development of extremely barren land the expenditure could be about Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000/- per hectare. He however, stated that according to him, money was no constraint so far as development of wastelands was concerned, as under different schemes—in State plans several crores of rupees were available.

4.7 The question of availability of resources was also gone into by the Mohan Dharia Committee according to them:—

“A superficial look at the magnitude of the problems that face us with regard to about 175 m. ha. of degraded lands and wastelands may give the impression that huge investments will be required to implement a time bound programme for their amelioration, and that lack of financial resources may come in the way of such an undertaking.”

Such fears are however largely imaginary. If we look at the matter a little more closely, we find that even if we assume that our 175 odd m. ha. of degraded and wastelands will on an average require an investment of around Rs. 8,000 per hectare for this amelioration the total amount required will be of the order of Rs. 1,40,000 crores at current prices. If the programme is spread over 15 years it will require an annual outlay of around Rs. 9,300 crores.

According to information collected by the DWD, the amounts that are presently available from schemes which have an important component of afforestation and soil and water conservation are as follows:—

	(Rs. crores)
1. Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment	1250 per annum
2. Ministry of Environment & Forests	906 per annum
3. Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperation	260 per annum
4. Planning Commission	362 per annum
5. NABARD	50 per annum
6. State Soil Conservation Department	341 per annum
7. State Land Development Banks	1106 per annum
<b>Total :</b>	<b>4275 per annum</b>

Apart from this investment, farmers are also using their own resources for soil and moisture conservation works on their own lands. Even if we assume that such investment are of the order of Rs. 700 to Rs. 800 crore per annum, the total availability of funds adds up to around Rs. 5000 crore a year. This mean that

the gap in resource will be around Rs. 4300 crores per annum. However, since the Prime Minister has recently announced that funds for rural development will be doubled during the 9th Plan, this gap will be automatically covered."

4.8 When asked as to how the Department ensure that the total budget allocation was used by them for a balanced development of wastelands in the country, the secretary, Department of Wastelands Development during his evidence before the Committee stated that they address a communication to all the State Governments to send proposals for development of wastelands in their States. On receipt of the proposals they are examined as per the standards laid down in this regard and if a proposal conforms to the guidelines, the same is sanctioned. According to them they do not receive projects in such a large number as may require rationing of funds.

4.9 In reply to the query whether any priority was given by the Department to a specific problem land under the scheme, the Department in its written reply stated as under:—

"Under on-going IWDP projects no prioritization for specific category of problem land has been fixed. Projects are sanctioned on various types of problem lands as they are posed."

4.10 According to the information furnished by the Department it is observed that during the period from 1992-93 to 1996-97 either they have not released any money for certain projects or if released, the amount was very negligible. When the Department was asked to explain the phenomena, the written note furnished by them stated that the funds in IWDP are released in favour of DRDAS/PIAs on receipt of up-to-date quarterly progress reports, audited statement of accounts, utilisation certificate, favourable mid-term evaluation reports by independent evaluators and utilisation of funds previously released. In case of projects where these conditions are not fulfilled or the quarterly progress reports do not reflect complete information and matter/clarifications are required from DRDAS, the release of funds has to wait.

#### **Utilization of funds**

4.11 In response to a question whether the Department maintained any data about the balance of funds released under the



scheme lying unspent with each District, the Department in its written reply stated that they sanction the projects under this scheme on project to project basis. The overall information in respect of unspent balance is not available at any given point of time. However, while releasing, the subsequent funds in each project utilisation certificate, the trend of expenditure and evaluation report are kept in view. However, no amount remained unspent under the scheme during 1992-93 to 1995-96.

4.12 When the Committee desired to know from the Secretary (WD), during his evidence before them, as to the total amount released by them and expenditure incurred on each project Statewise, the Department furnished a statement (see appendix III) showing amount released by them and expenditure incurred under IWDP schemes Statewise. According to this statement, in the case of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa, Tamil Nadu Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, the percentage of unspent balance of funds released by the Government varies from 30 to 51 per cent. In the case of Meghalaya and National Capital Territory of Delhi not even a single rupee was spent by the concerned State/UT Government, out of the funds released under the IWDP.

### **Timely Release of Money**

4.13 When the attention of the Department was invited to the observation of the sub-Committee of Committee on Urban and Rural Development which visited Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat during October, 1996 that the funds were not being released for the scheme by the Central Government in time, the Department in its written reply stated as under:—

“The release of funds is subject to receipt of Utilisation Certificate, Quarterly Progress Reports and Audited Statement of Accounts. In majority of the cases, there is delay in submission of these documents in time especially, Statement of Accounts, Utilisation of funds, QPRs. Hence, the Department is not able to release funds timely.”

### Physical Achievement under the Scheme

4.14 As stated earlier in the report, upto 1995-96 an area of 1.82 lakh hectares has been developed under the scheme as indicated below:—

	Target (physical-h.a)	Achievement (physical-h.a)
1992-93	27,000	27,000
1993-94	50,000	50,000
1994-95	65,000	65,000
1995-96	58,000	40,000(tentative)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,00,000</b>	<b>1,82,000</b>

4.15 When the Department was asked to provide information about the physical and financial progress in each of the project, the Department in its written reply stated:—

“That the targets are worked out on national basis of approximate average cost for development of the entire project area. As and when utilisation certificate is received and demand is placed for further funds, the release is considered. Information in respect of physical and financial progress of the project keeps changing as per the utilisation of funds for different components of the project which include afforestation, pasture development, promotion of natural re-generation, soil and moisture conservation works, distribution of smokeless chulhas etc. As such it is not possible to quantify the impact of all these components in physical terms. Moreover due to constraints at the field level, the utilisation of funds is not phased out by the PIAs as provided in the sanction order. Due to the above reasons the actual year-wise physical coverage of area is not possible to indicate.

Under the new guidelines, applicable from 1995-96, the first instalment of 15% of outlay is mainly used for community organisation, administration, infrastructure development including training, etc. and coverage of physical area under

most of the activities cannot be quantified. Under the watershed approach, the financial and physical targets are assigned keeping in view the gross coverage of whole area of the micro-watersheds and total land surface is not additively covered under the particular land based operation."

#### **Diversion of funds**

4.16 When the attention of the Department was invited to the observation of the sub-Committee II of the Committee that during their on-the-spot study-visit to Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh, they found that Central funds allocated to different projects in these States were being diverted, the Department in its written reply has stated that the observations of the Committee will be communicated to the State Governments for necessary action.

4.17 The Committee note that though the IWDP is the biggest scheme of the Department of Wastelands Development and major portion of the funds allocated to that Department are allocated to this scheme, neither the Planning Commission nor the Department of Wastelands Development have given any importance to the development of the wastelands in the country as against the demand made by the Department for allocation of Rs. 220 crore during the year 1997-98 only a small amount of Rs. 74.50 crores was allocated by the Planning Commission. On the other hand, the Department while admitting that funds were no constraint so far as development of wastelands was concerned, could only develop 1.82 lakh hectares of wastelands over a period of about 5 years. As the Committee have already remarked, the development of wastelands not only regenerate the natural resources but also help in generation of national wealth and alleviation of rural poverty. The Committee therefore, recommend that the Planning Commission while considering the proposal of the Department of wastelands for allocation of funds should adopt a more pragmatic approach. At the same time they urge the Department to pool all the resources at their command so as to achieve better results under the scheme.

4.18 The Committee note that the Department in its written reply has stated to achieve 100 per cent targets so far as

utilization of funds is concerned. However, the information in regard to individual projects/States reveals a different story as funds to the tune of 30 to 51 per cent were lying unspent with States/UTs. The Governments of Meghalaya and the National Capital Territory of Delhi have not spent any amount out of the funds released under the scheme. The Committee are constrained to observe that the State Governments are not fully utilising the funds released under the scheme for the development of wastelands in their States. As may be seen from the Statement at Appendix III that the amount of unspent balances with the State Governments ranges from 30 per cent to 100 per cent.

They hardly need to emphasise that by not properly utilising the funds released by the Central Government, the State Governments are not only blocking the scarce and precious money but also become instrumental in delaying the process of development of wastelands resulting in further, delay in regeneration of national wealth which otherwise would have been produced by the wastelands developed under the scheme. They, therefore, urge the Central Government to impress upon the State Governments to properly utilise the funds for the purposes of the scheme so that the projects could be completed in time.

4.19 The Committee note that while at one stage the Department has stated that no amount remains unutilised under the scheme, they have also furnished details of amount which remained unspent with individual projects. The Committee are constrained to observe that while furnishing information to the Committee at their behest no check appears to have been exercised in the Department to ensure that there was no contradiction in the information furnished to the Committee. The Committee, therefore recommend that while furnishing information to the Committee a proper check must be exercised in the Department.

4.20 The Committee regret to observe that off late it has become a tendency on the part of State Governments to divert the funds released by the Central Government for specific projects to other activities not related to the development work. The Committee feel that this tendency on the part of the State Governments not only

**delays the implementation of the various schemes for which the funds are meant but also compel the poor people for whose benefit and upliftment these schemes have been conceived to continue to live below the poverty line.**

**The Committee, therefore, urge the Central Government that they should take up the matter with the State Governments at the highest level so as to put an immediate step to the practice of diversion of funds meant for Centrally funded/sponsored schemes by the State Governments.**

## **CHAPTER V**

### **Monitoring of IWDP**

When the Department was asked to explain the mechanism evolved to monitor the IWDP scheme, the Department in its written information stated that there was a close monitoring of all the projects being implemented under the above mentioned scheme through the process of quarterly/half yearly progress reports, submission of utilisation certificates and audited statements of accounts. In addition to the above in built mechanism, independent evaluators are appointed for evaluation of the projects. Also Officers of the Department of Wastelands Development from time to time make inspection of different projects under the various schemes.

5.2 The Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development, during his evidence before the Committee stated that there should be proper monitoring of schemes. He however admitted that the IWDP scheme has not been monitored properly and adequately and there was need for its proper monitoring.

#### **Monitoring where funds are directly released to NGOs**

5.3 When asked about the monitoring mechanism where funds are directly released to NGOs, the representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence stated that they did not release the second or subsequent instalment unless the evaluation report is received from the respective NGOs. In reply to the question as to who conducted the evaluation, the representative stated that the evaluation of projects implemented through NGOs, is done by an outside agency like forest conservator or by some other independent Institution.

5.4 On the attention of the witness being invited to the fact that State Governments have reported to have said that since the money was being released by the Government of India directly to the NGOs, they (State Governments) were not aware of the activities being undertaken by the NGOs, he stated that there were some problems in the case of NGOs. Some NGOs were of the view that if the funds were released through State Government it would involve undue delay in implementation of projects, whereas the State Governments were

taking the stand that since money was being released to NGOs directly they were not concerned with them. To overcome this problem and to have better monitoring of NGOs, from last year they have started sending a list of NGOs to whom the money has been released to State Governments.

The State Governments are also being requested that if their officers are visiting an area where a project under IWDP was being undertaken, they should visit such project. When it was pointed out to the witness that cases have come to the notice of the Committee where NGOs have spent funds on purposes other than development of wastelands, the representatives of the Department admitted that in certain cases where they have released funds to NGOs they have not received satisfactory reports. To correct this situation, the only alternative available was to take action against such NGOs. Though no action has so far been initiated against any NGOs, but there was need to initiate such action.

### **Overall impact of the Scheme**

5.5 When asked about the need for a study of the overall impact of the scheme, the Department in its written reply while admitting the need for such a study stated that from 1.4.95 they have changed the guidelines for the development of wastelands by adopting the watershed approach. These projects would be completed in a few years and then only would a worthwhile evaluation and important assessment of them be possible.

5.6 The Secretary Department of Wastelands Development during his evidence before the Committee also admitted that no detailed impact assessment of the scheme has been done so far.

5.7 It has further been stated that some institutions/experts were funded for conducting a detailed study of the impact of the IWDP scheme in the States of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Manipur, UP and Sikkim. As per the findings of evaluation study, the overall impact of the scheme has been assessed to be satisfactory. Some suggestions for improvement of the individual projects have however, been given in the assessment reports like adopting the right type of location, specific techniques and mobilisation of people to take a lead to make the project sustainable.

### **Coordination at State level**

5.8 When the Committee asked whether there was any coordination Committee at the State level, the representative of the Department during the course of his oral evidence, stated that at present there was no coordination Committee at the State level. However, they have written to the State Governments for constituting a Coordination Committee, under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary/Additional Chief Secretary etc. of the State.

5.9 The Committee note that as admitted by the Secretary, Department of Wastelands Development, during his evidence before the Committee, the monitoring mechanism as at present existing is neither adequate nor satisfactory. The Committee feel that in view of the importance, size and amount of funds involved in the IWDP Scheme, the Department should evolve some effective monitoring system so as to ensure that the projects under the scheme were implemented as per schedule and there was no scope for non-utilisation/diversion of funds in the hands of implementing agencies.

5.10 The Committee note that the Department while releasing funds to NGOs, also send a list of such NGOs to State Governments with the request that they may direct their officers to visit such projects when they happen to be in that area. The Committee hope that this change, will not only encourage NGOs to come forward to undertake projects for development of Wastelands but will also keep the State Governments informed of the projects being implemented in their States. The Committee will like to be informed of the impact of this change on the monitoring of projects being implemented by the NGOs.

5.11 The Committee also recommend that in addition to the visit by the State Government officials, Central Government officers, should also visit such projects from time to time.

5.12 The Committee also note that the Central Government have written to State Governments to constitute a Coordination Committee at State level for better coordination in the implementation of various schemes. They hope that the State Governments will respond positively by constituting such Committee. They will like to be informed of the Constitution of such Committee by the State Governments.



## **CHAPTER VI**

### **PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION**

With a view to making the IWDP a people's movement and to ensure the participation of local people in the scheme, the guidelines of the scheme, provide that the implementation of the scheme shall be on the basis of micro plans prepared in consultation with the local people, so that their needs are met and their participation ensured at all stages of development and management through a properly devised mechanism of sharing and benefit distribution. People's participation in the scheme is ensured through various agencies/bodies as discussed below:—

#### **(i) Participation of NGOs**

6.2 As per the common guidelines of the scheme, the projects under IWDP could be implemented through voluntary Agency/Non-Governmental Organisation.

6.3 During his evidence before the Committee, the representative of the Department stated that though the projects under the IWDP were selected and recommended by D.R.D.A., they (DRDA) were free to get those projects executed through NGOs. The Department in its written reply further stated that they encourage even new NGOs who do not have previous experience to take up work of wastelands development. Small projects are sanctioned to these NGOs/Cooperative Societies for their Capacity building so that subsequently they can take up bigger projects. Established NGOs are also encouraged to promote new NGOs.

#### **Total No. of NGOs involved in the Scheme**

6.4 According to the written information furnished by the Department, so far 232 NGOs have been involved in the development of non-forest wastelands under the scheme. The corresponding figure for the year 1995-96 was 213.

**(ii) Participation of women**

6.5 With a view to involving women in the implementation of IWDP schemes, the new guidelines for Watershed Development, provide for the participation of women groups to mobilise the village community for development of wastelands as an important component of the programme. The guidelines also provide that while making nominations, it may be ensured that Watershed Committee has adequate representation of women, members from the SCs/STs/Shepherd Community, etc.

6.6 As regards involvement of women, the following observations made by the Mohan Dharia Committee need to be mentioned:

“Women are central to the issue of wastelands development both as head loaders and primary gatherers of fuelwood and fodder. Involvement of women and women’s groups at every level and every programme for implementation and management would need to be ensured.”

**(iii) Involvement of Cooperatives**

6.7 When the Department was asked to state the number of cooperatives that were executing projects under IWDP, the Department in a written note stated that the IWDP projects under the new Guidelines for Watershed development were sanctioned to the national Tree Grower’s Cooperative Federation Limited, Anand, for implementation of the project in Chittoor District (AP) and Ajmer (Rajasthan). While giving details of the project they have stated that the (Andhra Pradesh) project was sanctioned during 1995-96 with a total outlay of Rs. 20.00 lakhs. The second project viz. Ajmer (Rajasthan) was also sanctioned during 1995-96 with a total outlay of Rs. 26.00 lakh.

**(iv) Role of Panchayats**

6.8 When asked about the role of Panchayats in the implementation of projects under IWDP, the Department in its written reply stated that under the common guidelines the scheme is being implemented through DRDA/Panchayat Raj Institutions. When the Committee suggested that the implementation of projects under IWDP should be entrusted to Village Panchayat, Gram Panchayat, Gram Sabha and District Board, the representative of the Department during his evidence

before the Committee stated that they were considering the proposal to replace NGOs by Panchayats so far as implementation of projects under IWDP was concerned as Panchayats own rural land and they can maintain it also. They are trying to involve Panchayats on an experimental basis from the current year itself so that the common land of the village could be utilised. He, however, observed that the Panchayats were not having adequate funds and if some financial assistance was given to them, they could develop the village land according to their need and choice. He hoped that if the Panchayats were involved in the implementation of the scheme, they would be able to generate financial funds for this purpose. When it was pointed out that by involving Gram Panchayats in implementation of projects under IWDP, the people will be directly participating in the scheme, thereby realising the dream of Mahatma Gandhi of having "Our village our rule", the representative of the Department reiterated that they will try to involve village panchayats in the projects so that the village land could be developed through Gram Panchayats as they will not be facing the problem regarding availability of wastelands, the difficulty which was being faced by NGOs at present.

6.9 Commenting upon the people's participation in the scheme, the representative of the Department during his evidence before the Committee admitted that as at present the people's involvement in the scheme was not much. To have the maximum benefit of the scheme, the beneficiaries have to be involved in the process of formulation, implementation and execution of projects. Effort should also be made to ensure that the projects were being implemented by the people themselves.

6.10 When the attention of the Department was drawn to the observation of the sub-Committee which visited Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat during October, 1996, that the Watershed Committee were not empowered to maintain the completed projects, the Department in their written reply stated that as per the guidelines, the Panchayat Raj institutions shall be responsible for the maintenance of assets created under the project.

#### **(v) Involvement of Peoples' Elected Representatives**

6.11 In response to the question as to how the MPs/MLAs/MLCs are being associated in the implementation of projects under IWDP scheme, the Department in its written reply has stated that

local MPs/MLAs/MLCs are involved in the scheme at DRDA/Zilla Parishad and Panchayat level. Their involvement ensures public participation.

**(vi) Involvement of Financial Institutions**

6.12 When the Department was asked whether the Government have any scheme to enthruse the private owners to develop wastelands owned by them, the Department in its written reply stated that a separate scheme, namely, the 'Central Sector Investment Promotional Scheme' has been launched in 1994 with the objective of mobilising/channelising resources from financial institutions including banks, corporate sector, etc. for development of wastelands. Extending of soft loan, including reduction in interest rate for financial loan, etc. fall within the purview of NABARD and the Department of Banking in the Ministry of Finance. However, they have not made any effort to develop/maintain any data base about the wastelands owned by private people.

**(vii) Publicity**

6.13 When the Department was asked to explain the steps taken by them to publicise the activities of the scheme and to create awareness amongst the people, they in their written reply stated that for disseminating information, creating awareness and activating implementing agencies and beneficiaries, all means of communication—mass media, traditional media, group media including inter-personnel communication are used to the fullest possible extent. Publicity through the electronic and print media is also used for greater coverage and visibility. They have also instituted a National Award, namely '*Rajiv Gandhi Parti-Bhoomi Mitra Award*' with the objective of according recognition to the outstanding work done by individuals and institutions for development of non-forest wastelands.

6.14 The representative of the Department during his evidence before the Committee also stated that to create awareness amongst the people and to ensure their participation they have also organised a workshop. He however, admitted that people's participation was not significant and there was need for a strong publicity programme in the villages to convince the local people

about the intentions of the Government about development of wastelands. They were planning to start an awareness generation and training programme. To make the publicity programme more effective they have identified the different levels and mode of publicity that will be more effective. They have also got made 15-20 video films about the scheme.

6.15 As observed by the Committee, the IWDP scheme is an important scheme. The extent of wastelands in the country clearly indicates that it will practically be impossible for the government alone to develop the same. The Committee therefore, recommend that Government should make all possible efforts to involve people from all walks of life in the development of wastelands in the country so that this movement could become a national movement.

6.16 The Committee hope that the observations made by the Mohan Dharia Committee regarding involvement of women in the implementation of projects under IWDP will be kept in view while selecting projects under IWDP and also at the time of reconstituting watershed monitoring committees at the District level.

6.17 The Committee also feel that at present the involvement of cooperative sector is not significant. They, therefore, urge the Government to encourage the cooperative sector to come forward to take up the task of development of wastelands in the country.

6.18 The Committee feel that the involvement of village panchayat in the implementation of projects under IWDP will not only reduce expenditure but will also create employment opportunities for the rural poor and unemployed people.

The Committee hope that with the enactment of the Constitution (73rd Amendment Bill) 1992, the Panchayats would be provided with enough funds so as to enable them to implement the various projects under IWDP in their respective jurisdiction. The Committee recommend that while selecting an implementing agency under the IWDP scheme. DRDA/Zilla Parishad should give preference to village panchayats. They also recommend that the guide-lines for the scheme

**should be considerably modified so as to ensure a proper place for village panchayats so far as the development of wasteland is concerned.**

**6.19 as regards, the involvement of local people in the IWDP schemes, the Committee feel that a lot more is required to be done to convince and assure the local people about the feasibility of the projects and also about the benefits that will accrue to them (local people) by the development of the wastelands. To achieve this objective, more attention has to be paid to the publicity of the scheme through different means. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should chalk out a proper plan of publicity and should allocate sufficient funds for the purpose.**

## CHAPTER VII

### RESEARCH AND TRAINING

In reply to the question as to the measures taken by the Department for technology development and its extension, the Department in its reply stated that agro-forestry models evolved by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research on pilot scale are taken up. The main objective is to increase productivity of wastelands integrating intercropping with trees to meet fuel wood, fodder, timber, fibre and food needs of the people. It has further been stated that the Technology Development Extension and Training Scheme provides for extension of research in the fields of the farmers besides developing demonstration plots for replication of models and training of farmers. This would bring better results for the scheme in future.

7.2 When asked whether any specific amount was allocated for R&D under the scheme, the Department in its written reply has stated that no specific amount is allocated for R&D under the scheme. However, during 9th Plan the Government envisage to extend support for R&D. It was further stated that there was provision of financial support in the form of grant for research and development of wastelands under the ongoing Central Sector Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme. A provision of Rs. 2 crore was made in the budget for R&D during the year 1996-97.

7.3 The outlay has been substantially stepped up to a level of Rs. 8 crore for the year 1997-98. When the Committee desired to know whether any training Centres have been set up by the Government to impart training to the various agencies involved in the implementation of IWDP, the representative of the Department of Wastelands Development during the course of the evidence before the Committee replied in the negative.

7.4 As regards taking advantage of the foreign technology the Department in its reply stated that for degraded arid lands management a project has been undertaken in Rajasthan using JOJOBA Plantations with transfer of Israeli technology. Under this Project-fully funded by DOWD entitled "JOJOBA Plantations and Research Project". Israeli technology is availed particularly on the development of cost effective

and good genetic planting materials. In addition JOJOBA seeds and drip irrigation systems are also availed from Israel. The project has been designed for a period of 5 years and is expected to be completed by the year 2000 AD.

**7.5 The Committee note that during 1996-97 a meagre amount of Rs. 2 crore was provided for Technology Development, Extension & Training Scheme.**

**The Committee further note that the Government have substantially stepped up the budget allocation for the Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme, during the year 1997-98. The Committee hope that with the increased allocation for T.D.E & T Scheme, some tangible results will be achieved and the user will be benefited by the technological development in the field.**



## CHAPTER VIII

### STRATEGY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO DEVELOP WASTELANDS DURING 9TH FIVE YEAR PLAN

When the Department of Wastelands Development was asked to explain the strategy of the Government to develop the wastelands during the 9th Five Year Plan, the Department in its written reply stated as under:—

- (i) "The data base for wastelands should be established on the basis of scientific and technological input such as remote sensing satellite imageries, integrating computer base land information system including socio-economic aspects of the human and animal population of the Watershed.
- (ii) Technological conservation measures for wastelands development.
- (iii) Rejuvenation/regeneration of weathered barren rocky areas to enable bringing additional areas to productive use.
- (iv) Reclamation of special problem wastelands.
- (v) Close coordination with ICAR and State Agricultural Universities for research input with reference to location specific wasteland problems.
- (vi) For ensuring people's participation, visit to the concerned institutions and local workshop should be organised to create awareness and motivation among the farmers. This may also be extended to NGOs who are interested in taking such projects either under 'Support to NGOs' or as Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs) in the IWDP scheme".

8.2 The Committee note that the Government have evolved a strategy to develop wastelands during Ninth Plan. The Committee hope that the Government will take all necessary steps according to the strategy evolved by them for the development of wastelands during the Ninth Plan. They also recommend that the Government, in the light of practical experience gained, should review the strategy laid down by the Government.

NEW DELHI;  
24 July, 1998  

---

2 Shravana, 1920 (Saka)

KISHAN SINGH SANGWAN  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Urban and Rural Development.

## APPENDIX I

### WASTELAND AREA OF 241 DISTRICTS IN 21 STATES

Sl. No.	States/UTs	Wasteland Area of 241 Districts in India (in lakh ha.)
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	48.813
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1.620
3.	Assam	8.680
4.	Bihar	16.203
5.	Gujarat	20.989
6.	Goa	0.613
7.	Haryana	2.544
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5.051
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	9.832
10.	Karnataka	17.118
11.	Kerala	0.975
12.	Madhya Pradesh	69.714
13.	Maharashtra	38.323
14.	Manipur	5.351
15.	Nagaland	4.617
16.	Orissa	21.342
17.	Punjab	1.029

1	2	3
18.	Rajasthan	51.835
19.	Tamil Nadu	14.806
20.	Uttar Pradesh	14.904
21.	West Bengal	2.112
Total States		356.471

or  
35.647 Ml. ha.

Source : National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA)—1986-93; 1 : 50,000 scale wastelands maps prepared from Lands at Thematic Mapper/IRS LISS II Data.

## APPENDIX II

### CATEGORY-WISE WASTELAND AREA OF 241 CRITICALLY AFFECTED DISTRICTS IN INDIA

(Area in sq. kms)

S. No.	Category	Total W.L.	% to total Geographical Area covered
1.	Gullied and/or Ravinous land	18857.48	0.92
2.	Upland with or without scrub	135761.88	6.67
3.	Waterlogged and Marshy land	4232.38	0.21
4.	Land affected by salinity/ alkalinity-coastal/inland	12342.50	0.60
5.	Shifting cultivation area	18103.86	0.89
6.	Under utilised/degraded notified forest land	106897.81	5.25
7.	Degraded pastures/grazing land	13389.35	0.66
8.	Degraded land under plantation crop	4877.15	0.24
9.	Sands-Inland/Coastal	6585.76	0.32
10.	Mining/Industrial wastelands	832.88	0.04
11.	Barren rocky/stony waste/sheet rock area	25773.60	1.26
12.	Steep sloping area	4186.76	0.20
13.	Snow covered and/or glacial area	4628.70	0.23
<b>Total Wasteland Area</b>		<b>356470.11</b>	<b>17.49</b>

### APPENDIX III

#### STATEMENT SHOWING THE AMOUNT RELEASED AND EXPENDITURE INCURRED UNDER IWDP SCHEME STATEWISE (1991-92 TO 1996-97)

(in Rs.)

Total Project cost	Total Released	Total Achievement	Total Balance	
1	2	3	4	5
1. Andhra Pradesh				
5377.78	2853.15	1718.21	1134.94	39.78%
2. Bihar				
1828.63	1208.51	645.99	562.52	46.55%
3. Gujarat				
4026.16	2349.01	1511.75	837.26	35.64%
4. Haryana				
1893.63	1138.08	1236.1	- 112.52	108.61%
				(Expenditure as a % of release)
5. Himachal Pradesh				
1284.51	862.57	610.004	252.57	29.28%
6. Jammu & Kashmir				
137.11	111.79	91.38	20.41	18.26%

	1	2	3	4	5
7. Karnataka	929.11	787.89	596.20	191.69	24.33%
8. Kerala	1649.61	1019.02	2703.94	214.28	21.03%
9. Madhya Pradesh	3503.72	1247.98	663.42	584.56	46.84%
10. Maharashtra	198.76	180.50	183.65	- 3.15	101.74% (Expenditure as a % of Release)
11. Meghalaya	117.39	57.42	0	57.42	100%
12. Manipur	202.20	200.47	199.79	0.68	0.33%
13. Mizoram	359.95	351.95	341.52	10.43	2.96%
14. Nagaland	1674.67	1028.71	720.9	307.81	29.92%

	1	2	3	4	5
15. Orissa					
	2010.29	1242.56	791.76	450.80	36.28%
16. Punjab					
	1318.73	771.16	593.26	177.90	23.07%
17. Rajasthan					
	3500.89	2156.46	1803.39	353.07	16.37%
18. Sikkim					
	1151.52	758.03	748.8	9.23	1.22%
19. Tamil Nadu					
	1576.09	638.44	306.92	328.63	51.47%
20. Tripura					
	145.44	64.58	53.48	11.10	17.19%
21. Uttar Pradesh					
	5250.20	2035.17	1288.91	745.69	36.64%
22. West Bengal					
	1214.82	807.49	567.22	240.27	29.75%
23. Delhi					
	55.75	15.00	0	15.00	100%



## APPENDIX IV

### MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE-II ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT HELD ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1996

The Sub-Committee met on 30th September, 1996 from 1100 hrs. to 1140 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Chitra Sen Sinku
3. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

At the outset the Convenor, sub-Committee II informed that the sub-Committee had been constituted to examine the subject Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme (IWDP). Thereafter, the sub-Committee had indepth internal discussion on the various aspects of the Scheme. It was decided that the detailed information with regard to outlay & performance State-wise and Department-wise might be sought from the Department by the Secretariat. The next Sitting may be convened on 14th and 24th October, 1996 to discuss the Scheme in detail and have oral evidence of the Department.

*The sub-Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX V

### MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE-II ON INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SCHEME OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON 14TH OCTOBER, 1996

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexure, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
3. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
4. Shri Chitra Sen Sinku
5. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

2. The sub-Committee considered the preliminary material received from the Department of Wastelands Development on the subject 'Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme' (IWDP). The sub-Committee thereafter decided that before having official evidence on the subject they should make on-the-spot study visit to Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. It was decided that assembly of the tour should be in Bhopal on 28th October, 1996 and after visiting various projects and schemes implemented under IWDP in Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat the sub-Committee should disperse at Gandhi Nagar.

*The sub-Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX VI

### MINUTES OF THE THIRD SITTING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE-II ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT HELD ON 27TH MAY, 1997.

The sub-Committee met on Tuesday, 27th May, 1997 from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
3. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
4. Smt. Ketki Singh
5. Shri Chitra Sen Sinku

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

#### REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT (DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT)

1. Dr. N.C. Saxena — *Secretary (RD-WD)*
2. Shri T.N. Srivastava — *Additional Secretary*
3. Shri Hoshiyar Singh — *Joint Secretary*
4. Shri J.D. Sharma — *Deputy Inspector General—Forests.*

2. At the outset the Convenor welcomed the Secretary, Rural Development (Wastelands Development) and his colleagues to the sitting of the sub-Committee and invited their attention to the provisions of Directions 55 and 58 of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. The sub-Committee then took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (Department of Wastelands Development) on the subject of Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme.

The representatives of the Ministry explained and elaborated on the queries from the members.

4. The sub-Committee directed the representatives of the Ministry to furnish written information on the following points:—

- (i) List of projects undertaken by the Department under the Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme and the area of land developed under the Scheme so far;
- (ii) Financial Allocation and amount spent on each project;
- (iii) Ratio of administrative cost incurred by non-Governmental Organisations on each project; and
- (iv) A statement showing comparative achievements by different organisations responsible for implementing the Scheme.

(A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept).

(The witnesses then withdrew).

*The sub-Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX VII

### COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1997-98)

#### MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE-II ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT & WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT HELD ON FRIDAY THE 28TH NOVEMBER, 1997

The sub-Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1130 hrs. in Room No. 119, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria — *Convenor*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
3. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
4. Shri Chitrasen Sinku

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
2. Shri P. V. L. N. Murthy — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, the Convenor welcomed the members to the sitting of the sub-Committee.

3. The sub-Committee then considered and approved the draft Report on the subject Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) Scheme.

4. The sub-Committee decided that the report as approved by them might be placed before the whole Committee for their consideration and approval.

*The sub-Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX XIII

### COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

#### MINUTES OF THE 15TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 22nd JULY 1998

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri D. S. Ahire
3. Dr. Shaifiquur Rahman Barq
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Sriram Chauhan
6. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
7. Shrimati Malti Devi
8. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
9. Shri Vinod Khanna
10. Shri Subhas Maharia
11. Shri Chandresh Patel
12. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
13. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
14. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
15. Shri Gaddam Ganga Reddy
16. Shri Ramjidas Rishidev
17. Shri I. M. Jayaram Shetty
18. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
19. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti

