

13

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

TWELFTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(1996-97)**

THIRTEENTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

February, 1999/Magha, 1920 (Saka)

8-3657K



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

(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—(1996-97)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the First Report of the Standing Committee on
Urban & Rural Development (Eleventh Lok Sabha)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on.....
Laid in Rajya Sabha on.....



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

February, 1999/Magha, 1920 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 30.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY

Co. No.

Acc. No. 101255 (R)

Date 16/4/99

LC

328.3657R

N8.13:1

© 1999 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 THIRTEENTH REPORT (12TH LOK SABHA)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
5	1	Rely	Reply
9	32	After 'that' add 'by'	
14	16	Took	took
26	11	upgradation	updation
43	10	IX	IXth
27	19	upgraded	updated
51	26	security scheme	Assistance Programme
64		At the end of para II add 'Percentage to total recommendations - 86.21%'	
64	13	86.21%	8.62%

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	12
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	53
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	59
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	61

APPENDICES

I. Minutes of the 33rd sitting of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development held on 25.1.99	62
II. Analysis of action-taken by the Government on the recommendations, contained in the First Report (11th Lok Sabha)	64

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN & 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. Rajasekhar Reddy

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 11.6.1998.

23. Shri Ramjidas Rishidev
24. Shri Chatin Singh Samaon
25. Shri Nikhilaranda 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 Vijyantimala Bali
33. Shri Nilotpall 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 — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Thirteenth Report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

2. The First Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 27th August, 1996. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 13th April, 1998.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 25th January, 1999.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report of the Committee (Eleventh Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix-II.

NEW DELHI;
3 February, 1999
14 Magha, 1920 (Saka)

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) deals with the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their First Report on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 27th August, 1997.

2. Action Taken Notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 58 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:—

- (i) Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government:—

Sl. Nos. 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 4.16, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 4.20, 4.21, 4.22, 4.23, 5.11, 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.10, 6.11, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, 7.13, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 9.4, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 13.3(a), 13.3(b), 13.3(c), 13.4(a), 13.4(b), 13.4(d), 13.4(f), 13.4(g), 13.4(h), 13.4(i) and 13.5.

- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue:—

Sl. Nos. 7.14, 8.3, 13.4(c), 13.4(e) and 13.4(j)

- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee.

Sl. Nos. 4.15 and 5.15.

- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:—

Sl. No. 12.2.

3. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of these recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.

A. Underspensing in Rural Water Supply Programme

Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)

4. The Committee recommended as under—

“The Committee are dismayed to note the underspensing of 6.24% under Rural Water Supply Programme. Of equal concern is the position in States *viz.* Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, UP where outstanding balances have almost doubled from 1994-95 to 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Department in this regard.”

5. The Government in their reply have stated—

“The underspensing of 6.24% under the Rural Water Supply Programme during 1995-96 was mainly due to want of adequate project proposals seeking funds by the States under the Sub-Missions to deal with the quality problems of drinking water, Human Resource Development (HRD), Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) etc. Another important reason was the non-implementation of the new component of Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme in DPAP areas which could not be got approved from the Government during the VIII Five Year Plan. The savings under the above items of Rural Water Supply programme could however, have been utilised under the Centrally Sponsored ARWSP as there were demands for additional funds by some of the States. However, re-appropriation of funds from the various components of the Programme to the ARWSP was not approved by the Ministry of Finance (Department of expenditure) as a prudent financial practice as release of additional funds in the month of February and March, 1996 would remain un-utilised with the States resulting in heavy carry overs.

The increase in the outstanding balances in 1994-95 to 1995-96 in the case of Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh was mainly due to delayed release of funds by the State Government to the Implementing agencies (Zila Parishads and UP Jal Nigam respectively). In the case of Kerala, the increase in the outstanding balance was due to the fact that a sum of Rs. 1086 lakh was released towards the end of February and March 1994 which could not be utilised by the State Government during the year and, had to be carried over to the next financial year 1995-96. Except for the case of Andhra Pradesh, the outstanding balance

in 1996-97 was considerably reduced. It was Rs. 1247.76 lakh for Kerala and Rs. 462.63 lakh for Uttar Pradesh.

As a corrective measure, steps have been taken to utilize fully the approved outlay for Rural Water Supply programme for 1996-97. The position of outstanding balance was also reviewed in the third meeting of the Empowered Committee of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission held on 24th October, 1996 when all the States and Union territories were requested to take steps to utilise fully the available funds during the financial year 1996-97. It is also proposed to make release of the allocated funds to all the States/UTs by the end of December, 1996 so as to leave adequate time for meaningful utilisation of the available resources to achieve the physical targets."

6. The Committee note that the Government in their reply have attributed non-utilization of 6.24 per cent funds under the RWSP during 1995-96 to the lack of proposals from States and non implementation of new component of ARWSP in DPAP areas. They further note that outstanding balances in 1994-95 and 1995-96 with the States of Andhra Pradesh and UP were due to delayed release of funds by these States to the Implementing agencies. The Committee feel that appropriate steps were not taken by the Government to invite project proposals from State Governments under RWSP. They, therefore, recommend that proposals under the scheme should be invited from States well in advance before formulating Budget proposals in this regard.

They also recommend that the State Governments should be impressed upon to release the funds to the Implementing agencies in time so that such situations do not occur in future.

B. Community Latrines

Recommendation (Para No. 5.15)

7. The Committee recommended as under—

"The Committee urge that to cover more and more population under the programme thrust should be given on community latrines besides individual latrines."

8. The Government in their reply have stated—

"The general guidelines for implementation of CRSP provide that upto 10% of the annual funds should be used for

Construction of exclusive complexes for women (Community) where adequate space is not available in the village, if the Panchayat agrees to provide the land and undertake the responsibility to maintain such complexes. However, some of the States like Tamil Nadu have experienced that the scheme has not yielded the desired results because of poor response from the community and non use of the complexes established. The community latrines (about 11217) constructed by the State Government of Tamil Nadu during 1980-84 were not put to use by the community. In view of the past experience, the matter is left to the judgement of the implementing States to give the desired priority to women complexes/community latrines keeping in view their specific needs, constraints and acceptability by the Panchayats which have also to share 30% of the cost of such complexes."

9. The Committee note that in reply to their recommendation for a thrust on Community latrines the Government in their Action Taken Reply have cited a specific case of the State of Tamil Nadu in which the community latrine scheme could not become popular due to poor response of the Community. They regret that instead of finding out the reasons for poor response of the Community to Community Latrines Scheme in Tamil Nadu and taking necessary corrective steps in this regard, they have tried to generalise the poor response to other States also. They while reiterating their recommendation for giving thrust to Community Latrines Scheme, would like to be informed of the reasons for poor response to Community Latrines Scheme in Tamil Nadu and also the steps taken by the Government to rectify the situation particularly when sufficient funds have already been blocked in construction of about 11217 community latrines in the State of Tamil Nadu alone.

C. National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM) under the purview of Ministry of Agriculture

Recommendation (Para No. 12.2)

10. The Committee recommended as under—

"The Department in the written note have stated that decision regarding keeping National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (N/A/M) under the purview of Ministry of Agriculture is being taken shortly. The Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation."

11. The Government in their reply have stated—

“No decision is taken in the matter till date. The matter is being referred to the Committee of Secretaries for consideration so that a consensus opinion may emerge for arriving at a final decision.”

12. The Committee note that in response to their recommendation to bring the National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM) under the purview of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Government have stated that the matter is being referred to the Committee of Secretaries for arriving at a decision. The Committee hope that the decision in the matter would be taken without any further delay. They would also like to be informed about the final decision in this regard.

D. Review of Eighth Five Year Plan and the strategy for Ninth Five Year Plan

Recommendation [Para Nos. 13.3(b) and 13.3(c)]

13. The Committee recommended as under—

“Not only there is underspending in 8th Plan outlay for different Projects/Schemes, but releases to States are lesser than the allocation. Further alarming feature is that there are huge unspent balances with the States. In some of the States, the utilisation is marginal in specific programmes. The Committee also observe that under different programmes of the Department, States are not allocating the matching share. They would like that while chalking out the strategy for Ninth Plan, Govt. should reconsider and review the programme. If needed the schemes/programmes should be restructured.

The various factors responsible for the non-implementation of the various schemes/programmes of the Department are (i) the monitoring of the scheme is not adequate. States are not furnishing the Utilisation Certificate and unspent balances are increasing year by year (ii) States are not contributing the matching share as per the guidelines (iii) the financial allocation is not adequate (iv) there is lack of linkages which results into the blocking of funds with State Governments and with local bodies in the States (v) Identification of beneficiaries is not proper

(vi) There is not adequate provision for the maintenance of assets created under the different programmes."

14. The Government in their reply have stated—

"The Eighth Plan Outlay under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) was Rs. 175 crore. However, actual allocation through budget Estimates in Annual Plan was Rs. 112.53 crore. It was further reduced to Rs. 98.85 crore under the scheme during the Eighth Plan Period, the release of funds to the States/UTs was of the order of 98.23 crore. The main reason for lower level of expenditure during the Eighth Plan Period was that the State Governments were not able to provide their 50% share in time which resulted in accumulation of unspent balances with them towards the Central Share and non-release of further funds to them. The State Governments particularly the North-Eastern States have been requesting for 100% Central assistance under the scheme.

With a view to improve the status of implementation of the scheme during the Ninth Plan, it is proposed to provide 100% Central assistance to North-Eastern States and increase the Central share from the present level of 50% to 80% in respect of other States.

No allocation is made under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records. Proposal submitted by the State Governments are examined by the National Level Steering Committee on computerisation of Land Records for its approval. The State Governments have been requested from time to time to submit utilisation certificate in the prescribed proforma. This scheme is a 100% Centrally Sponsored Scheme, so the question of matching share by States does not arise. The financial allocation is not made under the scheme. This scheme is being jointly implemented by Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment, NIC and Revenue Departments of State Governments. Local bodies are not involved under this scheme. The funds are sanctioned directly to State Government but not to the individual beneficiary. The maintenance of computers is being done by NIC.

The principal reason was the delay on the part of the State Governments in completing the necessary arrangements and procedures to launch the Programme, disbursing the benefits and submitting the expenditure statements to the Ministry. Monitoring of the implementation of the programme in the districts by the State Nodal Department was not adequate in 1995-96. This situation has improved in 1996-97 as a result of several steps taken by the Ministry but still in several States the monitoring mechanism at States level needs to be strengthened and streamlined.

The reason for under spending in VII Plan outlay under the central sector for rural supply and rural sanitation is due to no provision of the full outlay provided in the VIII Plan document. Except during 1995-96, almost entire allocation provided in the yearly budgets was released to the States/UTs/Implementing Agencies. All States/UTs are advised from time to time to ensure full utilisation of funds.

The existing guidelines of the programme permit the States to carry over unutilised amount, if any, upto 25% of the annual allocation in the case of ARWSP and 15% in the case of CRSP. While finalising the guidelines for the IX Five Year Plan, the existing provision regarding carry over of unutilised amount will be reviewed so as to restrict it to the barest minimum. The matter will be pursued with the States periodically to ensure that the releases made by the Central Government are utilised in full. It is ensured that the States make matching provision under the MNP as any shortfall in matching expenditure is recovered from the allocation for the next financial year in respect of the defaulting States.

The monitoring of the programmes has been strengthened. Utilisation certificates are received before release of the final instalment of funds for the year. The unspent balances have been reduced during 1996-97 as compared to that of 1995-96. This will be reduced further.

The States providing matching share as per the guidelines. In the case of one or two States where matching share is not provided the allocation of the State Government is reduced to the extent of the shortfall in the matching expenditure.

The final allocation both for ARWSP and CRSP by the Planning Commission is not adequate for the magnitude of the number of NC/PC quality affected habitations to be provided safe drinking water facilities and the rural population yet to be provided sanitation facilities. It is hoped that the position will improve during the IX Five Year Plan.

The blocking of funds with the State Governments is kept to the minimum. At present, funds under Rural Water Supply and Rural Sanitation Programmes are not released directly to the local bodies and there is no blocking of funds with them.

In the case of Rural Sanitation Programme, the beneficiaries below the poverty line are identified as per the list applicable for other rural development programmes or in the Gram Sabha through panchayat resolutions."

15. The Committee note that on the recommendation of the Committee to review the different programmes undertaken by the Department while chalking out the strategy for Ninth Plan in view of the unspent balances with States and for not providing the matching shares by States, the Government have furnished the factual position with regard to each of the schemes. Except for the scheme of strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) no action is proposed to be taken to review or restructure the remaining schemes/programmes. The Committee would like that the Government should reconsider their recommendation to review the different programmes and they should be informed of the action taken/proposed to be taken in this regard.

E. Review of Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(f)]

16. The Committee recommended as under:—

"Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme should be accorded priority. It is very unfortunate that only 14.62% of the rural population has so far been covered by the Rural Sanitation Programme. There should not be compartmentalisation of the programme. To give the proper meaning to sanitation this programme should be launched in a holistic manner. There should be sufficient thrust to publicity campaign through media

to motivate the masses to construct individual latrine without subsidy by the Centre. Contaminated water is another area of concern. Government should accord the adequate priority to ensure the safe drinking water to rural masses."

17. The Government in their reply have stated:—

"Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programmes have been accorded priority within the Five Year Plan resources:

- (a) The outlay for VIII Five Year Plan was raised to Rs. 10054.52 crore from Rs. 3455.77 crore in the VII Plan for rural water supply and to Rs. 674.23 crore from Rs. 100.955 crore in the VII plan for rural sanitation.
- (b) Rural Water Supply has been included as part of the Seven Basic Minimum Services with high priority as recommended in the Chief Minister's Conference held on 4-5 July, 1996 for which special funds have also been released to the States by the Planning Commission. It was also recommended in the Conference that there should be effective convergence of sanitation hygiene and Public Health with drinking water sources and facilities.
- (c) Both the programmes are part of the MNP and Twenty Point Programme.
- (d) The Working Group for the Ninth Plan recommended an outlay of Rs. 35311 crore for rural water supply and Rs. 2556 crore to Rs. 6252 crore depending upon the availability of outlay for rural sanitation, excluding contribution by the Panchayats/community beneficiaries.

Regarding Rural Sanitation Coverage the Government have stated—

"Based on the NSS survey data (1988-89) and progress under Government supported rural sanitation programme since then, the coverage as on 31.1.97 was 15.89% excluding coverage through private efforts and initiatives. The Working Group for the Ninth Plan has assessed that including coverage through private self-help programme, the coverage by the end of VIII Plan is expected to be around 25% of rural population. It has recommended that coverage during IX Plan should be raised by additional 50%

(33% through private efforts and 17% through Government assisted programme)"

As regards to Launching the programme and publicity campaigns the Government have stated—

"The Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment is in full agreement with the concerns and observations of the Standing Committee. In the review meeting with the States, it was stressed that the programme should be implemented in a holistic and integrated manner taking full advantage of the availability of safe drinking water and the facilities that can be provided under other poverty alleviation & Employment and Rural development programmes. Even though the Central guidelines do not provide for subsidy to individual households above the poverty lines, those states which are giving such subsidy out of their own funds have not been denied the benefit of Central assistance in the interest of accelerated coverage.

10% of CRSP funds are permitted for IEC, Publicity, motivation, etc. Adequate funds (Rs. 13 crore provided in 1996-97) are also provided under Rural Water Supply Programmes. IEC Cells are being set up in the States. Projects for IEC and Publicity campaign have been approved for 20 States. TV spots on sanitary construction is being launched."

To ensure safe drinking water in contaminated water areas Government have stated.

"Adequate priority is being given to the problem of chemical contamination in drinking water under the Sub-Mission Programme. Rs. 402.58 crore has been released during the VIII Five Year Plan to various States for projects approved under the Sub-Missions on Arsenic, excess fluoride, brackishness, excess iron, etc. A sum of Rs. 240 crore has been earmarked for 1997-98. States are also free to approve schemes under the ARWSP and the MNP to overcome the problem of contaminated water. States have also been requested to provide a total picture of the magnitude of the problem in their State by furnishing district-wise and quality-wise details of affected habitations so that in future projects under the sub-Mission can be considered keeping in view the water priorities and specific action plan and a measure of transparency adopting cost effective approach."

18. The Committee appreciate that the Ministry had earnestly given the priority to Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme within the Five Year Plan resources with special emphasis to ensure safe drinking water in contaminated water areas. The Government have also given sufficient thrust to publicity campaign. However, they feel that the proposed target with regard to Rural Sanitation Programme in the country i.e. 17% through Government assisted programmes during IX Plan is too low as compared to the magnitude of the problem. They would like that the targets should be substantially stepped up. As regards the expected coverage of 25% by the end of VIII Plan in respect of the said schemes the Committee would like that the present position in this regard be intimated to the Committee.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATION THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.5 and 3.6)

The Committee are very perturbed to note the outlay for 1996-97 which has been pegged at the outlay for 1995-96 except for the one programme National Social Security Programme launched on 15th August, 1995 under which there is substantial increase of 69.45%. They note that the outlay for 1996-97 doesn't cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends.

It is noted that one third of India's population live below the defined poverty line. Rural Development which encompasses the entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas can only be achieved with the eradication of poverty. They further note that an ambitious programme 'National Social Security Programme' has recently been launched by the Government. Considering the large activities of the Department and also the fact that providing minimum required necessity of life has been of primary concern in the economic planning and development process in the Country, the Committee feel that the plan outlay for 1995-96 is not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Department. Further, they observe that the Standing Committee in their 16th Report had recommended to increase the outlay for 1995-96 from Rs. 7700 crores to Rs. 10,500 crores. However, no increase was made during 1995-96. Further BE 1996-97 has also been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee are noted. As regards 1996-97, the Department had proposed an outlay of Rs. 4098 crores, but due to resource constraint, the Planning Commission approved only an outlay of Rs. 2195 crores. Excluding the outlay for National Social Assistance Programme, which was launched on 15th August, 1995, the approved outlay for the Department of Rural Development for 1996-97 was at

the same level as that of the previous year. The matter had been taken up with the Planning Commission subsequently also, but Planning Commission could not given an increase in the outlay.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/
96-GC(P)]

Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9)

The Committee are equally dismayed to note that the allocation of Rs. 2195 crores under 'plan head' could not be utilised fully by the Department. The unspent amount is Rs. 255 crores which is equivalent to 11% of the total Plan allocation. Expressing their concern about it Hon'ble Chairman during the course of oral evidence stated:—

“The Ministry of Rural Development as well as the State Governments are responsible for not getting higher allocation. The claim of a Department to have an increase depends on its performance. In many areas, the money have been unspent. Not only that. I am surprised and rather shocked to see that in your note you have not given a satisfactory reply to this point. You have to elaborate. After giving Rs. 100 crores to a State on a specific Head of Account, you cannot wash your hands saying that we have given the money. State is to give you utilisation certificate”.

The Committee would like to have an explanation of the Department in this regard. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilisation of funds to get the sufficient outlay for their different activities commensurating with the targets. The Committee feel that due to ineffective implementation, the poorest of the poor should not suffer for no fault of theirs. To achieve the laudable objectives set-fourth by the Department there is an urgent need to take corrective steps for the effective implementation of the Programmes/Schemes.

The Committee note that during 1996-97 under Non-Plan head not only there was hike of around 33% over BE of 1995-96, but there was 100% utilisation of funds which is indicative of the effective infrastructure provided for the implementation of the Programme/Schemes of the Department. Inspite of getting the adequate

infrastructure there is lack of proper planning and coordination. The Committee hope that the sufficient infrastructure would help in the 100% utilisation of funds under the 'Plan heads' and effective implementation of the Schemes.

Reply of the Government

National Social Assistance Programme:

The budget outlay for NSAP for 1995-96 was Rs. 550 crores. Release of funds by this Ministry during the year amounted to Rs. 380.48 crores. Expenditure reported by States/UTs in 1995-96 amounted to Rs. 193.93 crores. The shortfall in releases as compared to the budget provision is due to the fact that the second instalment of funds could be released only to 11 States since information on expenditure on the required level of expenditure was not received from the other States/UTs. Despite reminders.

NSAP was a new schemes which was launched from 15th August, 1995. The States/UTs. Took considerable time in completing the necessary procedural formalities, constitution of district level and State level Committees, opening of separate accounts etc. The release of first instalment of funds under the programme was subject to these formalities and arrangements. Therefore, the release of first instalment continued from November, 1995 to February, 1996, since the time taken by different States to complete these arrangements varied. As a result, many States could not fully utilise the amount released under first instalment before March, 1996, especially since the pace of disbursement of benefits in the initial stage was slow. This explains the shortfall in expenditure as reported by the State Governments/UTs.

The Ministry had, from the very beginning, been writing to the States/UTs to expedite the necessary arrangements and issue necessary operational guidelines to launch the programme without delay. During 1996, the Ministry held a meeting of Nodal Secretaries in-charge of NSAP in States/UTs and Officers of the Ministry held discussions with State Government Officers and impressed upon them the need to implement the programme effectively by speeding up the process of identification of beneficiaries, processing applications, sanctioning and disbursing the benefits with minimum time lag. The Ministry has been continuously in correspondence with the States/UTs urging them to

furnish progress reports periodically and submit expenditure statements/utilisation certificates in time to enable the Ministry release the funds without delay. Senior Officers of the Ministry have also visited a number of States and held discussions with their counterparts in the States. Towards the end of 1996 the Minister for Rural Areas and Employment also held a Conference of State Ministers and Senior Officers in-charge of NSAP in States and UTs and appealed to them to disburse the benefits under the three Schemes without loss of time and submit the expenditure statements to the Ministry immediately for further release of funds.

Thus, it would be seen that the Ministry has spared no efforts to see that the programme is implemented effectively and successfully.

Roads in Special Problem Areas:

Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme, 'Roads in Special Problem Areas' funds are being released for completing the ongoing works in the three States, *viz.* Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, since 1992-93. The budget provision for the year 1995-96 was Rs. 2.00 crores. In the case of Uttar Pradesh, Central liability for ongoing works has been fulfilled. As regards Madhya Pradesh, funds could not be released since the progress reported was not satisfactory. Therefore, only an amount of Rs. 52.00 lakh due to Rajasthan was released during 1995-96. The progress of the scheme is monitored through periodical progress reports received from the three State Governments. In a review meeting taken by Secretary (RD) with the representatives of the three States on 8.11.96, they have been requested to accelerate the pace of work and give priority to complete all the ongoing works sanctioned under the scheme which had been taken up for execution several years ago. The Ministry will continue to pursue with the State Governments for the early completion of the ongoing works.

Under this Scheme, Central funds are released to the three States, *viz.* Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan for completing the ongoing works on the basis of utilisation of funds and Progress Reports. In a review meeting taken by Secretary (RD) with the representatives of the three States in November, 1996, they have been requested to accelerate the pace of work and gives priority to complete all the ongoing works sanctioned under the scheme which had been taken

up for execution several years ago. The Ministry will continue to pursue with the State Government for the early completion of the ongoing works.

Rural Water Supply and Rural Sanitation:

The allocation of Rs. 2195 crore included Rs. 1110 crore for Rural Water Supply and Rs. 60 crore for rural sanitation programmes. The amount actually released (utilised by the Ministry) was Rs. 1039.732 crore and Rs. 59.424 crore respectively. The reasons for non-utilisation of the balance allocation have already been submitted to the Committee due to (I) decision of the Government to defer ARWSP in DPAP areas for drinking water for cattle to the Ninth Plan (allocation Rs. 40 crore). (ii) non-receipt of adequate projects/release proposal from the States under the sub-missions, HRD, IEC etc. The marginal shortfall under CRSP was under HRD, Research and Monitoring & Evaluation due to non-receipt of proposals from the States/Institutes. The States/UTs have since submitted the utilisation certificates both under the Centrally Sponsored ARWSP and the CRSP. As result of the vigorous follow up action with the States and other implementing agencies, almost entire allocated amount of Rs. 1095 crore under Rural Water Supply and Rs. 60 crore under CRSP were released during 1996-97. The observations of the Committee have been noted for compliance and it would be ensured that the annual allocations are utilised in full. In the case of Rural Water Supply Programme the increase in the non-plan budget for 1996-97 over B.E. of 1995-96 was only about 16%. This is 0.08% of the total plan outlay for the sector. As recommended by the Committee, it would be ensured that 100% of funds are utilised under the plan heads and for effective implementation of the scheme.

Land Reforms:

The Budget Estimates under the scheme for 1996-97 was Rs. 18.80 crore. The expenditure was of the order of Rs. 19.15 crore. Thus there was no surrender of funds.

As regards utilisation of funds by the States/UTs under the scheme, against the total release of funds of Rs. 134.85 crores upto 1996-97 towards Central share, the utilisation of funds reported is about Rs. 81 crore which is about 60% of the total release of funds. The States have been requested from time to time for taking suitable steps for expeditious utilisation of funds under the scheme. The matter was also discussed in the recently held meeting of State Revenue Secretaries, Commissioners/Directors, Survey Settlement and Land Records on

28.4.1997. The State representatives were requested for effective implementation of the Scheme and for submission of latest position of utilisation of funds including State share by middle of May, 1997. As per the position intimated by the State Government representatives during the discussions, on receipt of the latest position, the figures on utilisation of funds are likely to go up significantly.

The Budget Estimate under the scheme is under plan head.

Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records, the Budget Provision during the financial year 1996-97 was Rs. 20.00 crores which has been fully utilised.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.16)

The Committee appreciate the laudable objectives as expressed at the Conference of Chief Ministers on 4th and 5th July, 1996 to cover entire population by 2000 AD. and to cover totally uncovered or very poorly covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98.

Reply of the Government

All the states have been requested to prepare special action plans for coverage of totally uncovered or very poorly covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98. The matter was also discussed with the States/UTs in the third meeting of the Empowered Committee of the Mission held on 24th October, 1996. The Action plans have already been prepared by the 18 States. The remaining States are in the process of finalising the action plan to be completed before 31st December, 1996.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.17)

They would like to recommend that funds for the programme should be substantially stepped up so as to achieve the target set at the Chief Minister's Conference. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilisation of funds allocated for the programme.

Reply of the Government

As the recommendations of the Chief Ministers Conference were received after the finalisation of the plan outlays for 1996-97, it has not been possible to step up the approved Central outlay of Rs. 1110 crore under Rural Water Supply Programme 1996-97. However, the Planning Commission has been requested to step up the outlay for 1997-98 to achieve the target set at the Chief Minister's Conference. The Department would ensure 100% utilisation of funds allocated for the programme based on the action plans of the States. Further, the Ministry has sought substantial step up of funds in the 9th Plan for R.W.S.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)

The Committee note with concern the achievement with regard to the coverage of problem villages which declined from 472 in 1993-94 to 132 and further 132 in 1994-95 to 26 in 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. They would also like to recommend that priority should be given to the problem villages.

Reply of the Government

The coverage of problem villages of the survey carried out in 1985 declined from year to year as the total number of uncovered problem villages also declined and these problem villages were in difficult and inaccessible areas. Efforts are afoot to cover the remaining 120 problem villages by 1997-98 alongwith other NC and PC (0-10 lpcd) habitations.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)

The Committee are dismayed to note the meagre allocation of Rs. 300 lakh during 1996-97 on R&D under the programme. They would like to recommend that the allocation for R&D should be substantially stepped up under this programme so that the benefit of new technology should be taken to address the specific requirement of an area. Besides more and more attention should be paid towards

R&D in the specific areas to improve the quality of drinking water as contaminated water is one of the major area of concern in the country.

Reply of the Government

The allocation of Rs. 300 lakh during 1996-97 on R&D under the programme is considered to be adequate for R&D activities for the specific problems/areas in the context that the expenditure under the various schemes to improve the quality of drinking water due to chemical contamination is met over and above the outlay on R&D. Under the Sub-Mission, the expenditure during 1994-45 was Rs. 100.92 crore which increased to Rs. 116.43 crore in 1995-96. The outlay for 1996-97 has been kept at Rs. 100.20 crore. However, keeping in view the recommendations of the Committee for increased outlay, the allocation for R&D for 1997-98 is proposed to be stepped up to Rs. 5 crore.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendations (Para No. 4.20)

The Committee note that sufficient attention has not been paid towards the maintenance of assets *i.e.* pumps, tube-wells under the programme. Necessary infrastructure should be provided to the Block Development Officer/Panchayats to ensure the maintenance of assets created under the programme.

Reply of the Government

The responsibility for proper operation and maintenance of assets created under Rural Water Supply programme is likely to be entrusted to the Panchayats in phases as against the existing arrangements through the Public Health Engineering Department/Rural Development Departments in the States. It will be ensured that necessary infrastructure in terms of technical manpower spare parts and financial resources are provided to the Panchayats to ensure the maintenances of assets created under the programme. The recently held national workshop on operation and maintenance of the Rural Water Supply Schemes had at length gone over this issue of effective O & M through decentralised systems, and suitable instructions have been sent to the States in this regard.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.21)

The Committee would also like to recommend that monitoring of the programme should be strengthened for the effective implementation of the programmes. They urge that there should be some sort of guidelines issued to the States under the specific programme to involve MPs and MLAs in the monitoring process.

Reply of the Government

The monitoring of the programme is being strengthened for the effective implementation by introducing current evaluation, independent evaluation of the implementation of the programme during the VIII Five Year Plan, involvement of the independent institutions closer review in the meeting of the Empowered Committee etc. With regard to the involvement of MPs and MLAs in the monitoring process, suitable guidelines would be evolved in consultation with State Governments and as approved in the Empowered Committee of the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission in which all the State Secretaries incharge of the RWS are Members.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.22)

The Committee would like to recommend that Government should take appropriate steps for recharging the ground water in the dark zone areas in the country in respective states where water level is going down.

Reply of the Government

The concerned states have been requested to frame schemes for conservation of water, sustainability and for recharging the ground water in the dark zone and over exploited areas under the Sub Mission on sustainability and the centrally sponsored scheme introduced by the Central Ground Water Board. Appropriate action will be taken for considering the specific projects/schemes as and when received from the respective states. Necessary follow up action will be taken with them to expedite the schemes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.23)

It is urged that trainees under training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) should be trained in the trades like repairing and maintenance of tubewells, pumps etc. under the scheme so as to benefit the rural people in maintaining their assets.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee is accepted. Necessary instructions will be issued to the states to train the trainees under the National Human Resource Development Programme of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission and under Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) for repairing and maintenance of tubewells, pumps other schemes under the programme so as to benefit the rural people in maintaining their assets. The total outlay provided of HRD/Training under the Mission for assistance to the States/UTs and the training institutions is Rs. 8 crore for 1996-97. Adequate funds are also available under the TRYSEM. The progress regarding the number of trainees trained will also be monitored.

As per the guidelines of IRDP and allied programmes of TRYSEM and DWCRA (April, 1991), 'Repair and maintenance of agricultural and irrigation equipments' is a permissible vacation under TRYSEM. The State Governments can design programmes and make arrangements for imparting training in repair and maintenance of irrigation equipments as per the local needs and demand.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.11)

It is disturbing to note that the meagre funds allocated for the programme have not been spent fully. The financial achievement during 1994-95 and 1995-96 has been stated by the Department as 99 and 93% leading to the corresponding shortfall in physical achievement of 88.27% and 85% respectively. Of equal concern is the huge unspent balances in states which are increasing steeply. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to shortfall in physical and financial achievement. It is recommended that endeavour should be made to ensure 100% implementation of funds.

Reply of the Government

The financial achievement during 1994-95 and 1995-96 under the CRSP was 97.75% and 99.13%. The marginal shortfall in 1994-95 was due to non/less drawal of funds by Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Orissa, West Bengal and UTs of Lakshadweep, Delhi and Chandigarh. The shortfall in 1995-96 was mainly due to less releases to CAPART due to decentralisation of their work in regional offices.

The shortfall of 12% in physical achievement (combined under CRSP/MNP) in 1994-95 was mainly in the case of the states referred to above due to less expenditure. However, the achievement in 1995-96 was 101.26% of the target. The number of sanitary latrines constructed was 8,81,299. It is likely to increase as report for the month of March 1996 is awaited from Maharashtra.

All the States/UTs have been requested to reduce the unspent balances. Further funds under CRSP will not be released or will be reduced correspondingly to the states having unspent balances beyond the permissible limit of 15% of annual allocation.

As recommended by the Committee all efforts will be made to release 100% of the funds under the CRSP.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.12)

The Committee are distressed to note the inadequate allocation of funds during 8th Plan out of Rs. 380 crores. Budget outlay of Rs. 230 crores has been sanctioned so far. As per the information furnished by the Department there is likely to be a shortfall of coverage of 53 lakh rural population with sanitation facilities. The Committee note that with the outlay provided only 14.62% of total population has been covered under the programme. They observe that it is unfortunate to see the rural masses living in total unhygienic conditions even after more than four and a half decades of planned development in the country. It is disturbing to note that Government have not paid any attention to the recommendations of the Committee to enhance the outlay from Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. Even during 1996-97 the outlay is same, i.e. Rs. 60 crores. It is needless, to point out here that Rural Sanitation Programme needs priority specifically

to break the vicious circles of disease, and poor health resulting from insanitary conditions. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to enhance funds under the programme suitably so as to cover the entire population within 5-10 years.

Reply of the Government

The Working Group for the IX Five Year Plan has recommended an outlay of Rs. 6000 crore both under Central and State/UT sector. An outlay of Rs. 400 crore has been proposed under the CRSP for 1997-98 for approval of the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.13)

The Committee note with distress the various irregularities in the implementation of the programme as pointed out in the audit para of 1993-94. They would like to be informed about the corrective action taken so far. The Committee would like to recommend that monitoring under the programme should be further strengthened. It should be ensured that there are no diversion of funds. Further the quality of the latrines constructed should be improved. The Committee would like to be informed about the outcome of the review of the Programme made in the meeting of Secretaries, Incharge of Rural Sanitation Programme on 5.8.96. The evaluation should be expedited.

The Committee note that in line with the objective of holistic approach to Rural Sanitation Programme, the Members of the previous Standing Committee 1995-96 had recommended certain names for Model Villages. They are not happy with the performance in these model villages. It is recommended that progress in the model villages should be monitored to achieve better results. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in the 16th Report that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people.

Reply of the Government

After taking up the matter with the concerned States which have taken the necessary corrective action, the comments/Action Taken Report on para 6.2 of the C&AG report No. 2 of 1994 has been sent to the Director of Audit for vetting. The monitoring of the programme has been tightened. Diversion of funds is not allowed through

departmental certificates of utilisation and certificate of actual expenditure from the concerned Accountant General. The Sanitary latrines are being constructed with superstructure to ensure their use. The report of the Expert Committee on range of technical options to ensure quality of construction is being made available to the implementing departments in the States/UTs and other agencies. During the review of the programme made in the meeting of the Secretaries held on 5.8.1996, the progress of implementation was reviewed. And the State Secretaries were requested to take a holistic approach for implementing the programme, utilise funds effectively and also achieve targets under the different components. They were also requested to involve more NGOs and also to make the programme more people oriented. The decision on the evaluation of implementation of the programme through independent organisations will be taken up shortly.

All the concerned States have been requested to send the physical and financial progress of the model villages being implemented by them and to complete the scheme by 31.3.1997.

In order to provide benefit to all categories of people, the States have been advised to adopt the whole village approach, motivate the people above the poverty line through intensive IEC campaigns, use of alternate delivery system having sanitary marts and production centres, etc. to construct sanitary latrines without Government subsidy. This strategy has been quite successful in West Bengal and Rajasthan.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.14)

The Committee urge that more attention should be paid towards the awareness campaign through media. More and more NGOs and Panchayats should be involved helping thereby to create sanitary latrines with lesser dependence on Government subsidy.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee is being implemented as part of the national strategy of IEC which is initially being taken up in 65 districts in the States by involvement of State, district, block, village, and panchayat level coordinating agencies, setting up of IEC cells in the States and use of different media. CAPART has been

requested to implement the IEC strategy document through local level reputed NGOs which are closer to the people and carry conviction with them.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.4)

It is noted with concern that the outlay allocated has declined from Rs. 27.47 crore in 1993-94 to Rs. 18.80 crore during 1995-96 and outlay for 1996-97 has been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96. The position is noted to be worse in States where more than 60% unspent balance has been reported. In some of the States 100% amount has been reported as unspent balance. The Committee take serious view of the poor performance of the scheme. They observe that adequate attention has not been paid towards the Scheme by Centre and States. The Secretary, Rural Development has acknowledged the poor performance of the Scheme in various States. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Budget Estimate (BE) for 1993-94 was Rs. 27.47 crore and the actual utilisation was Rs. 24.26 crore. During 1994-95, the Budget Estimate was again Rs. 27.47 crore but the utilisation was only Rs. 17.07 crore. This was after taking into consideration the unspent balances with the States. The BE for 1995-96 was kept at Rs. 18.80 crore, as reasonable. But position of utilisation had improved, there was scope for availing of additional funds through re-appropriation. The entire amount was released that year. Again, for 1996-97, the BE has been kept at Rs. 18.80 crore and, the entire amount will be released by the end of this month. The fluctuation in the Budget provision was as a result of funds remaining with the States, in their PWD and other departments, for construction, modifications etc. As a prudent financial measure the BE was kept on realistic terms. And, this may not be seen as the programme being down graded.

On receipt of the recommendations of the Standing Committee, the Department took necessary initiatives to improve upon the performance of the States. A number of correspondence were made for early execution of on-going schemes/programmes, utilisation of funds and submission of utilisation certificates as well as submission of suitable proposals for further release of funds. In addition, a

Conference of Revenue Secretaries was convened on 26th and 27th November, 1996. Through this process a good number of fresh proposals have been received to utilise the budgetary utilisation for the current financial year and also to release additional funds, if available, from any other Division of this Ministry. The utilisation of funds by the States has also improved and utilisation certificates covering more than Rs. 10 crore have been received during the last 2 months. The State Governments have been properly briefed to prepare suitable schemes and programmes for effective implementation of the schemes relating to Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Upgradation of Land Records.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.5)

Considering the huge unspent amount the Committee would like to recommend that the Scheme should be reviewed and restructured during the Ninth Plan. They urge that instead of spreading the amount throughout the country, the Department should choose some of the model districts/villages where performance has been very good. The best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/Districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of Land Records.

Reply of the Government

As per recommendation of the Standing Committee, the scope of activities which can be financed under the scheme has been expanded for the Ninth Plan period. Updation of Land Records mainly depend on periodical survey and settlement operations and hence State Governments have been requested to take up such operations wherever it is in default. The Minister (RA&E) and representative of this Department attended the 12th All India Cadastral Survey Conference held in Hyderabad on 6-8 November, 1996 which adopted useful resolutions for effective implementation of survey and settlement operation, adoption of appropriate technologies for different types of topography; and this Ministry gave assurance for more liberal assistance to the States for implementation of revisional survey and settlement operations. As per the letter and spirit of the recommendations, States which have not taken up any survey settlement operation after

Independence and States which are yet to take up survey settlement operation for the first time, have been requested to send their officers to those States which have completed revisional survey settlement in recent years. The States have also been requested to send, in increased number, their field level officials to undergo suitable training in the Survey of India Training Institute at Hyderabad and, this Department will provide financial assistance for all such training programmes availed of by the State Governments officials. It has also been proposed in the Ninth Plan that a T.V. Serial will be prepared under the financial assistance of this Ministry to popularise the "intermediary" as well as "latest technologies" available in the field of survey settlement, digitisation of maps and reproduction of digitised maps and settlement records.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.6)

The Committee note that the Parliamentary Standing Committee 1995-96 carried out a detailed review and made field visits to various States and found that the upgraded maps had several discrepancies. The earlier Committee in their 26th Report had made an in-depth analysis concerning major issues of the said scheme and made recommendations with regard to outlay, monitoring, standardisation, completing survey, re-survey & Settlement in State where it has not been done, monitoring, training etc. The Committee urge that the recommendations of the earlier Committee should be considered and implemented in letter and spirit while formulating the policy and guidelines during Ninth Plan.

Reply of the Government

The copy of the 26th Report of the Standing Committee was sent to all the States, to take appropriate measures to review and improve upon the existing RS maps and remove the discrepancies, by revision and reprinting of the maps, wherever necessary. A consultancy work has been given to one Faculty of the Roorkie Engineering College for development of suitable software for better implementation of consolidation works/survey settlement works at the field level. The Technical Committee on Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records (SRA & ULR) had appointed a Sub-Group for recommendation of standardised equipments necessary for

implementing survey settlement/consolidation operation. The Report of the said Group was examined and adopted with modifications in the last meeting of the Technical Committee on SRA & ULR held on 27th November, 1996. As per recommendation of the Standing Committee, this Ministry has prepared Ninth Five Year Plan to adopt and finance more Pilot Projects for disseminating the technologies available for survey settlement operation for using the photogramatring system, global positioning system, total stations as well as using of scanners and digitisers for presentation and reproduction of maps with necessary modification and updation of existing cadastral maps. The budgetary allocation under this scheme during the Ninth Five Year Plan has been increased by about 300% against the total release of funds under the scheme during the Eighth Five Year Plan.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.10)

The Committee strongly recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the programme of Computerisation of Land Records. The monitoring of the programme should be strengthened specifically when it is a 100% Centrally sponsored programme. It should be ensured that the amount sanctioned for a specific project is spent fully.

Reply of the Government

As per the recommendations of the Standing Committee adequate attention was given for expeditious implementation of the Computerisation programme. During the current financial year 100 new districts are going to be financed alongwith ongoing 223 project districts. A meeting of the National Level Steering Committee on Computerisation of Land Records was held on 27th November, 1996 to discuss the problems relating to effective implementation of the programme and suitable decisions were taken up to remove the bottlenecks and to expedite the execution of on-going schemes. The Director General, National Informatics Centre, as a party to the tripartite agreement, who is also the Vice-Chairman of the National Level Steering Committee, gave assurance for speedy supply and installation

of computer Hardware in all the on-going project districts. The budgetary allocation of the current financial year will be fully absorbed against the financial demands received from the States for on-going and fresh projects.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.11)

The Committee also urge that the Computerisation Programme should be continued in Ninth Plan. They also urge that while formulating the strategy of 9th Plan, the recommendations made by the Committee at their 26th Report with regard to enhancing of outlay, implementation, training etc. should be considered and implemented.

Reply of the Government

Keeping in view the recommendation of the Committee submitted through their 26th Report, this Ministry has duly enhanced the outlay for Computerisation programme from Rs. 48 crore during the Eighth Plan to Rs. 339.90 crore. The training programme for revenue officials will be further strengthened by the NIC. States have been assured of financial assistance for providing further training, if required for the aforesaid purpose, by appointing private institutions/organisations for imparting such training. The States have also been requested to send Quarterly Progress Reports regularly in the prescribed format. Through electronic mail, the progress of implementation of this scheme is also being collected by the NIC and supplied to this Department for the purpose of periodical monitoring.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendations (Para No. 7.9 and 7.10)

The Committee appreciate the launching of National Social Security scheme on 15th August, 1995 and observe that it is a significant step towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles in Articles 41 and 42 of the Constitution of India.

The Committee are however, concerned about the implementation of the Scheme. Not only there was shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 but the number of beneficiaries as reported by the Department in each of the Scheme was quite low. They are dismayed to note that 10 States/UTs have not reported so far about the utilisation and number of beneficiaries. It is observed that although Old Age Pension Scheme had picked up the performance was poor in other two Schemes, Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme. The Committee feel that there is a need for more information dissemination and more awareness generation. They strongly recommend that the Scheme should be advertised on TV, Radio and Regional Newspaper and displaying at important places in the village like Panchayat office.

Reply of the Government

The Committee has rightly pointed out that there was shortfall in expenditure as well as the number of beneficiaries during 1995-96. It is also a fact that 10 States/UTs had not reported utilization of funds and number of beneficiaries given the benefits. However, in the meantime States barring Karnataka and Union Territories barring Chandigarh, Pondicherry and NCT of Delhi have sent their reports on utilization. The Ministry has taken several steps since the last meeting of the Standing Committee to impress upon the States/Union Territories to gear themselves up for effective implementation of the NSAP. The Conference of State Ministers was also organized on 13.12.1996 to review the progress achieved by the various States/UTs.

The Ministry is in full agreement with the observations of the Standing Committee regarding the need for greater information dissemination and awareness generation specially regarding NFBS and NMBS. Apart from the various publicity measures undertaken so far the Ministry has launched a publicity campaign through Radio, street plays by the Song and Drama Division to take up the message of NSAP to every nook and corner of the country as suggested by the Hon'ble member of the Standing Committee, States/UTs have also been given funds for undertaking publicity at their level.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-
GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 7.11)

The Committee express their apprehension regarding the victimisation of beneficiaries on account of certifying age, destitute or below poverty line. They have been informed that the matter has been left to the State Government. The Committee urge that some standardised guidelines should be issued by Centre with regard to the criteria of age, a person being destitute or below poverty line so as to avoid harassment of beneficiaries

Reply of the Government

The apprehension expressed by the Committee is very relevant. The Advisory Committee on NSAP also made certain recommendations regarding the definition of destitution, selection criteria and streamlining of procedure, These recommendations have been communicated to all the States/UTs and may be seen at Annexure-I. From the perusal of the recommendations it would be evident that Central Government had made an attempt at standardising the guidelines in respect of destitution etc. A measure of flexibility with the States is, however, desirable.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 7.12)

The Committee observe that for the lack of initiative/Coordination between Department in the Centre and State Governments, the poorest of the poor suffer. They would like to recommend that Centre should issue the necessary guidelines to States for the effective implementation and should also ensure that funds allocated for the specific schemes are spent fully.

Reply of the Government

It is a fact that coordination between the State and the Centre has been a little difficult so far as the implementation of NSAP is concerned as there is more than one department at the State/UT level involved in the implementation of the three different schemes. While in most of the States the Department of Social Welfare is implementing this programme, in a number of States the Women & Child Development, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Housing and Special Assistance,

and Labour Employment & Training Departments are involved. This is so because of the very nature of this programme. The States have in many cases involved Women & Child Development Department for the implementation of the National Maternity Benefit Scheme as the scheme is aimed at providing financial assistance to pregnant women.

However, anticipating these difficulties, the Ministry has identified a nodal Department in each State/UT which is required to coordinate the implementation of the three schemes within the State and inform the Ministry about the progress achieved.

The Ministry is making all out efforts to ensure that funds allocated for the scheme are properly spent. In this connection it may be mentioned that Minister of Rural Areas & Employment himself held a meeting on 13.12.1996 while the Parliament was in session. This goes to indicate the extent of seriousness the Ministry attaches to the implementation of this scheme. The Area Officers have also been visiting the States/UTs to review the operation of this scheme.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 7.13)

As regards Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme the Committee observe that benefit given for maternity and on the death is fruitful if given at the appropriate time. They would like to recommend that such benefit should be accorded timely and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiary.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry is in full agreement with the observations of the Committee that the benefits must be made available to the beneficiaries in time. It has been provided in the guidelines that the panchayats and municipalities will bring to the notice of the Sanctioning Authorities any delay in disbursement of the benefits. So far as making funds available to the State Government, it may be mentioned that funds under NSAP are released in two instalments to States/UTs. Funds are available for six months at a time with the States/UTs and as such there is no problem as to the availability of funds.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.4)

The Committee note that in view of the big challenges of poverty eradication programme, the outlay of Rs. 14.50 crores for various components of training would not be sufficient. It should be enhanced substantially.

Reply of the Government

Keeping in view the challenging task of poverty alleviation and the rejuvenated Panchayati Raj Institutions, enhanced outlays for Training and related activities have been requested during the Ninth Five Year Plan. The proposed outlay for IX Plan and Annual Plan (1997-98) as compared to VIIIth Plan has been suggested for the consideration of the Planning Commission as under:—

VIIIth Plan Outlay	IX Plan Outlay (Proposed)
50.00 Crores	250.00 Crores
Annual Plan Outlay (1996-97)	Annual Plan Outlay (1997-98) (Proposed)
14.50 Crores	57.50 Crores

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.5)

The Committee would also like to recommend that the training by these institutions should be imparted keeping in view the practical difficulties in the implementation of various rural programmes such as JRY, IAY, IRDP etc.

Reply of the Government

SIRDs and ETCs mainly conduct such training programmes which relate to the schemes/programmes of this Ministry. Many courses have been organized on various on-going programmes of this Ministry like JRY, IRDP. Modern techniques and equipments are now being used for such training programmes. The practical difficulties, problems in

the implementation of the schemes/programmes and success-stories are kept in mind while designing the training programmes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.6)

The Committee note that there is no section of Rural Technology in the National Institute of Rural Development. They would like to recommend that Government should take the necessary steps for setting up such Sections for the effective implementation of various Programmes/Schemes for the upliftment of rural masses.

Reply of the Government

A Centre for Rural Technology has been proposed to be established at NIRD under the IXth Five Year Plan.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.7)

The Committee would also like to recommend that a specific part of the funds provided for administrative expenses of each scheme should be provided for imparting training to village functionaries and elected representatives in Panchayats.

Reply of the Government

The suggestion of the Committee to provide sufficient funds for imparting training to village functionaries and elected representatives in the PRIs is agreed to. It is, further, stated that the Centre has been impressing upon the States to draw suitable training programmes for all the elected representatives and the officials at the three tier of PRI. The Centre has also been providing grants to the State Governments for this purpose from the funds available under the scheme of Panchayat Development and training and also from the third stream of JRY during the last 2-3 years. The specific suggestion to set apart a portion of the funds provided under administrative expenses of each scheme for imparting training to the elected representatives and other functionaries would also be considered in 1997-98.

With regard to IAY, it may be mentioned that a Committee has been constituted in the Ministry to look into question of providing adequate funds for administrative expenses under IAY separately.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 9.4)

The Committee note with constraint the unsatisfactory performance of the scheme in three States *viz.* U.P., M.P. and Rajasthan. They feel that construction of roads to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country should be given priority. Observing the poor performance they would like to recommend that the scheme should be reviewed and restructured without any further delay.

Reply of the Government

The progress of the scheme was reviewed in a meeting with representatives of the three States on 8.11.1996. They have been requested to accelerate the pace of work and give priority to complete all the ongoing works sanctioned under the Scheme which had been taken up for execution several years ago. In the meanwhile, the Ministry has approached Planning Commission with a proposal for accelerated village connectivity throughout the country.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.4)

The Committee note that with the system of Panchayati Raj as per 73rd Amendment of the Constitution, Panchayats have an important role in the Poverty Alleviation Programme. They urge that elections of Panchayats should be expedited in the States/UTs where elections are not held or are due. Further, they would also like that Panchayats should be associated with the maximum number of Poverty Alleviation Programme. The Panchayats should be involved in the process of identification of beneficiaries and reviewing and monitoring of such programmes.

Reply of the Government

Almost all the States and Union Territories where provisions of Part-IX of the Constitution are applicable have conducted elections to Panchayats except Bihar, Pondicherry, Lakshadweep and Goa at Zila Parishad level. The matter is also being taken up with the concerned authorities highest level to expedite the same. Panchayats are associated with identification of beneficiaries and implementation of various rural development and poverty alleviation programme.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.5)

The Committee feel that maintenance of assets created under the different programmes is the major areas of concern. They would like that Panchayats should be equipped with necessary infrastructure to ensure the maintenance of such assets.

Reply of the Government

For maintenance of the assets created under the Rural Water Supply Programme, 10% of the annual ARWSP and the MNP Funds are allowed to be utilised, in addition to the non-plan funds provided for this purpose by the States/UTs and contribution collected from the users by certain States particularly for the externally aided projects. All the States have been requested to take action for transfer ownership of the assets to the Panchayats and their proper maintenance after equipping them with necessary infrastructure like trained manpower, arrangement for timely supply of spare parts, and adequate financial resources through the recommendations of the State Finance Commission, Central/State Plan funds under ARWSP/MNP, O&M cost recovery from the users, formation of Water and Sanitation Committee at the habitation, Panchayat, block and district levels etc.

The Panchayats are at present not involved in implementation of the schemes of Land Reforms. However, the matter relating to involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in Land Management/Land Reforms was discussed in the Conference of Revenue Ministers of State held on 28.1.97 in New Delhi. The Conference, *inter-alia*, recommended involvement of Gram Panchayats in prevention of alienation of tribal land and restoration of alienated land, selection of

beneficiaries for allotment of various types of lands, management of the Common Property Resources, unearthing the surplus land concealed tendency and unrecorded share-croppers etc. It was also recommended that the State Governments are at liberty to delegate such powers and responsibilities to PRIs as may be considered reasonable and pragmatic, taking into account the ground level realities, public needs and abilities of the PRIs of the concerned States. The recommendations of the Conference have been sent to the States/UTs for follow up action.

As per the MOU for implementation of the scheme of computerisation of land records, it is the duty of the NIC to install, operate and maintain the computers and other infrastructure at the Tehsil or equivalent level.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.6)

The Committee would also like that the elected representatives should be given appropriate training to enable them to discharge the multiple constitutional responsibilities.

Reply of the Government

The State Governments and UTs have been requested by the Ministry to organise training programmes for elected representatives and officials of Panchayats. A number of States have already conducted training programmes. Reputed NGOs have also been associated in this task. Limited financial assistance is provided by this Ministry to the States and UTs for the Training Programmes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.7)

The Committee further stress that the Budget Estimates 1996-97 of Rs. 3 Crores is not sufficient in view of the multiple Constitutional obligations to be performed by Panchayats as given above. They would like that the outlay should be substantially stepped up.

Reply of the Government

An outlay for Rs. 20 crores has been proposed for the year 1997-98 under the scheme "Panchayat Development and Training" to meet the expenditure on training of Panchayati Raj functionaries, research studies etc. by the Ministry.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 11.4)

The Committee note that with the increased involvement organisations in rural development the workload of CAPART is bound to increase manifold in the coming years. As such they would like to recommend that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially increased.

Reply of the Government

CAPART has been/is supplementing the national efforts in implementing the programmes/schemes of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY), Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA), Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP), Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP), Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) and Training of Panchayati Raj Functionaries (PR) through the voluntary organisations. In the allocations made for these nationally planned programmes/schemes, some funds, depending upon the requirements and availability are given to CAPART for implementation of these programmes/schemes through voluntary organisations.

In addition, CAPART is implementing awareness building programmes and programmes for development and dissemination of rural technology through the schemes of (i) Assistance to CAPART, (ii) Promotion of voluntary Action in Rural Development (PC) and (iii) Organisation of Beneficiaries (OB). For these three schemes, Eighth Five Year Plan allocation was Rs. 160 crores. It is proposed by this department to the Planning Commission to step up the outlay for these three schemes during the Ninth Plan to Rs. 289 crores. The budget allocations for these three schemes during the current year 1996-97 is Rs. 25.50 crores. The Planning Commission has been requested to step up this outlay to Rs. 44.00 crores during 1997-98.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 11.5)

In order to provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination between voluntary organisations and the district administration as well as the Panchayati Raj Institutes needs to be developed.

Reply of the Government

To ensure greater accountability,, transparency and coordination between voluntary organisations and the district administration as well as the Panchayati Raj Institutes, CAPART has decided to endorse a copy of all its sanctions to District Collectors and to the concerned Panchayats. The Regional Committee of CAPART are also holding awareness workshops and seminars at Sub-Regional and District levels to enlist the cooperation of the district administration. In several schemes such as drinking water and housing, certification by district administration has been laid down.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 11.6)

The Committee have informed during the course of oral evidence that 376 NGOs have been blacklisted. They note that almost 50% of the funds allocated to NGOs are being misused. It is therefore strongly recommended that there should be appropriate monitoring and proper evaluation of NGOs by the concerned agency.

Reply of the Government

It is submitted that CAPART has intimated that as per the available records, an amount of about Rs. 5.84 crores has been released by it (CAPART) to the blacklisted organisations since its inception and upto 31.12.95. CAPART has also intimated that many voluntary organisations have had completed the sanctioned projects satisfactorily but were blacklisted on account of acts of omission or commission in some later projects. As such the misutilised amount may be of a much lower order. The total amount released by CAPART to the VOs upto 31.3.96 is approximately Rs. 2.78 crores. Therefore, the amount likely to have been misutilised by the blacklisted VOs may be less than 2.1% of the total amount released by CAPART to VOs till 31.3.96.

To strengthen the monitoring and evaluation mechanism, CAPART has taken the following measures:—

- (i) It has been decided to step up a National Standing Committee on Monitoring and Evaluation which would comprise eminent representatives of VOs.
- (ii) It has been decided that every project assisted by CAPART would be ordinarily appraised three times, i.e. before sanction, during implementation and after completion.
- (iii) As far as possible, a different project evaluator will be deputed on the three occasions.
- (iv) Specialisation and experience will be the main basis on which eminent experts would be impaneled as project evaluators.
- (v) Since the Regional Committees of CAPART are near to the VOs at the grassroot level, it has been decided to closely involve the Regional Committees in the monitoring and evaluation of sanctioned projects.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.3(a)]

The Committee observe that actual allocation during the 8th Plan for the various Schemes/Programmes is far less than the 8th Plan outlay.

Out of the outlay of Rs. 6166 crores, the actual allocation as per the data furnished by the Department is Rs. 4647.09 crores after excluding the outlay of Rs. 1482 crores for newly started National Social Assistance Programme. Thus there is net underspending of Rs. 1519 crores under different planned Schemes during the 8th Plan. It is needless to say here that due to the underspending in different Projects/Schemes, the poorest of the poor in the country is suffering. The Committee would like that during Ninth Five Year Plan, there should be proper planning and financial projection should be realistic for each programme and the scheme so that there is 100% utilisation. They urge that there should not be diversion of funds from one Scheme to the other. The Committee urge that the backlog of 8th Plan outlay should be appropriately allocated in the different Schemes/Programmes.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee are noted.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendations [Para No. 13.3(b) and 13.3(c)]

Not only there is under spending in 8th Plan outlay for different Projects/Scheme, but releases to States are lesser than the allocation. Further alarming feature is that there are huge unspent balances with the States. In some of the States, the utilisation is marginal in specific programmes. The Committee also observe that under different programmes of the Department, States are not allocating the matching share. They would like that while chalking out the strategy for Ninth Plan, Govt. should reconsider and review the programme. If needed the schemes/programmes should be restructured.

The various factors responsible for the non-implementation of the various schemes/programmes of the Department are (i) the monitoring of the scheme is not adequate. States are not furnishing the utilisation certificate and unspent balances are increasing year by year; (ii) States are not contributing the matching share as per the guidelines; (iii) the financial allocation is not adequate; (iv) there is lack of linkages which results into the blocking of funds with State Governments and with local bodies in the States; and (v) Identification of beneficiaries is not proper (vi) There is no adequate provision for the maintenance of assets created under the different programmes.

Reply of the Government

The Eighth Plan outlay under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) was Rs. 175 crore. However, actual allocation through Budget Estimates in Annual Plan was Rs. 112.53 crore. It was further, reduced to Rs. 98.85 crore at the stage of Revised Estimate. Against the total R.E of 98.85 crore under the scheme during Eighth Plan Period, the release of funds to the States/UTs was of the order of 98.23 crore. The main reason for lower level of expenditure during the Eight Plan Period was that the State Governments were not able

to provide their 50% share in time which resulted in accumulation of unspent balances with them towards the Central share and non-release of further funds to them. The State Governments particularly the North-Eastern States have been requesting for 100% Central assistance under the scheme.

With a view to improve the status of implementation of the scheme during the Ninth Plan, it is proposed to provide 100% Central assistance to North-Eastern States and increase the Central share from the present level of 50% to 80% in respect of other States.

No allocation is made under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records. Proposal submitted by the State Governments are examined by the National Level Steering Committee on Computerisation of Land Records for its approval. The State Governments have been requested from time to time to submit utilisation certificate in the prescribe proforma. The matter was also discussed in the meeting of the Revenue Ministers held on 28th January, 1997 and recently on 28th April, 1997 in the meeting of the Revenue Secretaries, Settlement Commissioners and Collectors of selected districts on Computerisation of Land Records. This scheme is a 100% Centrally Sponsored Scheme, so the question of matching share by States does not arise. The financial allocation is not made under the scheme. This scheme is being jointly implemented by Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, NIC and Revenue Departments of State Governments. Local bodies are not involved under this scheme. The funds are sanctioned directly to State Government but not to the individual beneficiary. The maintenance of Computers is being done by NIC.

The reasons for lesser releases of funds and unspent balances with States under National Social Assistance Programme during 1995-96 have been explained under Para 3.7/3.8. The principal reason was the delay on the part of the State Governments in completing the necessary arrangements and procedures to launch the Programme, disabursing the benefits and submitting the expenditure statements to the Ministry. Monitoring of the implementation of the Programme in the districts by the State Nodal Department was not adequate in 1995-96. The situation has improved in 1996-97 as a result of several steps taken by the Ministry but still in several States the monitoring mechanism at State level needs to be strengthened and streamlined.

The reason for under spending in VIII Plan outlay under the central sector for rural supply and rural sanitation is due to no provision of the full outlay provided in the VIII Plan document. Except during 1995-96, almost entire allocation provided in the yearly budgets was released to the States/UTs/Implementing Agencies. All States/UTs are advised from time to time to ensure full utilisation of funds.

The existing guidelines of the programme permit the States to carry over unutilised amount, if any, up to 25% of the annual allocation in the case of ARWSP and 15% in the case of CRSP. While finalising the guidelines for the IX Five Year Plan, the existing provision regarding carry over of unutilised amount will be reviewed so as to restrict it to the barest minimum. The matter will be pursued with the States periodically to ensure that the releases made by the Central Government are utilised in full. It is ensured that the states make matching provision under the MNP as any shortfall in matching expenditure is recovered from the allocation for the next financial year in respect of the defaulting states.

The monitoring of the programmes has been strengthened. Utilisation certificates are received before release of the final installment of funds for the year. The unspent balances have been reduced during 1996-97 as compared to that of 1995-96. This will be reduced further.

The states are providing matching share as per the guidelines. In the case of one or two states where matching share is not provided the allocation of the State Government is reduced to the extent of the shortfall in the matching expenditure.

The final allocation both for ARWSP and CRSP by the Planning Commission is not adequate for the magnitude of the number of NC/PC/quality affected habitations to be provided safe drinking water facilities and the rural population yet to be provided sanitation facilities. It is hoped that the position will improve during the IX Five Year Plan.

The blocking of funds with the State Governments is kept to the minimum. At present, funds under Rural Water Supply and Rural Sanitation Programmes are not released directly to the local bodies and there is no blocking of funds with them.

In the case of Rural Sanitation Programme, the beneficiaries below the poverty line are identified as per the list applicable for other rural

development programmes or in the Gram Sabha through panchayat resolutions.

As submitted under para 10.5, adequate provision is allowed for the maintenance of the assets created under the Rural Water Supply Programme.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Comments of the Committee

Please *see* para 15 of Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendations [Para No. 13.4(a) and 13.4(b)]

Government should consider to enhance the Central's share in the respective Schemes where the implementation of the scheme is poor due to the fact that States are not providing matching share.

Monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened. It should be ensured that States furnish the Utilisation Certificate timely. It should also be ensured that quarterly, monthly and annual report are submitted in time by States. There should be timely review of the programme. It is noted that C&AG cover selective Scheme for review. In most of the Schemes no review has been made.

The Committee would like to suggest that timely evaluation by some independent agencies should be made. Further there should be concurrent evaluation of the programmes. District level monitoring Committees should be constituted to monitor the programme. Further, monitoring by the Centre should be strengthened. There should be surprise visits by the officials of the committee to the various sites where programmes are being implemented.

For monitoring of the schemes of SRA&ULR the States/UTs are requested to submit Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) on the progress of the scheme in the prescribed proforma. The progress is also reviewed from time to time by the Technical Committee constituted under the scheme under the Chairmanship of the Secretary (RD). In addition, it is also reviewed from time to time at various fora including the Conference of Revenue Secretaries and Ministers. Last such conference of Revenue Secretaries and Commissioners/Directors of Survey,

Settlement and Land Records was held on 28.4.1997. The State Government representatives were requested for taking suitable steps for effective implementation of the scheme and for submission of latest position of utilization of funds by 15th May, 1997. It is expected that the progress under the scheme would improve to a large extent during the Ninth Five Year Plan.

The Scheme of Computer of Land Records is a 100% centrally sponsored scheme, so the question of enhancing the Central share does not arise. The States have been requested from time to time to submit quarterly progress report of utilisation of funds in the prescribed format. Recently on 28th April, 1997, in the meeting of the Revenue Secretaries, Settlement Commissioner and Collectors of selected districts on computerisation of land records, the progress of utilisation of funds are reviewed. This Ministry has assigned an evaluation study of Morena (M.P.), Project to Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussorie to identify the process of computerisation, its shortcomings if any. The NIC officials are frequently visiting the computerisation project districts to monitor the progress of the project.

Since the states are providing the matching share both under ARWSP and CRSP, it is not necessary to enhance the centre's share. Further this would require amendment of the guidelines. In the interest of the accelerated coverage, it is not desirable to relax the condition of the matching share.

The recommendation of the Committee is accepted for compliance. The recommendations have also been communicated to the states for implementation. The matter regarding concurrent evaluation of Rural Water Supply/Rural Sanitation programme is under consideration.

The observation of the Committee have been noted and a number of steps have been taken by the Ministry to strengthen the monitoring of NSAP. Formats of periodical progress reports have been sent to all districts in the country and reports are being received from a number of districts though several States/UTs are lagging behind in this respect. The importance of effective monitoring by State nodal departments have been stressed at the meeting of State nodal Secretaries and during discussions with Senior Officials of the State Governments. The Ministry has also been writing to the State Governments in this connection. District level Committees on NSAP have been constituted in various States to monitor and supervise the implementation of the programme.

At the Centre, the Ministry has been monitoring the Programme on a continuous basis. Area Officers of the Ministry have been asked to report on the progress of NSAP in the districts they visit, Senior Officers of the Ministry have also visited a number of States, held discussions with State Officers reviewed the progress of the Programme. The observations of the Committee regarding evaluation of the Programme have been noted for necessary action.

Under the Scheme of Roads in Special Problem Areas, of the three States, there is a shortfall in release of State share in the case of Madhya Pradesh. The State Government has been sanctioned works costing Rs. 19.84 crores. 50% of this cost, i.e. Rs. 9.92 crores is to be released by the Central Government and an equal amount by the State Government. While the Central Government has released Rs. 9.04 crores, the State Government has released Rs. 6.59 crores upto February, 1997 as their share. The State Government has reported that some roads could not be completed for want of clearance from the Forest Department. This Ministry is pursuing with the State Government to take all possible steps including necessary clearances and complete the ongoing works expeditiously.

The scheme of Roads in Special Problem Areas is being implemented by the Public Works Department of the three States. The monitoring of the scheme is done through quarterly progress reports from the State Governments. Since the scheme is implemented in selected areas only, it is not felt very necessary to have district level monitoring Committees. The present system of monitoring through progress reports and discussions with State Officials is considered adequate.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/
96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(d)]

There should be set guidelines regarding the maintenance of assets created under different programmes. Block Development Officers and Panchayats should be equipped with more infrastructure to ensure the proper maintenance of assets. The problem of supervisory/technical staff might be solved by placing officials of the State Departments viz., Public Works Department, Irrigation, PHE, E&D and Health Department etc. on deputation basis. Sufficient supervisory technical

staff to maintain the accounts and perform Secretarial duties should be provided to Panchayats to enable them to ensure proper maintenance of assets. To cater to the need of infrastructure Panchayats/BDOs should be provided adequate funds.

Reply of the Government

For the maintenance of the assets created under the Rural Water Supply Programme, 10% of the annual ARWSP and the MNP funds are allowed to be utilised, in addition to the non-plan funds provided for this purpose by the States/UTs and contribution collected from the users by certain States particularly for the externally aided projects. All the States have been requested to take action for transfer ownership of the assets to the Panchayats and their proper maintenance after equipping them with necessary infrastructure like trained manpower, arrangement for timely supply of spare parts, and adequate financial resources through the recommendations of the State Finance Commission, Central/State plan funds under ARWSP/MNP, O&M cost recovery from the users, formation of Water and Sanitation Committee at the habitation, Panchayat, block and district levels etc.

The Panchayats are at present not involved in implementation of the schemes of Land Reforms. However, the matter relating to involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in Land Management/Land Reforms was discussed in the Conference of Revenue Ministers of State held on 28.1.97 in New Delhi. The Conference, *inter-alia*, recommended involvement of Gram Panchayats in prevention of alienation of tribal land and restoration of alienated land, selection of beneficiaries for allotment of various types of lands, management of the Common Property Resources, unearthing the surplus land, concealed tenancy and unrecorded share-croppers etc. It was also recommended that the State Governments are at liberty to delegate such powers and responsibilities to PRIs as may be considered reasonable and pragmatic, taking into account the ground level realities, public needs and abilities of the PRIs of the concerned States. The recommendations of the Conference have been sent to the States/UTs for follow up action.

As per the MOU for implementation of the scheme of Computerisation of land records, it is the duty of the NIC to install operate and maintain the computers and other infrastructure at the Tehsil or equivalent level.

There are proper guidelines for implementation of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records. A copy of the same has already been issued to State Governments for implementation of the project as per the guidelines.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(f)]

Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme should be accorded priority. It is very unfortunate that only 14.62% of the Rural population has so far been covered by the Rural Sanitation Programme. There should not be compartmentalisation of the programme. To give the proper meaning to sanitation, this programme should be launched in a holistic manner. There should be sufficient thrust to publicity campaign through media to motivate the masses to construct individual latrine without subsidy by the Centre. Contaminated water is another area of concern. Government should accord the adequate priority to ensure the safe drinking water to rural masses.

Reply of the Government

Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programmes have been accorded priority within the Five Year Plan resources:

- (a) The outlay for VIII Five Year Plan was raised to Rs. 10054.52 crore from Rs. 3455.77 crore in the VI Plan for rural water supply and to Rs. 674.23 crore from Rs. 100.955 crore in the VII Plan for rural sanitation.
- (b) Rural Water Supply has been included as part of the Seven Basic Minimum Services with high priority as recommended in the Chief Minister's Conference on 4-5 July, 1996 for which special funds have also been released to the States by the Planning Commission. It was also recommended in the Conference that there should be effective convergence of sanitation hygiene and Public Health with drinking water sources and facilities.
- (c) Both the programmes are part of the MNP and Twenty Point Programme.

- (d) The Working Group for the Ninth Plan recommended an outlay of Rs. 35311 crore for rural water supply and Rs. 2556 crore to Rs. 6252 crore depending upon the availability of outlay for rural sanitation, excluding contribution by the Panchayats/community beneficiaries.

Rural Sanitation Coverage

Based on the NSS survey data (1988-89) and progress under Government supported rural sanitation programme since then, the coverage as on 31.1.97 was 15.89% excluding coverage through private efforts and initiatives. The Working Group for the Ninth Plan has assessed that including coverage through private self-help programme, the coverage by the end of VIII Plan is expected to be around 25% of rural population. It has recommended that coverage during IX Plan should be raised by additional 50% (33% through private efforts and 17% through Government assisted programmes).

Launching the programme in a holistic manner

The Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment is in full agreement with the concerns and observations of the Standing Committee. In the review meeting with the States. It was stressed that the programme should be implemented in a holistic and integrated manner taking full advantage of the availability of safe drinking water and the facilities that can be provided under other Poverty Alleviation & Employment and Rural Development programmes. Even through the Central guidelines do not provide for subsidy to individual households above the poverty line, those States which are giving such subsidy out of their own funds have not been denied the benefit of Central assistance in the interest of accelerated coverage.

Thrust to publicity Campaigns

10% of CRSP funds are permitted for IEC, Publicity, motivation, etc. Adequate funds (Rs. 13 crore provided in 1996-97) are also provided under Rural Water Supply Programmes. IEC Cells are being set up in the States. Project for IEC and Publicity campaigns have been approved for 20 States. TV spots on sanitary construction is being launched.

Recently an advertisement was given in the Newspaper on Rural sanitation. This will be followed up with special motivational message to construct individual latrines without subsidy, as recommended by

the Standing Committee. Messages will be encouraged through use of Postal stationary.

Priority to ensure safe drinking water in contaminated water areas

Adequate priority is being given to the problem of chemical contamination in drinking water under the Sub-Mission Programme. Rs. 402.58 crore has been released during the VIII Five Year Plan to various States for projects approved under the Sub-Missions on Arsenic, excess fluoride, brackishness, excess iron, etc. A sum of Rs. 240 crore has been earmarked for 1997-98. States are also free to approve schemes under the ARWSP and the MNP to overcome the problem of contaminated water, States have also been requested to provide a total picture of the magnitude of the problem in their State by furnishing district-wise and quality-wise details of affected habitations so that in future projects under the Sub-Mission can be considered keeping in view the water priorities and specific action plan and a measure of transparency, adopting cost effective approach.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendations [Para Nos. 13.4(g) and 13.4(h)]

Linkages amongst the various agencies of implementation *viz.*, Centre, State and local bodies should be strengthened to have coordination and 100% implementation of funds.

The implementation of the respective schemes by best performing States should be circulated to other States to motivate them. Further there should be some sort of incentives to the best performing States.

Reply of the Government

As stated already, the scheme of Roads in Special Problem Areas is being implemented by the Public Works Department of the three State Governments and linkages with local bodies is not considered very essential for this particular scheme. The performance of the scheme has been discussed in a joint meeting of representatives of the three States in November, 1996 and the States are aware of the performance of each other.

For ARWSP and CRSP, the recommendation is accepted for implementation.

Local bodies are not involved at present in implementation of the scheme of SRA & ULR. Interaction with the States/UTs takes place under the scheme at regular intervals particularly in the Conference of Revenue Secretaries and Ministers. Last such Conferences were held on 26-27.11.1996, 28.1.1997 and 28.4.1997 where detailed discussions were held on implementation of scheme with the State Government representatives.

As regards incentives to the best performing States, such States automatically get more funds under the scheme compared to the poor performing States.

For NSAP recommendations of the Committee have been noted. In order to strengthen linkage between Centre and States, meeting of nodal Secretaries' in-charge of NSAP is held and officers of the Ministry visit States and discuss with Senior Officers of the States. Ministry's representative will also be attending the meetings of State level Committees. State Governments have also been urged during discussions to call meeting of District Collectors and review the progress from time to time. The implementation of best performing States will be intimated to other States. Regarding incentives to best performing States, the recommendation has been noted.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(i)]

So far as National Social Security Scheme is concerned, the Committee note that adequate publicity has not been given to the programme. To ensure the success of the programme there should be coverage by TV, Radio and newspapers. Further the scheme should be popularised by displaying at the important places in the villages like Panchayat office.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted. The Ministry has taken steps to publicise the Programme through newspaper advertisements and sponsored programmes through All India Radio in various regional languages. TV spots on the Programme were also broadcast. Publicity was also done through postal stationery. Steps are being taken to publicise the programme through street plays, publicity hoardings etc. by Song & Drama Division and DAVP of the I&B Ministry, Funds have been given to all districts for administrative expenditure including publicity for the programme. The Ministry has also released funds to the Nodal departments of States/UTs towards expenditure on publicity and other expenditure for effective implementation of the Programme.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 13.5)

The Committee would like to recommend that while formulating strategies for Ninth Plan Government should consider the various observations and recommendations of the Committee as given in the preceding paragraphs of the Report. As regards outlay for different Schemes/Programmes during Ninth Plan, they urge that there should be appropriate enhancement of outlay in view of the recommendations of the Committee with regard to each of the Scheme/Programme.

Reply of the Government

The observations/recommendations of the Committee have been noted. The recommendation regarding outlay during Ninth Plan has been communicated to Planning Commission also.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATION WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

Recommendation (Para No. 7.14)

The Committee note the prescribed ceiling with regard to number of beneficiaries in each of the State as given at Annexure IV of the First Report of Eleventh Lok Sabha. They would like to recommend that the number of ceiling in each of the States should be fixed considering the specific requirement of that State that should be depending on the pattern of the population. It is urged that guidelines issued by the Centre should be reviewed accordingly.

Reply of the Government

It may be pointed out that the numerical ceiling prescribed for the States/UTs are in fact based on the population pattern of the States/UTs. The projected population as on 1st July 1995 which is one of the parameters used for fixing the numerical ceilings of States/UTs is based on the Report of the Standing Committee of Experts on Population Projection (1989) and estimated by Registrar General's Officer. The other parameters taken into consideration for the derivation of the numerical ceilings are the poverty ratio, ratio of 65 age group in total population, ratio of 18 to 64 age group in total population, age specific mortality in 18-64 age groups, crude birth rate and the ratio of first two births in total births.

Thus it may be seen that the ceilings for the States/UTs have been arrived at by careful consideration of the basic parameters essential for the purpose. The specific requirement for each State will emerge from implementation of the scheme for sometime.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-
GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

(a) Definition of Destitute and Selection Criteria

(1) A destitute may be defined as a person with an annual income from all sources—his/her own or through financial support from family members or other sources—not exceeding Rs. 1500 per annum.

(2) In the selection of applicants for OAP priority may be given to the following categories:

(i) Persons of age 65 or above living alone or living with spouses who are also of age 65 or above, who satisfy the destitution criterion.

(ii) Among them, preference may be given to women living alone, SC/ST, the handicapped and landless agricultural labourers.

(iii) If both husband and wife are individually eligible, there should be no bar to each of them getting a OAP.

(3) OAP should be available to eligible persons who are ordinarily resident in the State. If a minimum period of domicile is considered necessary, it need not be more than 3 years.

(4) In some States a criminal record or conviction in criminal case debars eligibility to OAP. On the principle that no one should be punished twice for the same offence, such a restriction on eligibility does not seem to be justified.

(5) Some States have debarred professional beggars from OAP. While this may not be unreasonable, dependence on casual charity may be ignored.

(6) In most States, the OAP continues for the lifetime of the beneficiary. In some States, the pension can be withdrawn if eligibility is not sustained on account of changed circumstances. In one State the pension is valid for five years at a time and is subject to renewal thereafter. In order to avoid harassment and discontinuities, the OAP may be for life-time.

(7) The Guidelines (para 19) require that the death of a pensioner should be promptly reported to the sanctioning authority. Disbursement through M.O. will also ensure stoppage of payment on death. In these circumstances, it may not be necessary to insist on periodical verification of survival.

(8) States/UTs which had more liberal income criteria should be free to continue with them recognising that the financial burden entailed thereby in excess of the QFE under the NSAP would have to be met by the own resources of the State/UT. States/UTs can also consider the option of moving to the criterion suggested above in respect of future applicants for the OAP. This would enable them to cover a large number of the neediest for a given financial outlay.

(b) Streamlining of procedures

(1) Applications should be available at all times at the village Panchayat, block and tehsil levels. The Panchayat/Village Administrative or Development officials should be authorised to forward applications to the sanctioning authority. The verification process must be simple, expeditious and transparent. Particular care must be taken to eliminate corruption at this stage. The Gram Sabha may be associated with the verification process in an appropriate manner.

(2) The sanctioning authority should be a responsible authority as close as possible to the village such as Tehsildar, BDO or SDO. Both sanctions and rejections should be communicated to applicants and also published on the Panchayat notice board. Procedures should be available for appeals against rejection for redressal of any other grievances related to access to the NSAP benefits.

(3) States/UTs may ensure strict time limits for each of the following stages: (i) Receipt of application to completion of verification (ii) completion of verification to communication of sanction or rejection (iii) date of sanction to first disbursement. Adequate arrangements must be instituted to monitor the time actually taken compared to the prescribed norms and appropriate action taken to curtail delays at all stages.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.3)

The Committee observe that to meet the challenging task of poverty alleviation more and more programmes are being launched by the Centre. Besides as per 73rd Amendment Panchayati Raj is being established. They also note that besides to take the benefit of latest global technology, there is need to modernise the training Institutes like satellite and other modes of communication. The training of Panchayati Raj functionaries should be a continuous programme. The Committee would also like that the resources at National level, State level or the District should be pooled together to impart knowledge and skill.

Reply of the Government

NICNET connectivity facilities have been provided to NIRD, Hyderabad and to NESIRDS of various States. This will enable these institutes to exchange training and other printed material with each other. NIRD functions as a link Institute with SIRDs and ETCs in the field of Training and Research in Rural Development. It acts as a 'Think Tank' for formulation of policies in this regard and provides feed back to the Ministry. SIRDs and ETCs are making use of the expertise and consultancy services of NIRD. Attempts are also being made to produce training material on video and multi-media system. These steps will result in sharing of resources among the training institutes. NIRD as the apex institution, is involved in the processing of proposals for strengthening SIRDs and ETCs. Every year the NIRD organises a colloquium with SIRD to discuss the problems and the manner in which the collaboration among training institutes can be strengthened.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(c)]

To ensure proper identification of beneficiaries and implementation Panchayats should more be involved in keeping with the spirit of 73rd Amendment. There should be standard guidelines by the Centre to involve the Panchayats in identification and implementation of the various Programmes and Schemes.

Reply of the Government

Panchayats are already being involved in the identification of beneficiaries and implementation under NSAP. The NSAP guidelines already provide for this.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4(e)]

The Committee note that in some of the States, Secretary, Panchayats have been posted on adhoc basis. The Committee would like to recommend that the adhoc Secretaries should be regularised.

Reply of the Government

Panchayati Raj being a State subject, posting of Panchayat Secretaries and other staff of Panchayats falls under the purview of the concerned State Government. However, this recommendation of the Standing Committee will be sent to all the States/UTs for necessary action.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Recommendation [Para No. 13.4 (j)]

MPs and MLAs should be associated with the implementation of various Schemes/Programmes launched by the Department. There should be standard guidelines by the Centre in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The scheme of Roads in Special Problem Areas is an old scheme which was launched in 1985-86 and the Roads works to be taken up had already been identified. The works are executed by the State Governments of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan through their Public Works Department. Valuable suggestions from Hon'ble MPs and MLAs for early completion of the ongoing works, are welcome.

Though no instructions have been issued to the State Governments for involvement of MPs/MLAs/PRIs in implementation of various Land Reforms Schemes/Programmes as the subject matter relating to Land falls under the legislative and administrative jurisdiction of the State

Governments, the matter has been discussed during the meetings with the Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers. Certain important recommendations were made in this regard in the recently held conference of Revenue Ministers on 28.1.1997. As already explained against Recommendation No. 10.5 above, these recommendations have been sent to the States/UTs for necessary follow-up action.

The guidelines already issued by the Department of Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation are applicable for Rural Water Supply/Rural Sanitation Programme also.

The NSAP guidelines clearly provide that MPs and MLAs will be members of the District Level Committee on NSAP.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-
GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)

The Committee are dismayed to note the underspending of 6.24% under Rural Water Supply Programme. Of equal concern is the position in States *viz.* Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, U.P. where outstanding balances have almost doubled from 1994-95 to 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Department in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The underspending of 6.24% under the Rural Water Supply Programme during 1995-96 was mainly due to want of adequate project proposals seeking funds by the States under the Sub-Missions to deal with the quality problems of drinking water, Human Resource Development (HRD), Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) etc. Another important reason was the non-implementation of the new component of Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme in DPAP areas which could not be got approved from the Government during the VIII Five Year Plan. The Savings under the above items of Rural Water Supply Programme could however, have been utilised under the Centrally Sponsored ARWSP as there were demand for additional funds by some of the States. However, re-appropriation of funds from the various components of the programme to the ARWSP was not approved by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) as a prudent financial practice as release of additional funds in the month of February and March, 1996 would remain unutilised with the States resulting in heavy carry overs.

The increase in the outstanding balances in 1994-95 to 1995-96 in the case of Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh was mainly due to delayed release of funds by the State Government to the Implementing agencies (Zilla Parishads and U.P. Jal Nigam respectively). In the case of Kerala, the increase in the outstanding balance was due to the fact that a sum of Rs. 1086 lakh was released towards the end of February and March 1994 which could not be utilised by the State Government during the year and, had to be carried over to the next financial year 1995-96. Except for the case of Andhra Pradesh, the outstanding balance in 1996-97 was considerably reduced. It was Rs. 1247.76 lakh for Kerala and, Rs. 462.63 lakh for Uttar Pradesh.

As a corrective measures, steps have been taken to utilise fully the approved outlay for Rural Water Supply Programme for 1996-97. The position of outstanding balances was also reviewed in the third meeting of the Empowered Committee of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission held on 24th October, 1996 when all the States and Union Territories were requested to take steps to utilise fully the available funds during the financial year 1996-97. It is also proposed to make releases of the allocated funds to all the States/UTs by the end of December, 1996 so as to leave adequate time for meaningful utilisation of the available resources to achieve the physical targets.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Comments of the Committee

Please *see* para 6 of Chapter I of the Report.

Recommendation (Para No. 5.15)

The Committee urge that to cover more and more population under the programme thrust should be given on community latrines besides individual latrines.

Reply of the Government

The general guidelines for implementation of CRSP provide that upto 10% of the annual funds should be used for Construction of exclusive complexes for women (community) where there is no adequate space is available in the village, if the panchayat agrees to provide the land and undertake the responsibility to maintain such complexes. However, some of the states like Tamil Nadu have experienced that the scheme has not yielded the desired results because of poor response from the community and non use of the complexes established. The community latrines (about 11217) constructed by the State Government of Tamil Nadu during 1980-84 were not put to use by the community. In view of the past experience, the matter is left to the judgement of the implementing States to give the desired priority to women complexes/community latrines keeping in view their specific needs, constraints and acceptability by the Panchayats which have also to share 30% of the cost of such complexes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

Comments of the Committee

Please *see* para 9 of Chapter I of the Report.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATION IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Para No. 12.2)

The Department in the written notes have stated that decision is being taken shortly. The Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation.

Reply of the Government

No decision is taken in the matter till date. The matter is being referred to the Committee of Secretaries for consideration so that a consensus opinion may emerge for arriving at a final decision.

[Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/3/96-
GC(P) dated 13th April, 1998]

NEW DELHI;
3 February, 1999
14 Magha, 1920 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I

COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF THE 33RD SITTING OF THE
COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT
HELD ON MONDAY, THE 25TH JANUARY, 1999 IN
COMMITTEE ROOM 'E' PARLIAMENT HOUSE
ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1245 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri D.S. Ahire
3. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Sriram Chauhan
6. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
7. Shri Mitha Lal Jain
8. Shri Subhash Maharia
9. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
10. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
11. Shrimati Ranee Narah
12. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
13. Shri Gaddam Ganga Reddy
14. Shri Vital Baburao Tupe
15. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Nilotpal Basu
17. Dr. M.N. Das
18. Shri N. R. Dasari
19. Shri John F. Fernandes
20. Shri C. Apok Jamir
21. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
22. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
23. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee.

Consideration of draft Action Taken Reports

3. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **

4. The Committee thereafter, took up, for consideration Memorandum No. 6 regarding draft Report on action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 1st Report of the Committee (11th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the draft action taken Report.

5. ** ** ** ** ** ** **

6. The Committee, then authorised the Chairman, to finalise the said draft action taken Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/Departments.

7. ** ** **~**~**~

*The Committee then adjourned to meet at 1500 hrs.
on 9th February, 1999.*

APPENDIX II

(*vide* Para 4 of the Introduction)

I. Total number of recommendations	58
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	
Para Nos. 3.5 to 3.9, 4.16 to 4.23, 5.11 to 5.14, 6.4 to 6.6, 6.10 & 6.11, 7.9 to 7.13, 8.4 to 8.7, 9.4, 10.4 to 10.7, 11.4 to 11.6, 13.3 (a) to 13.3 (c), 13.4 (a), 13.4 (b), 13.4 (d), 13.4 (f) to 13.4 (i) and 13.5	50
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	
Para Nos. 7.14, 8.3, 13.4(c), 13.4(e), 13.4(j)	5
Percentage to the total recommendations	86.21%
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	
Para Nos. 4.15 and 5.15	2
Percentage to the total recommendations	3.45%
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	
Para No. 12.2	1
Percentage to the total recommendations	1.72%