

17

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

**TWELFTH LOK SABHA**

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(1997-98)**

**SEVENTEENTH REPORT**



LC  
-8.3657R  
48.17;4

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

SEVENTEENTH 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 (1997-98)

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

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 5.3.1999  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 5.3.1999*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*February, 1999/Phalguna, 1920 (Saka)*

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

CORRIGENDA TO SEVENTEENTH REPORT 12TH LOK SABHA

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
13	18	Substainability	Sustainability
15	18	Institution	Institute

## CONTENTS

		PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....		(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....		(v)
CHAPTER I	Report .....	1
CHAPTER II	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	16
CHAPTER III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	34
CHAPTER IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	35
CHAPTER V	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	45

### APPENDICES

I.	Minutes of the 34th Sitting of the Committee held on 9.2.99 .....	48
II.	Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 8th Report of the Committee (11th Lok Sabha) .....	51

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 Nikhilananda Sar
26. Shri I.M. Jayaram Shetty
27. Shri Daya Singh Sodhi
28. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
29. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
30. Shri K. Venugopal

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
32. Shrimati Vyjayantimala Bali
33. Shri Nilotpal Basu
34. Shri Jhumaklal 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*
4. Shri A.K. Srivastava — *Committee Officer*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Seventeenth Report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

2. The Eighth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 2nd April, 1997. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 12th March, 1998.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 9th February, 1999.

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

NEW DELHI;  
February 23, 1999  

---

Phalguna 4, 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 Eighth Report on Demands for Grants for the year 1997-98 of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment (Department of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1997.**

**2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 33 recommendations which have been categorised as follows :—**

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

**Sl. Nos. 2.11, 3.9, 3.11, 3.20, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 7.3, 8.2, 9.2, 10.5 and 12.1.**

- (ii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee :**

**Sl. Nos. 2.3 to 2.10, 2.12 and 3.10.**

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

**Sl. Nos. 3.8, 3.15, 3.16 and 11.2.**

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



## **A. Overall analysis of Demands for Grants & Plan Budget for the year 1997-98**

### **Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.3 to 2.10)**

#### **4. The Committee recommended as under :—**

“The Committee note with concern the status quo in the outlay of 1997-98 as compared to that of the year 1996-97. They note that the outlay for 1997-98 does not cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. They further note an alarming feature that emerges out of the data given at Para 2.1 above. The accepted during 1997-98 by the Ministry of Finance is much lesser *i.e.* around 20% of the proposed outlay by the Department. It is also observed that not only the outlay sanctioned is inadequate keeping in view the challenges of rural poverty and entire grant of improvement in the overall quality of life but the scarce resources as sanctioned for different rural development schemes are not fully utilised. The Committee visualize that underspending of funds earmarked for rural development schemes is the major area of concern. They in their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had expressed their concern towards the non-utilisation of funds and urged the Department to ensure 100% utilisation of funds. It is noted that there is no such improvement in the spending position and the feature of underspending reoccur during 1996-97. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government on this account. (2.3)

It is also observed that the Department could not get the proposed amount under the respective schemes due to underspending of funds allocated in the previous year. In other words ineffective implementation of the schemes is responsible for not getting sufficient funds for the various schemes of Rural Development. The Committee note that the Department should not feel contended by merely allocating the State's share for respective schemes to States/UTs. Rather the schemes should be properly monitored and it should have been ensured that funds for Centrally sponsored schemes are utilised by various State Governments for the specific purpose these are meant for. They would like the Department to review their programmes/schemes so as to have first hand knowledge of the weaknesses responsible for the poor implementation of the schemes.

The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. It is strongly recommended to have a fool proof mechanism incorporated in the guidelines to ensure effective implementation of the programmes/schemes and cent per cent utilisation of funds. (2.4)

It is observed that implementation of respective schemes of Rural Development is slow because the implementing personnel do not have the technical expertise required for proper planning to make projects and ceiling tenders of small, medium and big nature. Besides the implementing agency lack the required infrastructure such as road roller, water pumps etc. It is recommended that to improve the implementation of the programmes, personnel responsible for the implementation should be given the proper technical training and the required infrastructure should also be provided. (2.5)

Further, it is found that because of paucity of funds required for various programmes, the staff of respective State Departments like PWD, PHA, R&D etc. are sitting idle. The services of such persons should be adequately used by transfer on deputation basis as BDO for implementing rural development schemes to improve the implementation position. (2.6)

The maintenance of assets created under different programmes should be the responsibility of the respective Panchayats. (2.7)

Intensive programmes for sensitizing the local community and the target groups be undertaken on large scale. (2.8)

People's participation in the implementation of the schemes be enhanced. This can be done through involvement on much larger scale of elected representatives (MPs/MLAs/MLCs) and representative institutions (Panchayats) in the implementation process. (2.9)

The Committee of beneficiaries be formed at the grass root level and such Committees be associated with the implementation process. (2.10)

5. The Government in their reply have clarified their position scheme-wise as given below:—

**(i) Land Reforms**

The following three schemes are being administered by the Land Reforms Section of the Department of Rural Development:—

- (1) Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR);
- (2) Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Computerisation of Land Records;
- (3) Central Sector Scheme for Grant-in-aid to Institutions for Agrarian studies.

Financial assistance is provided to the States/UTs only under the Schemes at (1) and (2) above.

The Department admits that the Budgetary outlay for 1997-98 under the above mentioned schemes has been kept at the level of 1996-97 and does not cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. In fact, proposals for the 9th Five Year Plan under the schemes were prepared incorporating some basic changes in the schemes with increased allocation of funds of Rs. 80.00 crore, Rs. 83.60 crore and Rs. 1.00 crore under the schemes at (1), (2) and (3) above respectively. However, keeping in view the overall allocation of funds by the Planning Commission to the Department, the allocation under the schemes has been kept at the level of 1996-97.

As regards utilisation of funds under these schemes, the Department is persistently pursuing the States/UTs for expeditious utilisation of funds. This issue has also been discussed from time to time to various fora for including the Conferences of State Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers. Last such Conferences of Revenue Ministers and Secretaries, in which the position of utilisation of funds under these schemes was discussed in detail, were held recently on 28.1.97 and 28th-29th April, 1997 respectively. The Conferences *inter alia* made some important recommendations in this regard which have been sent to the States/UTs for necessary follow up action. It is expected that the position would improve significantly during the

current financial year. In addition, the implementation of the schemes is monitored by field visits by LR Division officials, by area officers, by collecting utilisation certificates and ensuring a substantial amount of utilisation before further funds are released. Through the aforesaid procedure it is ensured that the Central funds are utilised for the purpose for which they have been sanctioned. Further, the two Committees, constituted under the Chairmanship of the Secretary (RD) viz. Technical Committee under the SRA & ULR scheme and National Level Steering Committee under the Computerisation of Land Records scheme also examine the proposals received from the States/UTs for release of funds and review the physical and financial progress of the Schemes before making further release of funds to the States/UTs.

In fact funds are being provided to the States/UTs under the SRA & ULR scheme for Strengthening the Training infrastructure for the Revenue. Survey and Settlement staff by way of construction of new Training Institutes, renovation of existing institutes, purchase of equipments for imparting the training, hiring of technical experts for training etc. In addition, States/UTs have been requested from time to time for nomination of their staff/officers for training being organised by the Survey Training Institutes of the Surveyor General of India. Under the scheme of Computerisation of Land records the National Information Centre (NIC) has been imparting training to the State Government Officers/Staff involved in the implementation of the scheme. Thus adequate provisions exist for training of manpower under the aforesaid schemes.

The States/UT Governments have not been able to utilise fully the funds released under the schemes and have unspent balances with them. Thus there is no paucity of funds with the State Governments under the schemes administered by the Ministry under Land Reforms. As the schemes are being implemented through Revenue Departments, the BDOs are not involved in their implementation.

The assets created under the schemes are not community assets. These are for strengthening the existing infrastructure for training of revenue, survey and settlement staff, storage of land records, Computerisation of Land Records etc. Accordingly, it has not been felt necessary to involve Panchayats in their maintenance.

With a view to have greater transparency and dissemination of information under the schemes, the States/UT Governments have been requested for taking suitable steps for wide publicity in local media about the schemes, items/projects sanctioned and funds released etc. These steps are also expected to help in preventing any misuse and leakage of funds under the schemes.

As regards involvement of elected representatives in implementation of the Land Reform Schemes/Programmes, no guidelines/instructions have been issued to States/UTs as the subject matter relating to Land Administration falls within the Legislative and Administration jurisdiction of the State Governments, as per the Constitution. However, the issue relating to involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in land Managements/Land Reforms was discussed in the Revenue Ministers Conference held on 28.1.97. The Conference *inter-alia* recommended involvement of these institutions in prevention of alienation of tribal land and restoration of the alienated land, selection of beneficiaries for allotment of various types of lands, managing Common Property Resources, unearthing surplus land, concealed tenancy, unrecorded sharecroppers etc. the recommendations of the Conference have been sent to the States/UTs for suitable follow-up action. The States/UTs have been requested to inform the steps taken by them for involvement of PRIs in implementation of Land Reforms/Programmes.

#### (ii) Technology Mission

The outlay for 1997-98 has been increased by Rs. 192 crore in the case of Rural Water Supply and Rs. 40 crore for Central Rural Sanitation Programme. The R.E. 1996-97 for Rural Water Supply Programme and Rural Sanitation Programme were fully utilised.

There is adequate mechanism incorporated in the guidelines of implementation of Centrally Sponsored Rural Water Supply Programme and Central Rural Sanitation Programme for effective implementation of the schemes and cent per cent utilisation of funds. If due to certain valid reasons, full funds cannot be used, it is stipulated that the carry over amount should not exceed 25% and 15% of the annual allocation for ARWSP and CRSP respectively. The physical and financial progress is reviewed through periodic reports and meetings and appropriate follow-up action is taken with the implementing Department to ensure effective implementation and remedial measures.

The Public Health Engineering Department/Rural Development Department/PWD (Public Health) Department in the States implementing the Rural Water Supply Programme have the necessary technical expertise of public health engineering, civil, mechanical engineering/managerial and accounting expertise. Under the Human Resource Development Programme, training is provided to the grass root level workers and sector professionals/functionaries.

All States/UTs have been requested to entrust the responsibility for ownership of the assets and maintenance of the schemes to the Panchayats with active involvement of the local people, Water and Sanitation Committees and also for meeting the routing cost of operation and maintenance, adequate financial resources to the Panchayats to discharge the responsibilities, arrangement for training of the manpower, spare parts etc. The States/UTs have been requested to avail the facility under the IEC programme funded by the Central Government for Rural Water Supply/Rural Sanitation Sector.

All the States/UTs were requested *vide* letter No. W-11012/4/94-TM-II dated 14.12.94 to set up Water User Committees at the habitation and Panchayat level and support services for monitoring and for major repairs at the block, district and State level monitoring committees. States have also been requested that selection of beneficiaries-households below the poverty line for construction of subsidised sanitary latrines should be made by the Gram Sabha/Panchayats.

An outlay of Rs. 932 crore was budgeted for NSAP during 1996-97 which was subsequently reduced to Rs. 550 crore in the Revised Estimates. During 1996-97, this Ministry could release Rs. 551.13 crores including Rs. 3.02 crore towards administrative expenditure at Centre. As mush funds for the three schemes of NSAP (*viz.* NOAPS, NFBS and NMBS) were released to the maximum extent.

As submitted earlier, the entire amount of Rs. 550 crore has been spent by the Ministry during 1996-97. The State Governments have been instructed to strictly utilise the funds for the purpose for which they were released. They are being reminded from time to time to make all out efforts for effective and speedy implementation of the programmes. Meetings with officials of the States are held on a regular basis and this would continue.

Under the existing monitoring mechanism for NSAP, format for reporting the monthly progress have been prescribed. The districts as well as the State Governments have been sending these reports quite regularly. Besides officers from the Ministry review the progress during their visit to States under the "Area Officers Schemes" of the Ministry.

6. The Committee are constrained to observe that while furnishing action taken replies to their recommendations Government do not cover all schemes about which the recommendations were made by the Committee. For example, the Committee made an overall analysis of all the Centrally Sponsored schemes of the Department of Rural Development *vide* Para Nos. 2.3 to 2.10. However, Government preferred to furnish replies in respect of three schemes relating to land records only. They choose to remain silent about other schemes *viz.*, ARSWP, RSP, NSAP, T&R, PD&T, Roads in special problem areas, CAPART, NIRD and distribution of surplus land etc. The Committee therefore urge the Government that in future while furnishing Action Taken Replies to their recommendations which are omnibus in nature, the information should be given in respect of all the schemes under the control of the Department. They also recommend that complete replies to their recommendations referred to above should be furnished without delay.

As regards the replies made by the Committee in respect of the schemes mentioned above the Committee are not satisfied on some of the points as given below:—

### Land Reforms

(1) Contradictory statements have been made with regard to the allocation of funds for the year 1997-98 for the three schemes under Lands Reforms. On the one hand it has been stated that BE 1997-98 was pegged at the level of BE 1996-97 in view of the overall allocation of funds by the Planning Commission to the Department, on the other it has been stated that there is no paucity of funds as States are not able to utilise the funds fully. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government and would like that

they should clearly mention the reason for lower Budget Estimate for the three schemes under Land Records during 1997-98. So far as the recommendation of the Committee regarding involving elected representatives in the implementation of Land Reforms schemes/programmes (Sl. No. 2.9). The Committee are not satisfied with the plea made by the Government that the matter falls under the jurisdiction of State Governments. Notwithstanding the fact that Land Management is a State Subject, Central Government can always issue certain guidelines for the better implementation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes specially when the computerisation of Land Records is 100% funded by the Central Government. They, therefore, would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made at Para 2.9 of the 8th Report.

#### **B. National Rural Assistance Programme**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)**

#### **7. The Committee recommended as under:—**

“The Committee note that no rural programme can be successfully implemented without people’s involvement. It is recommended that necessary steps should be taken for effective people’s participation in all the rural development schemes.”

#### **8. The Government in their action taken reply stated as below:—**

“In so far as NSAP is concerned, Panchayats and Municipalities are responsible for implementation of all three schemes of NSAP. Besides, MPs, MLAs, Chairpersons of Zilla Parishads and representatives from among Chairpersons of Panchayats and Municipalities are member of the District Level Committees which are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the programme. As such elected representatives are involved in the process of implementation of this programme.”



9. On the recommendation of the Committee for effective people's participation, the Government have stated the existing position with regard to the involvement of elected representatives in the implementation of National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP). However reply nowhere mentions the steps taken by the Government to ensure people's participation in the various schemes, they would therefore like to be informed about the steps taken by the Government in this direction.

### C. Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)

10. The Committee recommended as under:—

"The Committee would like to express their doubts about the claim of the Government of 84.23% of rural population having access to safe drinking water. They feel that the reality at the grass root level is quite different. It is observed that Government should verify their claim and would like the explanation of the Government in this regard."

11. The Government in their reply have stated as under:—

"Rural Population of 85.13% (provisional as reports are awaited from some States for March, 1997) as on 1.4.97 having access to safe drinking water is based on the status survey of 1994 and the subsequent progress reported by the States/UTs upto 1996-97. The observations of the Committee have been communicated to them for verification/confirmation of the coverage data reported by the States/UTs."

12. The Committee note that the Government have taken up the matter of verification of data regarding availability of safe drinking water in rural areas, with State Governments/UTs Administrations. They would like to be informed of the result of such verification.

**Recommendation (Para No. 3.10)**

13. The Committee recommended as under:—

“The Committee further note that not only inadequate funds are allocated for the said programme, but also the funds are utilised fully by State Governments which adversely affects the implementation of the Programme. During 1996-97 (upto January, 1997) out of Rs. 1110 crore outlay Rs. 937.41 crore could be released by Central Government out of which expenditure reported (upto *i.e.* December, 1996) is Rs. 456.12 crore. They fail to understand how the Department could utilise the remaining around 60% funds during the last two months. During 8th Plan period out of Rs. 4047.251 crore released, the expenditure reported by States/UTs is 3296.161 crore. It is disturbing to note that 18% of the outlay is lying unutilised with the State Government/UT Administration during the 8th Plan. They note that under utilisation does not only affect the implementation of the programme for which funds are sanctioned but also have far reaching effect on the other programmes for which the scarce resources could have been utilised. This speaks well of the lack of planning and monitoring on the part of the Government. It is noted by the Committee that the norms of 35% of the funds during the 4th quarter as per the guidelines of the Government are itself responsible for under-utilisation of funds. Bulk of funds are released during the fag end of the year which causes diversion of funds by State Government for other purposes”.

The Committee strongly recommend that Government should further strengthen the monitoring system and review the programme to know the reasons for the under-utilisation of funds by State Governments. Government should not be contented with issuing merely instruction to State Governments rather it should be strictly monitored on regular intervals. Strict action should be taken against the defaulter State Government/UT Administration. They would like to urge that the faulty norm of releasing 35% of the outlay during the 4th quarter should be reviewed by the Government and guidelines be revised accordingly.

## 14. The Government in their reply have stated:—

“The latest position regarding utilisation of funds during 1996-97 is as under :

(Rs. in crore)

Central Sector	RE 1996-97	Release by the Ministry	Expenditure reported by the States/UTs implementing Deptts.
	1095.00	1093.02	877.42 (Provisional)
<b>State/UT Sector MNP</b>			
Provision		Expenditure	
1411.56		1190.774 (Provisional)	

As recommended by the Committee, the monitoring of physical and financial progress is being strengthened. The States/UTs have been requested to indicate specific reasons for under-utilisation of funds.

From 1998-99, it is proposed to reduce the limit of carry-over of funds from 25% to 15% of the allocation. The action in terms of (i) deduction as at present of the excess carry over from the annual allocation and (ii) a further deduction as under will be made in respect of the States which do not send the proposal for release of second instalment of funds in time.

	Amount of 2nd instalment
Proposals received upto December	50% of annual allocation
January	40%
February	30%
March	26%

The present norm is to release the 2nd instalment of 50% of the annual allocation soon after utilisation of 50% (now raised to 60%) of the 1st instalment, including unspent amount, if any, from the previous year during the 3rd quarter but preferably in October itself. 35% of the outlay refers to the norm of expenditure during the last quarter and not to release of funds."

15. The Committee note that clarification offered by Government that the norm of 35% of the outlay refers to the norm of expenditure during the last quarter and not to the release of funds. They would like to be informed of the impact of this norm on the balances outstanding under different schemes at the end of financial year.

#### Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)

16. The Committee recommended as under:—

"The Committee feel that Government should not be contended by providing a source of drinking water to a habitation to have the claims to provide access to their population. Rather all out efforts are needed for the maintenance and sustainability of the assets. They note that with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, Panchayats can plan an important role in this regard. It is also felt that the major limitation of the Panchayat is the financial constraint. For achieving better result by Panchayats, there is the need for their capacity building. It is recommended that Government should make a study to explore ways to make Panchayats financially strong and the result of such study should be placed before the Committee. They should observe that by linking Rural Development Programmes like TRYSEM, the better maintenance of assets can be ensured."

17. The Government in their reply have stated as under :—

"The recommendations of the National Workshop on O&M were discussed in the Empowered Committee of the Mission for implementation by the States/UTs to ensure effective maintenance and sustainability of the Rural Water Supply Schemes/assets.

The capacity building of the Panchayats is taken up under National Human Resource Development Programme of the Mission and TRYSEM.

In order to make the Panchayats financially strong to discharge their responsibilities under the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, the States had constituted State Finance Commission for devolution of resources. The details regarding the recommendations of the Commission and the Action Taken will be ascertained from the States for being placed before the Committee."

18. The Committee hope that the Department of Rural Development would furnish the details regarding the recommendations of State Finance Commissions and recommendations of the National Workshop on O&M alongwith the outcome of the Empowered Committee of the Mission for implementation by the States/UTs and action taken thereon.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.16)**

19. The Committee recommended as under :—

"The Committee feel that falling down of water table is the major area of concern. They would like that Government should seriously draw some action plan with regard to conservation of water and watershed management to tackle this problem."

20. The Government in their reply have stated as under :—

"The States have been requested to prepare concrete action plans under the Sub Mission on sustainability for conservation of water and recharge of aquifers particularly for over exploited and dark areas where utilisation of ground water has already reached over 100% and 85% of the potential. The matter is being pursued actively."

21. The Committee hope that the Department of Rural Development would pursue the matter vigorously with State Governments in respect of preparation and implementation of action plans under the Sub-mission on sustainability for conservation of water recharge of aquifers and furnish the concrete action taken by States in this regard.

**D. National Institute of Agricultural Marketing****Recommendation (Para No. 11.2)**

22. The Committee had recommended as under :

“The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing, Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy services. The Standing Committee in their 16th Report 1995, 1st Report (1996-97) had recommended that NIAM should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of its activity falls under the purview of that Ministry. But it is noted that no action has been taken on the recommendation of the Committee. they would like to reiterate their earlier recommendations and would urge that it should be complied with without any further delay.”

23. The Government in their reply have stated as under :—

“The matter is presently under consideration of the cabinet Secretariat whose decision is awaited.”

24. The Committee note with concern that in spite of their recommendation to keep National Institution of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM) under the Ministry of Agricultural made by them for three consecutive years, in their 16th Report (1995-96), 1st Report (1996-97) and again in 8th Report (1997-98), the matter is still under consideration of the Cabinet Secretariat. They hope that the matter has been decided by now and would like to be appraised of the decision taken in the matter.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)**

The Panchayati Raj system in view of 73rd Amendment of the Constitution of India can be effective if there is all round empowerment of Panchayats. Besides devolution of financial powers, there is need to empower Panchayats with regard to administrative, planning technical angle. The Committee urge that it is high time to evaluate the functioning of Panchayats with regard to each and every aspect *viz.*, the status of elections, devolution of powers, financial, administrative etc.

#### **Reply of the Government**

All the States and Union Territories where the provisions of the Constitution (73rd Amendment) Act, 1992 are applicable, have passed necessary State legislations on Panchayati Raj in accordance with the Constitution Amendment Act. The States and Union Territories have also implemented various mandatory provisions of the Act like reservation for SCs, STs and Women, constitution of State Finance Commissions and Election Commission, devolution of powers and authority to Panchayats etc. All States except Bihar have conducted elections to Panchayats. In the case of Goa, elections to Zilla Parishads are due. In the case of UTs, elections to Panchayats have been held in all the UTs, except Pondicherry and Lakshadweep. The elections have been delayed due to litigation pending in the Courts.

2. As on date, State Finance Commissions of 15 States have given their reports. These States are Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu. Among the UTs, only in Andaman & Nicobar Islands an interim report has been submitted and partly accepted. Reports of State Finance Commissions have been accepted by the Governments of Assam, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura, West Bengal, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. The reports of

SFCs of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Haryana and Manipur have not been accepted and are still under consideration.

3. While Article 243G of the Constitution visualises Panchayats as institutions of self-Government, it subjects the extent of devolution of powers and functions to the will of the State Legislatures. It also devolves the powers, functions and responsibilities upon Panchayats on 29 subjects listed in the Eleventh Schedule. State Governments have initiated steps for devolution of powers and functions to PRIs in a phased manner. States like Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Kerala, Tripura and West Bengal have issued detailed executive instructions. In certain States like Himachal Pradesh and Haryana, powers and functions relating to some departments have been identified and general orders have been issued.

4. The progress of implementation of the Constitution (73rd Amendment) Act, 1992 is monitored by the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment on a regular basis in the various meetings and conferences held with senior officers and Ministers of the States and UTs. A conference of Chief Ministers of all States was held on 2nd August, 1997 which was chaired by the Prime Minister to review the situation. A Committee of Chief Ministers for accelerating the pace of devolution of powers, functions and responsibilities upon Panchayati Raj Institutions has also been constituted under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister. A meeting of this Committee was held on 1st October, 1997.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.9)**

The Committee appreciate the gesture of the Government to enhance the outlay from Rs. 1110 crores to Rs. 1302 crores during 1997-98. The percentage hike is around 17.3%. Still they feel that the outlay is insufficient to address to the problem of water supply in rural areas specifically in view of the revised increased number of partially covered habitation i.e. 4,25,000 and not covered habitation 1,47,614 as on 1.4.96 as per the recent survey (as mentioned by the Secretary, Government during the course of oral evidence). They would like to recommend that sufficient funds



should be earmarked during Ninth Plan under Rural Water Supply Programme to achieve the laudable objective of the Government to cover all the remaining not covered habitations and partially covered habitations by 2000 AD.

### **Reply of the Government**

Keeping in view the overall constraint of resources for the Ninth Five Year Plan, the Planning Commission has finally been requested to provide an outlay of Rs. 11,000 crore (as compared to Rs. 5100 crore in the Eighth Plan) for Rural Water Supply in the central sector, apart from the outlay to be provided under the State/UT sector MNP.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.11)**

The Committee also find that State Government are not contributing equal matching share under MNP. Another surprising feature noted by the Committee is that while some of the State Governments are not contributing equal matching share under MNP, the other State Governments/UT Administration like Andaman & Nicobar, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry and Delhi are deprived of the Central funds and the argument furnished by the Government is that the respective State funds commensurate the targets fixed by such State Governments. The Committee would like to be appraised of, by the Government on this account.

### **Reply of the Government**

During 1996-97, all the States had provided MNP funds to match the ARWSP allocation.

The total provision under the ARWSP for NCT of Delhi and 5 UT Admn. other than Chandigarh) was Re. 1 crore out of which Rs. 10 lakh was released to Pondicherry and Rs. 3 lakh to Dadra & Nagar Haveli. The balance amount could not be released due to (i) no proposal being received from Delhi, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep and

Andaman & Nicobar Islands who are being asked to indicate the reasons and (ii) non-utilisation of full funds already released upto 1995-96 in the case of Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.20)**

The Committee note with concern the data with regard to quality affected habitation *i.e.* around 1.42 lakhs habitations out of the total habitation of 13.24 lakhs (*i.e.* about 11%). They also observe that ground reality may be more than the official data given by the Department. It is recommended that Government should make sincere efforts to address to problem of the quality affected habitations. It should be ensured that the funds earmarked under the Sub Mission Programme are spent for the purpose. The Committee also urge that the efforts to take benefit of the latest technology adopted by the advanced countries like Isreal should be taken.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The observation/recommendation is accepted for compliance. After discussion of the issues in the Empowered Committee Meeting held on 13.2.1997, the States were requested to (i) firm up the data of quality affected habitations/prioritisation of the areas on the basis of severity of water quality problems, (ii) send progress reports regularly and (iii) take steps to rectify non-functional deflouridation/desalination/iron removal plants.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.5)**

The Committee note with concern the inadequate attention given to the sanitation programme by Central as well as State Governments. It is really regretted to note that as per official data only 10.96% of rural population could have access to sanitation facility when the country is celebrating its 50th year of Independence. It is noted that Government have proposed coverage of each and every individual by the completion of Tenth Plan. The Committee fail to understand how

the objective would be achieved with the very slow progress seen in half of the century as per official data.

### **Reply of the Government**

It is estimated that by the end of VIII Five Year Plan, about 25% of rural population had access to sanitary latrines both through Government programmes and private efforts/initiatives. During the Ninth Plan, more and more coverage will be through private efforts, use of cost effective and appropriate range of technical options, alternate delivery system production centres/sanitary marts, intensive health education, demand creation etc. with less reliance on Government subsidies. The precise strategy and the target will be worked out after the Ninth Plan document (including outlays) is finalised by the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 4.6)**

The Committee feel that to make the programme a success there is an urgent need to create awareness amongst the rural masses. The spread of epidemics like Cholera, Plague and Dengue in recent years speaks volume about the least attention paid to sanitation all over the country. It is further noted with regret that the meagre resources allocated during 8th Plan for the programme could not be utilised fully by the Department. Out of Rs. 380.00 crores allocated outlay during 8th Plan, total expenditure has been stated as Rs. 234.59 crore.

### **Reply of the Government**

Adequate funds are being provided to the States for creating awareness amongst the rural masses both under Rural Sanitation and Rural Water Supply Programmes. Against the outlay of Rs. 380 crore for VIII Plan, the amount actually made available was Rs. 210 crore only.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. F. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

**Recommendation (Para No. 4.7)**

In view of what has been stated in paras above the Committee would like to recommend:—

- (i) sufficient funds should be provided during Ninth Plan under Rural Sanitation Programme by Central Government. Further States should also be directed to provide sufficient funds under MNP to achieve the target of providing access to hygienic surrounding to each and every individual in the country.
- (ii) the Committee note that providing small dose of funds is not sufficient, rather it should be ensuring that the funds earmarked for the programme are fully utilised for the purpose.
- (iii) before proposing funds, the Department should chalk out the action plan regarding how the funds could be utilised. State Governments are also required to make the similar action Plans.
- (iv) to make the programme really effective, adequate attention should be paid to publicity campaign through media and NGOs.
- (v) Rural Sanitation Programme should not be meant to provide latrines to the selected areas/beneficiaries. To have the tangible impact it is required that Government should evolve the holistic approach. The Committee during the 16th Report 1995-96 and 1st Report 1996-97 has recommended that the programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation. In line with the objective of providing a holistic approach, they would like that emphasis should be given to model villages.
- (vi) The implementation of the respecting programme by best performing model villages should be circulated to other villages to motivate them.

### **Reply of the Government**

Due to overall constraint of resources, the Planning Commission has been requested to provide Rs. 750 crore for the Ninth Plan for the central sector. The outlay for the States/UT sector MNP is yet to be decided by the Planning Commission.

- (ii) Accepted. The programme funds will be fully utilised.
- (iii) Annual Action Plans will be discussed and finalised in coordination with the States keeping in view the availability of financial resources.
- (iv) Accepted for implementation.
- (v) The Working Group had recommended that the subsidy should not be introduced for households above the poverty line and that for BPL households, there should be a gradual reduction of Government subsidy. The benefit to other categories of people can be ensured through health education, IEC, publicity campaign etc. A final view will be taken in the light of the Ninth Plan policy and strategy yet to be finalised by the Planning Commission.
- (vi) Accepted for implementation after the Model Villages Projects are completed and evaluated.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H. 11020/7/97-  
GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 5.5 and 5.6)**

The Committee note with concern the shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 and 1996-97. During 1995-96, Rs. 380.65 crores could be released out of the outlay of Rs. 550 crores. Similarly during 1996-97 till January, 1997 only Rs. 299.15 crores could be released. Another alarming situation is noted by the Committee that around 45% of the outlay is released by the Centre during the last two months of the financial year. It is further observed by the Committee that outlay during 1997-98 has been reduced from Rs. 932 crores during 1996-97 to Rs. 700 crores during 1997-98.

The Committee observe that on one side allocation is being reduced and on the other side the funds are not being utilised properly. They are disturbed to note that the funds are released during the fag end of the year which given an opportunity to State Governments to divert money for other purposes.

### **Reply of the Government**

The reasons for shortfall in expenditure (releases) in 1995-96 have been explained in written submissions to the Committee earlier. Releases during 1996-97 amounted to Rs. 548.28 crores against the reduced Budget Grant of Rs. 550 crores. As already explained in earlier submissions, the late receipt of information on utilisation of funds from the States, despite repeated requests made by the Ministry, is the reason for releasing the 2nd instalment in the last quarter of the year.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.7)**

It is noted that a good start with the laudable objective of helping the rural poor has been made by the Government. However, the poor implementation of the programme would deprive the needy persons of the benefits given by the Government. They would like that all out efforts should be made to help the respective beneficiaries. They strongly recommend that the Programme should be widely publicised by media on TV, Radio and Rural Newspapers and by displaying at the important place in the village like Panchayat Office. The Committee hope that Central and State Governments would gear up the Centre and State machinery for the better implementation of the programme.

### **Reply of the Government**

The observations of the Committee are noted. The Ministry has taken several steps including discussion with the concerned officials of the State Governments, convening of State Ministers incharge of NSAP by Minister (RA&E), visits by officers of the Ministry to various States, apart from correspondences to create a sense of urgency and commitment for the Programme. Regarding publicity for the Programme, States/UTs were given funds for wide publicity of the

schemes under NSAP. They are being reminded from time to time in this regard. So far as publicity by the centre is concerned, publicity was done through printed media and messages were got printed on postal stationery. Advertisements in Hindi, English and regional language Newspapers were released and brouchers were printed in all languages. The publicity of the schemes was also done through Radio. During 1996-97, funds were given to the Dte. of Field Publicity and Song & Drama Division of Ministry of Information & Broadcasting for out-door publicity especially to the remote areas of villages.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 5.8)**

As regards timely release of money by the Central Government, the Committee during their 1st report had recommended that the benefits under the programme should be given timely to the beneficiaries and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government to so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiaries. It is noted that funds are not released timely by the Central Government to States. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for compliance by the Government.

#### **Reply of the Government**

NSAP funds are being released in two instalments. However, release of funds is subject to substantial utilisation (50% or more) of funds release earlier. Funds are available for 6 months at a time with the States/UTs and as such there should be no problem as to the availability of funds. the Ministry's endeavour is to release funds as soon as utilisation/expenditure statements are received from the States.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 6.2 and 6.3)**

The Committee note that—

- (i) the actual releases during the 8th Plan are lesser than the allocation;

- (ii) there is shortfall in expenditure as compared to the actual allocation;
- (iii) inadequate funds are allocated for the scheme in view of the magnitude of the problem of updating of land records.

It was observed that the Standing Committee in their 26th Report (1995-96) and 1st Report (1996-97) had examined the subject in detail and found that inadequate attention has been given to the updating of base land records of rural areas. It was recommended to enhance the outlay in view of the magnitude of the problem. It was also recommended in the 1st Report 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 and the best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of Land Records. The Committee find that in spite of the strong recommendation made in the said Reports, funds instead of increased they have decreased from Rs. 19.14 crores during 1996-97 to Rs. 18.80 crores during 1997-98. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in 1st and 26th Reports as quoted above and would like that Government should provide sufficient funds for the scheme. Besides the implementation of the programme should further be strengthened to ensure 100% utilisation of earmarked funds.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Ministry admits that the actual release of funds under the Scheme during 8th Five Year Plan was less than the Plan allocation. The main reason for this was the inability of the States to fully utilise the released funds in time which resulted in accumulation of unspent balances and prevented further release of funds to them. However, despite reported outstanding balances with the States, the Department released funds to some States after being sure that most of such outstanding funds were at the disposal of the executing agencies for construction works sanctioned under the Scheme, like the State Public Works Department (PWD), and the States would not be in a position to take up other Programmes and Schemes without further release of funds from the Centre. The Department, with the intention of



improving the existing situation, has submitted proposals for higher budgetary allocation with wider scope of financial assistance alongwith higher percentage of Central share for execution of the Scheme during the 9th Five Year Plan. The States have also been impressed upon for increased provision for the Scheme under their budget in the Ninth Plan.

As regards action taken on the recommendations of the Committee made in its 26th Report (1995-96) and 1st Report (1996-97) is concerned, a copy of the 26th Report of the Committee was sent to all the States and subsequently action taken notes were submitted to the Committee's Secretariat. As per the recommendations made by the Committee in its above stated Reports the scope of activities which can be financed under the Scheme has been expanded for the Ninth Plan period and proposals for a provision of Rs. 325 crore during 9th Plan under the Scheme have been prepared and submitted to the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 6.7)**

The Committee would like to recommend that Government should allocate the sufficient funds for the Computerisation of Land Records so that the scheme is effectively implemented in all the Districts of the country. They would also like to emphasis that Department should ensure that the funds allocated are utilised properly for the purpose.

#### **Reply of the Government**

In view of the problem inherent in the current manual system of maintenance and updating of land records and with the advancement of technology, it was felt that efforts should be made to computerise the core data contained in Land Records. Accordingly some projects on Computerisation of Land Records were taken up on pilot basis during the period 1988-89 to 1991-92 as a sub-scheme of Agrarian Studies, Subsequently, in 1993-94 keeping in view the encouraging results obtained from the pilot projects, the scheme was approved as a separate Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records.

During the 8th Plan period, against the budget allocation of Rs. 40.00 crores, funds to the tune of Rs. 59.42 crores have been released to States/UTs by covering 299 districts. Hence, since inception of the scheme 323 districts have so far been covered under the Scheme. The year-wise break-up of B.E. and funds released during the 8th Plan period are given below :—

Eighth Plan outlay	Rs. 48.00 crores
BE 1992-93	Rs. 5.00 crores
Actual expenditure	Funds not released as EFC Memorandum was not approved.
BE 1993-94	Rs. 8.00 crores
Actual expenditure	Rs. 8.76 crores
BE 1993-94	Rs. 10.50 crores
Actual expenditure	Rs. 10.50 crores
BE 1995-96	Rs. 20.00 crores
Actual expenditure	Rs. 20.00 crores
BE 1996-97	Rs. 20.00 crores
Actual expenditure	Rs. 20.16 crores
Total expenditure during the Eighth Plan period	Rs. 59.42 crores

B.E. for the year 1997-98 under the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records has been earmarked as Rs. 20.00 crores.

During the Ninth Plan period it has been proposed to cover all the remaining districts in the country and to include two more activities *i.e.* (i) Scanning of the existing Cadastral Maps and Digitization of the same in the computer network, and (ii) Computer processing of Agricultural Land Holdings for the purpose of consolidation of holdings, preparation of consolidated Revenue Settlement/Cadastral

Maps etc. Thus, total requirement of funds during the 9th Plan period under the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records has been projected at Rs. 371.90 crores.

With a view to give further impetus to the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records and to review the physical and financial progress of the projects a meeting of the Revenue Secretaries, Settlement Commissioners/Directors, Survey Settlement and selected Collectors was convened on 28th April, 1997. They have been requested to speed up the work so that funds could be utilised expeditiously and properly.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### Recommendation (Para No. 7.3)

The Committee during their 1st Report on demand for grant 1996-97 had recommended to enhance the outlay to the respective training institutes keeping in view the need of training to be imparted to the implementing personnel of various rural development programmes. It is noted with concern that although rural development schemes have been increased but outlay for training is the same. It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided to the respective training institutes during 9th Plan.

### Reply of the Government

The financial outlays of the Ministry are finalised by the Planning Commission. Accordingly, the Ministry had proposed the following financial outlays for the 9th Plan (1997-2002) and annual plan 1997-98 in respect of the schemes being dealt with by the Training Section:—

Name of the Scheme	Outlays proposed by the Ministry		Outlay approved by the Planning Commission for	
	Annual Plan 1997-98	9th Plan Period	Annual Plan 1997-98	9th Plan Period
1	2	3	4	5
1. Grant-in-aid to N.I.R.D.	7.00	75.00	5.00	Yet to be approved

1	2	3	4	5	
2.	Establishment/ Strengthening of S.I.R.Ds.	10.00	58.00	3.25	-do-
3.	Establishment/ Strengthening of E.T.Cs.	8.00	114.00	3.00	Yet to be approved
4.	Organisation of Training courses/ Seminars/Work- shops (O.T.Cs.)	0.60	4.00	0.50	-do-

The observations of the Standing Committee of the Parliament have been noted. Efforts will be made to get more financial outlays approved by Planning Commission for the 9th Plan period in respect of the above mentioned schemes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-  
GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### Recommendation (Para No. 8.2)

The Committee during their 1st report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had recommended to step up the outlay for Panchayat Development and Training. It is noted with concern that *status quo* has been maintained during 1997-98. In view of the 73rd Amendment, devolution of power to Panchayat have been made. But due to financial constraints they are not able to discharge their constitutional obligations. They note that capacity building of Panchayats is the major area of concern. In view of this it is strongly recommended that the allocation for the Panchayat Development and Training should substantially stepped up as proposed by the Department to Planning Commission.

#### Reply of the Government

Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment (Department of Rural Development) during 9th Plan period, assigns priority to provide

training to the elected representatives of Panchayats and PRI functionaries at all levels. Keeping in view this objective, the Department has prepared on EFC Memo. to provide financial assistance to the State/UT Governments, Institutes, NGOs of repute for providing/training to the PRIs. A comprehensive Action Plan has been prepared, envisaging a substantial step up in Budgetary Allocation for Panchayat Development and Training Scheme during the entire 9th Plan period as well as for the Annual Plan 1997-98, which is under consideration in the Government.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 9.2)**

The Committee during their Ist Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had noted the unsatisfactory performance of the Scheme in three States *viz.* Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and recommended to review and restructure the programme with a view to give emphasis to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country besides the mentioned three States. They note with concern that during 9th Plan the outlay has been decreased from Rs. 20 crore during 8th Plan to Rs. 8 crore during 9th Plan. No specific explanation with regard to continuing the scheme with such a marginal amount has been given. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to:—

- (i) the decreased outlay during 9th Plan under the Scheme.
- (ii) the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee in their Ist Report to review and restructure the Scheme.

### **Reply of the Government**

This Scheme was started in 1985-86 in the dacoity affected districts of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. In 1992, the progress of works sanctioned under this scheme was reviewed. It was found that the progress was very slow. It was also noted that the problem of dacoity had become less critical. Therefore, it was decided to complete the ongoing works only and not to take up any new works which was not started by 1-2-1992, and from the first year of the 8th Plan, *i.e.* 1992-93, funds were being released to the three States to meet the balance of Central liability for ongoing works depending on

their progress. In the case of Uttar Pradesh, Central liability for ongoing works has been fulfilled. In the case of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan together, an amount of Rs. 2.91 crores remains to be released as the balance of Centre's share of sanctioned cost of works which will be released during the 9th Plan. However, an outlay of Rs. 10 crores has been proposed to the Planning Commission for this Scheme for the 9th Plan, keeping in view the need to provide some funds in respect of some works which the Government of U.P. had not started prior to February, 1992 decision mentioned above, in case some of those works are decided to be taken up during this Plan.

2. Regarding the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee in their first report to review and restructure the Scheme, it may be mentioned that this Ministry has submitted a proposal to the Planning Commission to provide Central assistance to accelerate the pace of village connectivity in all States and U.Ts.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 10.5)**

Keeping in view the increased involvement of voluntary organisations in rural development the Committee would like that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially stepped up. Besides increasing the outlay the Committee desire that to provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination amongst voluntary organisation and the District Administration and Panchayat Raj Institution should be developed. It is also noted by the Committee that huge funds allocated to NGOs are being misutilised. They would like that appropriate foolproof monitoring mechanism should be evolved to check the misuse of the funds by NGOs.

#### **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), Million Wells Scheme (MWS) 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 (i) Assistance to CAPART, (ii) Promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development (PC) and Budget allocation for these three schemes during the current year 1997-98 is Rs. 25.50 crores.

Keeping in view the increased involvement of voluntary organisations over the years, CAPART has been decentralised in 1994 by setting up six Regional Committees at Jaipur, Lucknow, Bhubaneswar, Guwahati, Hyderabad and Ahmedabad. These Regional Committees are to help the grassroot level organisations and also to reach remote unreached areas effectively. These Committees are headed by a representative from the voluntary sector of the concerned region and members are drawn both from voluntary sector and Government. The Regional Committees are empowered to consider and sanction projects upto an outlay of Rs. 5.00 lakhs.

For sanctioning projects having outlay more than Rs. 5.00 lakh, National Standing Committees on different subject matters have been formed by CAPART with representatives from voluntary sector, subject matter specialists and Government so as to ensure transparency. Projects sanctioned to the voluntary organisations are publicised through the print media. A copy of the order sanctioning, the project is also endorsed to the concerned State Government. Voluntary organisations have been advised to exhibit the particulars of the projects sanctioned at the project site. The system relating to processing and monitoring of the projects has been streamlined by CAPART with more emphasis to involve the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

To minimise the misuse of funds by the voluntary organisations, several steps have been taken by CAPART to monitor the projects closely. According to the present procedure in vogue in CAPART, generally project is appraised thrice-pre-funding appraisal, mid-term appraisal and post evaluation.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

**Recommendation (Para No. 12.1)**

The Committee note that under the programme Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land, the data with regard to Ceiling Surplus Land by States is monitored. However, the nomenclature states as if the distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land is undertaken under the programme. They would like that the nomenclature should be suitably revised in line with the objective and status of the programme.

**Reply of the Government**

This Ministry agrees to the recommendation of the Standing Committee as regard to the change of nomenclature of the Scheme now termed as "Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land". Land Reforms Division actually fix up targets and follow up the progress made in distribution of ceiling surplus land through writing letters to the States and by organising Conference of Revenue Secretaries, Revenue Ministers and Chief Ministers. So these activities actually relate to monitoring the performance of the States/UTs in the aforesaid matter. Hence, accepting the recommendation of the Standing Committee, the programme would be termed henceforth as "Programme for Monitoring of Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land." The revision of the nomenclature of the programme is being communicated to the States/UTs accordingly.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-  
GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]



**CHAPTER III**

**RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO  
NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF  
GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES**

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.3 to 2.10 and 2.12)

##### Para 2.3

The Committee note with concern the *status quo* in the outlay of 1997-98 as compared to that of the year 1996-97. They note that the outlay for 1997-98 does not cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. They further note an alarming feature that emerges out of the data given at Para 2.1 above. The accepted outlay during 1997-98 by the Ministry of Finance is much lesser *i.e.* around 20% of the proposed outlay by the Department. It is also observed that not only the outlay sanctioned is inadequate keeping in view the challenges of rural poverty and entire grant of improvement in the overall quality of life, but the scarce resources as sanctioned for different rural development schemes are not fully utilised. The Committee visualize that under-spending of funds earmarked for rural development schemes is the major area of concern. They in their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had expressed their concern towards the non-utilisation of funds and urged the Department to ensure 100% utilisation of funds. It is noted that there is no such improvement in the spending position and the feature of under-spending reoccurrence during 1996-97. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government on this account.

##### Para 2.4

It is also observed that the Department could not get the proposed amount under the respective schemes due to under-spending of funds allocated in the previous year. In other words ineffective implementation of the schemes is responsible for not getting sufficient funds for the various schemes of Rural Development. The Committee note that the Department could not feel contended by merely allocating the State's share for respective schemes to States/UTs. Rather the schemes should be properly monitored and it should have been ensured that funds for

Centrally Sponsored schemes are utilised by various State Governments for the specific purpose these are meant for. They would like the Department to review their programmes/schemes so as to have first hand knowledge of the weaknesses responsible for the poor implementation of the schemes.

The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. It is strongly recommended to have a full proof mechanism incorporated in the guidelines to ensure effective implementation of the programmes/schemes and cent per cent utilisation of funds.

#### **Para 2.5**

It is observed that implementation of respective schemes of Rural Development is slow because the implementing personnel do not have the technical expertise required for proper planning, to make projects and calling tender of small, medium and big nature. Besides the implementing agency lack of the required infrastructure such as road roller, water pumps etc. It is recommended that to improve the implementation of the programmes, personnel responsible for the implementation should be given the proper technical training and the required infrastructure should also be provided.

#### **Para 2.6**

Further, it is found that because of paucity of funds required for various programmes, the staff of respective State Departments like PWD, PHA, R&D etc. are sitting idle. The services of such persons should be adequately used by transfer on deputation basis as BDO for implementing rural development schemes to improve the implementation position.

#### **Para 2.7**

It is also recommended that the maintenance of assets created under different programmes should be the responsibility of the respective Panchayats.

#### **Para 2.8**

It is recommended that intensive programmes for sensitizing the local community and the target groups be undertaken on large scale.

**Para 2.9**

People's participation in the implementation of the schemes be enhanced. This can be done through involvement on much larger scale of elected representatives (MPs/MLAs/MLCs) and representative institutions (Panchayats) in the implementation process.

**Para 2.10**

Committees of beneficiaries be formed at the grass root level and such Committees be associated with the implementation process.

**Para 2.12**

The Committee note that no rural programme can be successfully implemented without people's involvement. It is recommended that necessary steps should be taken for effective people's participation in all the rural development schemes.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P), dated 12th March, 1998]

**Reply of the Government****Land Reforms**

The following three schemes are being administered by the Land Reforms Section of the Department of rural development:—

- (1) Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR);
- (2) Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Computerisation of Land Records;
- (3) Central Sector Scheme for Grant-in-aid to Institutions for Agrarian Studies.

Financial Assistance is provided to the States/UTs only under the schemes at (1) and (2) above.

The Department admits that the Budgetary outlay for 1997-98 under the above mentioned schemes has been kept at the level 1996-97 and does not cover even the percentage hike due to

inflationary trends. In fact, proposals for the 9th Five Year Plan under the schemes were prepared incorporating some basic changes in the schemes with increased allocation of funds of Rs. 80.00 crores, Rs. 83.60 crores and Rs. 1.00 crore under the schemes at (1), (2) and (3) above respectively. However, keeping in view the overall allocation of funds by the Planning Commission to the Department, the allocation under the schemes has been kept at the level of 1996-97.

As regards utilization of funds under these schemes, the Department is persistently pursuing the States/UTs for expeditious utilisation of funds. This issue has also been discussed from time to time at various fora including the Conferences of State Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers. Last such Conferences of Revenue Ministers and Secretaries, in which the position of utilisation of funds under these schemes was discussed in detail, were held recently on 28.1.1997 and 28th-29th April, 1997 respectively. The Conferences *inter-alia* made some important recommendations in this regard which have been sent to the States/UTs for necessary follow-up action. It is expected that the position would improve significantly during the current financial year. In addition, the implementation of the schemes is monitored by field visits by LR Division officials, by Area Officers, by Collecting utilisation certificates and ensuring a substantial amount of utilisation before further funds are released. Through the aforesaid procedure it is ensured that the Central funds are utilised for the purpose for which they have been sanctioned. Further, the two Committees, constituted under the Chairmanship of the Secretary (RD) *viz.* Technical Committee under the SRA & ULR scheme and National Level Steering Committee under the Computerisation of Land Records Scheme also examine the proposals received from the States/UTs for release of funds and review the physical and financial progress of the schemes before making further release of funds to the States/UTs.

In fact funds are being provided to the States/UTs under the SRA & ULR Scheme for Strengthening the Training infrastructure for the Revenue, Survey and Settlement Staff by way of Construction of new Training Institutes, renovation of existing institutes, purchase of equipments for imparting the training, hiring of technical experts for training etc. In addition, States/UTs have been requested from time to time for nomination of their staff/

officers for training being organised by the Survey Training Institutes of the Surveyor General of India. Under the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records the National Informatic Centre (NIC) has been imparting training to the State Government Officers/Staff involved in the implementation of the scheme. Thus adequate provisions exist for training of manpower under the aforesaid schemes.

The State/UT Governments have not been able to utilize fully the funds released under the schemes and have unspent balances with them. Thus there is no paucity of funds with the State Governments under the schemes administered by the Ministry under Land Reforms. As the Schemes are being implemented through Revenue Departments, the BDOs are not involved in their implementation.

The assets created under the Schemes are not community assets. These are for Strengthening the existing infrastructure for training of revenue, survey & settlement staff, storage of land records, Computerisation of land records etc. Accordingly, it has not been felt necessary to involve Panchayats in their maintenance.

With a view to have greater transparency and dissemination of information under the schemes, the State/UT Governments have been requested for taking suitable steps for wide publicity in local media about the schemes, items/projects sanctioned and funds released etc. These steps are also expected to help in preventing any misuse and leakage of funds under the schemes.

As regards involvement of elected representatives in implementation of the Land Reform Schemes/Programmes, no guidelines/instructions have been issued to States/UTs as the subject matter relating to Land Administration falls within the Legislative and Administration jurisdiction of the State Governments, as per the Constitution. However, the issue relating to involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in land Managements/Land Reforms was discussed in the Revenue Ministers Conference held on 28.1.1997. The Conference *inter-alia* recommended involvement of these institutions in prevention of alienation of tribal land and restoration of the alienated land, selection of beneficiaries for allotment of various types of lands,

managing Common Property Resources, unearthing surplus land, concealed tenancy, unrecorded sharecroppers etc. The recommendations of the Conference have been sent to the States/UTs for suitable follow-up action. The States/UTs have been requested to inform the steps taken by them for involvement of PRIs in implementation of Land Reforms/Programmes.

### **Technology Mission**

The outlay for 1997-98 has been increased by Rs. 192 crores in the case of Rural Water Supply and Rs. 40 crore for Central Rural Sanitation Programme. The R.E. 1996-97 for Rural Water Supply Programme and Rural Sanitation Programme were fully utilised.

There is adequate mechanism incorporated in the guidelines of implementation of Centrally Sponsored Rural Water Supply Programme and Central Rural Sanitation Programme for effective implementation of the schemes and cent per cent utilisation of funds. If due to certain valid reasons, full funds cannot be used, it is stipulated that the carry over amount should not exceed 25% and 15% of the annual allocation for ARWSP and CRSP respectively. The physical and financial progress is reviewed through periodic reports and meetings and appropriate follow up action is taken with the implementing Department to ensure effective implementation and remedial measures.

The Public Health Engineering Department/Rural Development Department/PWD (Public Health) Department in the States implementing the Rural Water Supply Programmes have the necessary technical expertise of public health engineering, civil, mechanical engineering/managerial and accounting expertise. Under the Human Resource Development Programme, training is provided to the grass root level workers and sector professionals/functionaries.

All States/UTs have been requested to entrust the responsibility for ownership of the assets and maintenance of the schemes to the Panchayats with active involvement of the local people, Water and Sanitation Committees and also for meeting the routine cost of operation and maintenance, adequate financial resources to the panchayats to discharge the responsibilities, arrangement for training of the manpower, spare parts etc. The States/UTs have been requested to avail the facility under the IEC programme funded by the Central Government for Rural Water Supply/Rural Sanitation Sector.

All the States/UTs were requested vide letter No. W-11012/4/94-TM-II dated 14.12.94 to set up Water User Committees at the habitation and panchayat level and support services for monitoring and for major repairs at the block, district and State level monitoring committees. States have also been requested that selection of beneficiaries-households below the poverty line for construction of subsidised sanitary latrines should be made by the Gram Sabha/Panchayats.

### **National Social Assistance Programme**

An outlay of Rs. 932 crores was budgeted for NSAP during 1996-97 which was subsequently reduced to Rs. 550 crores in the Revised Estimate. During 1996-97, this Ministry could release Rs. 551.13 crores including Rs. 3.02 crores towards administrative expenditure at centre. As much funds for the three scheme of NSAP (*viz.* NDAPS, NFBS and NMBS) was released to the maximum extent.

As submitted earlier, the entire amount of Rs. 550 crores has been spent by the Ministry during 1996-97. The State Governments have been instructed to strictly utilise the funds for the purpose which they were released. They are being reminded from time to time to make all out efforts for effective and speedy implementation of the Programmes. Meetings with officials of the States are held on a regular basis and this would continue.

Under the existing monitoring mechanism for NSAP, formats for reporting the monthly progress have been prescribed. The districts as well as the State Governments have been sending these reports quite regularly. Besides officers from the Ministry review the progress during their visit to States under the "Area Officers Scheme" of the Ministry.

In so far as NSAP is concerned, Panchayats and Municipalities are responsible for implementation of all three schemes of NSAP. Besides, MPs, MLAs, Chairpersons of Zilla Parishads and representatives from among Chairpersons of Panchayats and Municipalities are members of the District Level Committees which are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the programme. As



such elected representatives are involved in the process of implementation of this programme.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M No. H-11020/7/097-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para Nos. 6 & 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.10)**

The Committee further note that not only inadequate funds are allocated for the said programme, but also the funds are not utilised fully by State Governments which adversely affects the implementation of the Programme. During 1996-97 (upto January, 1997) out of Rs. 1110 crores outlay Rs. 937.41 crores could be released by Central Government out of which expenditure reported (upto *i.e.* December, 1996) is Rs. 456.12 crores. They fail to understand how the Department could utilize the remaining around 60% funds during the last two months. During 8th Plan period out of Rs. 4047.251 crores released, the expenditure reported by States/UTs is Rs. 3296.161 crores. It is disturbing to note that 18% of the outlay is lying unutilised with the State Government/UT Administration during the 8th Plan. They note that underutilisation does not only affect the implementation of the programme for which funds are sanctioned but also have far reaching effect on the other programmes for which the scarce resources could have been utilised. This speaks well of the lack of planning and monitoring on the part of the Government. It is noted by the Committee that the norms of 35% of the funds during the 4th quarter as per the guidelines of the Government are itself responsible for under-utilisation of funds. Bulk of funds are released during the fag end of the year which causes diversion of funds by State Government for other purposes.

The Committee strongly recommend that Government should further strengthen the monitoring system and review the programme to know the reasons for the under-utilisation of funds by State Governments. Government should not be contended with

issuing merely instruction to State Governments rather it should be strictly monitored on regular intervals. Strict action should be taken against the defaulter State Government/UT Administration. they would also like to urge that the faulty norm of releasing 35% of the outlay during the 4th quarter should be reviewed by the Government and guidelines by revised accordingly.

### Reply of the Government

The latest position regarding utilisation of funds during 1996-97 is as under :

(Rs. in crore)

Central Sector	R.E. 1996-97	Releases by the Ministry	Expenditure reported by the States/UT implementing Depts.
	1095.0	1093.02	877.42 (Provisional)
<i>State UT Sector MNP</i>			
<i>Provision</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>		
1411.56	1190.774 (Provisional)		

As recommended by the Committee, the monitoring of physical and financial progress is being strengthened. The States/UTs have been requested to indicate specific reasons for underutilisation of funds.

From 1998-99, it is proposed to reduce the limit of carry-over of funds from 25% to 15% of the allocation. The action in terms of (i) deduction as at present of the excess carry over from the annual allocation and (ii) a further deduction as under will be made in respect of the States which do not send the proposal for release of second

instalment of funds in time :

	Amount of 2nd instalment
Proposals received upto December	50% of annual allocation
January	40%
February	30%
March	26%

The present norm is to release the 2nd instalment of 50% of the annual allocation soon after utilisation of 50% (now raised to 60%) of the 1st instalment, including unspent amount, if any, from the previous year during the 3rd quarter but preferably in October itself. 35% of the outlay refers to the norm of expenditure during the last quarter and not to release of funds.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

## **CHAPTER V**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)**

The Committee would like to express their doubts about the claim of the Government of 84.23% of rural population having access to safe drinking water. They feel that the reality at the grass root level is quite different. It is observed that Government should verify their claim and would like the explanation of the Government in this regard.

#### **Reply of the Government**

Rural population of 85.13% (provisional as reports are awaited from some states for March, 1997) as on 1.4.97 having access to safe drinking water is based on the status survey of 1994 and the subsequent progress reported by the States/UTs upto 1996-97. The observations of the Committee have been communicated to them for verification/confirmation of the coverage data reported by the States/UTs.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-  
GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Para No. 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)**

The Committee feel that Government should not be contended by providing a source of drinking water to a habitation to have the claims to provide access to their population. Rather all out efforts are needed for the maintenance and substainability of the assets. They note that with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, Panchayats can plan an important role in this regard. It is also felt that the major limitation of the Panchayat is the financial constraint. For achieving better result by Panchayats, there is the need for their capacity building, it is

recommended that Government should make a study to explore ways to make panchayats financially strong and the result of such study should be placed before the Committee. They also observe that by linking Rural Development Programmes like TRYSEM, the better maintenance of assets can be ensured.

### **Reply of the Government**

The recommendations of the National Workshop on O&M were discussed in the Empowered Committee of the Mission for implementation by the States/UTs to ensure effective maintenance and sustainability of the Rural Water Supply Schemes/assets.

The capacity building of the Panchayats is taken up under National Human Resource Development Programme of the Mission and TRYSEM.

In order to make the Panchayats financially strong to discharge their responsibilities under the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, the States had constituted State Finance Commission for devolution of resources. The details regarding the recommendations of the Commission and the Action Taken will be ascertained from the States for being placed before the Committee.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 18 of the Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.16)**

The Committee feel that falling down of water table is the major area of concern. They would like that Government should seriously draw some action plan with regard to conservation of water and watershed management to tackle this problem.

### **Reply of the Government**

The States have been requested to prepare concrete action plans under the Sub Mission on Sustainability for conservation of water and recharge of aquifers particularly for over exploited and dark areas

where utilisation of ground water has already reached over 100% and 85% of the potential. The matter is being pursued actively.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 21 of the Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 11.2)**

The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing, Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy services. The Standing Committee in their 16th report 1995, 1st Report (1996-97) had recommended that NIAM should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of its activity falls under the purview of that Ministry. But it is noted that no action has been taken on the recommendation of the Committee. They would like to reiterate their recommendation strongly and would urge that it should be complied with without any further delay.

### **Reply of the Government**

The matter is presently under consideration of the Cabinet Secretariat whose decision is awaited.

[Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment O.M. No. H-11020/7/97-GC(P) dated 12th March, 1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 24 of the Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;  
February 23, 1999  

---

Phalgun 4, 1920 (Saka)

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

## APPENDIX I

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

#### EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE 34TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 9TH FEBRUARY, 1999 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'C', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1550 hrs.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
3. Shri Sriram Chauhan
4. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
5. Shri Mitha Lal Jain
6. Shri Subhash Maharia
7. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
8. Smt. Ranee Narah
9. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
10. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
11. Shri Gaddam Ganga Reddy
12. Shri Chatin Singh Samaon
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri I.M. Jayaram Shetty

15. Shri Daya Singh Sodhi
16. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
17. Shri K. Venugopal

*Rajya Sabha*

18. Shri Nilotpal Basu
19. Shri Jhumuklal Bhendia
20. Dr. Manmath Nath Das
21. Shri N.R. Dasari
22. Shri John F. Fernandes
23. Shri C. Apok Jamir
24. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
25. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
26. Shri Jagdambi Mandal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

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

**Consideration of draft Action Taken Reports**

3. The Committee considered the following Memoranda regarding draft Action Taken Reports :—

- |       |    |    |    |
|-------|----|----|----|
| (i)   | ** | ** | ** |
| (ii)  | ** | ** | ** |
| (iii) | ** | ** | ** |
| (iv)  | ** | ** | ** |

---

\*\*Minutes regarding consideration of Memorandum Nos. 7, 8, 12 and 13 are kept separately.



- (v) Memorandum No. 14 regarding Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 8th Report (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment).

4. The Committee, then authorised the Chairman, to finalise the said Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/Departments and present the same to Parliament.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 4 of the Introduction)

*Analysis of the Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (11th Lok Sabha)*

I.	Total Number of Recommendations	33
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government (Para Nos. 2.11, 3.9, 3.11, 3.20, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 7.3, 8.2, 9.2, 10.5 and 12.1)	19
	Percentage to the total recommendations	57.58%
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	Nil
	Percentage to the total recommendations	Nil
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of that Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Para Nos. 2.3 to 2.10, 2.12 and 3.10)	10
	Percentage to the total recommendations	30.30%
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Para Nos. 3.8, 3.15, 3.16 and 11.2)	4
	Percentage to the total recommendations	12.12%