

**10**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004-2005)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2005-2006)**

**TENTH REPORT**



मयमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

TENTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2004-2005)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2005-2006)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 20.4.2005*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.4.2005*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*April, 2005/Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)*

**C.R.D. No. 013**

*Price : Rs. 40.00*

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, New Delhi-110 005.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS .....	(v)
INTRODUCTION .....	(vii)
REPORT	
CHAPTER I      Introductory .....	1
CHAPTER II     Analysis of the overall allocation of the Department of Land Resources.....	4
CHAPTER III    Scheme-wise Evaluation .....	28
APPENDICES	
I.      Statement showing Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditure during 9th Plan by the Department of Land Resources.....	60
II.     Statement showing proposed outlay, outlay agreed to, total release, Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure, during 10th Plan by the Department of Land Resources.....	62
III.    Overall position of the proposed, agreed to allocation during 9th and 10th Plan .....	64
IV.    State-wise Wastelands of India .....	65
V.     Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 29 March, 2005 .....	68
VI.    Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 8 April, 2005.....	70
VII.   Statement of Observations/Recommendations.....	72

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri L. Ganesan
5. Shri Mohan Jena
6. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
7. Shri Subhash Maharia
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri Dawa Narbula
10. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
11. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
12. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
13. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
14. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
15. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
17. Shri Mohan Singh
18. Shri Sita Ram Singh
19. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
20. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
21. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
24. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
25. Shri Penumalli Madhu

(iv)

26. Vacant<sup>@</sup>
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Vacant<sup>\*</sup>
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

- |                           |   |                         |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary     | — | <i>Secretary</i>        |
| 2. Shri V.K. Sharma       | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>  |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri A.K. Shah         | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>  |

---

<sup>@</sup>*Vice* Shri Stephen Marandi, ceased to be a member of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 16 March, 2005 consequent upon his election to the Jharkhand Legislative Assembly *vide* Rajya Sabha Secretariat notification No. RS. 10/2005-T, dated 11 April, 2005.

<sup>\*</sup>*Vice* Shri Keshubhai S. Patel ceased to be a member of the Committee *w.e.f.* 22 March, 2005 consequent upon his resignation from the membership of Standing Committee on Rural Development.

## ABBREVIATIONS

BE	—	Budget Estimates
BPL	—	Below Poverty Line
CAPART	—	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CLR	—	Computerisation of Land Records
CRS	—	Centre for Rural Studies
CSIR	—	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DDP	—	Desert Development Programme
DFID	—	Department for International Development
DOAC	—	Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
DoLR	—	Department of Land Resources
DoWD	—	Department of Wastelands Development
DPAP	—	Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
EFC	—	Expenditure Finance Committee
IAY	—	Indira Awaas Yojana
ICAR	—	Indian Council for Agricultural Research
IPS	—	Investment Promotional Scheme
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
LBSNAA	—	Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration
NABARD	—	National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development
NALRM	—	National Agency on Land Resources Management
NIC	—	National Informatics Centre
NIRD	—	National Institute of Rural Development
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
NWDB	—	National Wastelands Development Board

PIA	—	Project Implementation Agency
PMGJSY	—	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SAUs	—	State Agriculture Universities
SGSY	—	Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SGHs	—	Self-Help Groups
SRA & ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	—	Technology Development Extension and Training
TERI	—	The Energy and Resources Institute
UGs	—	User Groups
UT	—	Union territory
WA	—	Watershed Association
WC	—	Watershed Committee
WDF	—	Watershed Development Fund
ZP	—	Zilla Parishad



## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Tenth Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. Demands for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 29 March, 2005.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 8 April, 2005.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) for placing before them the requisite material and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

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

NEW DELHI;  
15 April, 2005  

---

25 Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Rural Development.*

# REPORT

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments (i) Department of Rural Development (ii) Department of Land Resources and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

#### **Responsibility of the Government**

1.2 The Department of Land Resources implements schemes for development of non-forest wastelands and degraded lands and other area development programmes such as Desert Development Programme and Drought Prone Areas Programme to increase bio-mass production as also to create opportunities for providing rural employment. It also implements scheme for Technology Development Extension and Training. Besides, the Department also monitors implementation of land reform measures and implement the scheme of Modernisation of Revenue and Land Administration.

#### **Functions of the Department**

1.3 The following functions have been assigned to the Department of Land Resources:

- (i) National Land Use and Wasteland Development Council;
- (ii) Promotion of Rural Employment through Wastelands Development;
- (iii) Promotion of production of fuel-wood, fodder and timber on non-forest lands, including private wastelands;
- (iv) Research and development of appropriate low cost technologies for increasing productivity of wastelands in sustainable ways;
- (v) Inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary coordination in programme planning and implementation of the Wastelands Development Programme including training;

- (vi) Promotion of people's participation and public cooperation and co-ordination of efforts of Panchayats and other voluntary and non-Government agencies for Wastelands Development;
- (vii) Area specific development programmes to counter endemic problems due to adverse climatic conditions and degeneration of the eco-system (DPAP, DDP);
- (viii) Administration of Land Acquisition Act, 1894;
- (ix) Examination of Central and State Legislations on Acquisition and Requisition of Properties;
- (x) Examination of other land laws;
- (xi) National Policy on Resettlement & Rehabilitation;
- (xii) Distribution of ceiling surplus land;
- (xiii) Distribution of Government wastelands and Bhoodan land;
- (xiv) Conferment of Ownership Rights to tenants;
- (xv) Prevention of alienation and restoration of alienated tribal land; and
- (xvi) Consolidation of land holdings;

1.4 The Department of Land Resources comprises of two divisions namely Wastelands Development Division and Land Reforms Division and implements the following important programmes under these divisions:

1. Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP);
2. Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP);
3. Desert Development Programme (DDP);
4. Modernisation of Revenue and Land Administration;
  - (a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR); and
  - (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR).
5. Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET);

1.5 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for the year 2005-2006 are Rs. 1,399.44 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.6 The Demands for Grants of the Department were presented to Lok Sabha under Demand No. 80.

1.7 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in Lok Sabha on 18 March, 2005.

1.8 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the over – all analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demands for Grants 2005-2006.

## CHAPTER II

### ANALYSIS OF THE OVERALL ALLOCATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

The information regarding 9th Plan (1997–2002) outlay and expenditure, 10th Plan (2002–2007) outlay as proposed by the Department and as agreed to by Planning Commission, BE, RE and actual expenditure during 2002–2003, 2003–2004 and 2004–2005 (upto 22.03.2005) and BE 2005–2006 overall as well as scheme-wise has been indicated in *Appendices – I & II*.

2.2 The following analysis of the comparative position of outlay during 9th and 10th Plans for plan and non-plan can be made:

<b>Plan + Non-Plan</b>	<b>(Rs. in Crore)</b>
<b>The 9th Plan (1997–2002)</b>	
Outlay	2769.90
Actual expenditure	2479.11
Underspending	290.79
<b>The 10th Plan (2002–2007)</b>	
Proposed outlay	5965.00
Agreed to outlay	6526.00
Difference between proposed and agreed to outlay	+561.00

2.3 Year-wise BE, RE, cut at RE stage, actual expenditure and underspending during first three years of the 10th Plan (2002–2007) viz. 2002–2003, 2003–2004 and 2004–2005 as also proposed,

agreed outlay and BE for fourth year (2005-2006) of the 10th Plan are as under:

<b>(Plan + Non-Plan)</b>					(Rs. in crore)
Year	B.E.	R.E.	Cut at R.E. stage	Actual Expenditure	Under spending as compared to RE
10th Plan (2002-2007)					
2002-2003 (1st Year)	1003.81	953.62	50.19	919.87	33.75
2003-2004 (2nd year)	1053.66	953.43	100.23	957.28	—
2004-2005 (3rd year)	1264.48	1053.43	211.05	1010.61(Plan) (releases upto 31.03.2005)	42.82
<b>2005-2006 (4th year)</b>					
Proposed Outlay	Agreed Outlay		B.E.		Difference (between proposed and agreed outlay)
1588	1396		1399.44 (including Rs. 3.44 crore under non-plan)		188.56

2.4 The following conclusions can be drawn by analysing the aforesaid data:

- (1) The outlay of the 10th Plan is more than two times of the allocation made during the 9th Plan;
- (2) The Department has got Rs. 561 crore more than what was proposed during 10th Plan;
- (3) Underspending is the recurrent feature during 9th Plan and during 1st and 3rd year of 10th Plan;

- (4) Whatever is allocated at BE stage is further reduced at RE stage;
- (5) Although 10th Plan outlay is more than what was proposed, the outlay earmarked during 2005-2006 is Rs. 188.56 crore lesser than what was proposed;
- (6) Although 3 years of the 10th Plan are already over, the expenditure position indicates that around  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the total resources were utilised; and
- (7) The expenditure position during 2004-2005 is also not very encouraging leaving an under spending of Rs. 42.82 crore.

2.5 The reasons for under-utilisation during 9th Plan have been submitted by the Department as under:

“The under utilisation of funds during the 9th Plan was because (i) the grounding of projects under the new guidelines of Watershed Development, which envisaged a high level of community participation for planning, implementation, monitoring, etc. of the projects took time. The development of community organisations and institutional mechanisms like Watershed Associations, Watershed Committee, Watershed Development Team, Self-Help Group, User Group, etc. is a time consuming process and caused delay in take off of the projects. (ii) The cuts imposed by the Ministry of Finance in the Budget outlay of the Department were quite substantial and led to lower release of funds. (iii) The funds earmarked for North Eastern States could not be fully released due to non-submission of proposals and poor fund absorption capacity.”

2.6 While the detailed analysis of each of the scheme has been done in the succeeding chapters of the Report, the overall position of the proposed, agreed to allocation during each year of 9th and 10th Plan is at *Appendix –III*.

2.7 While analysing the data as indicated at *Appendix III*, the following is observed:

- (i) Although the overall agreed to allocation during 10th Plan is more than what was proposed, the same is not the position when outlay for individual schemes is analysed. The agreed to outlay is more due to Rs.1,000 crore earmarked for ‘New Initiatives’;

- (ii) The comparative position of outlay during 9th and 10th Plan scheme-wise indicate that in each of the schemes of the Department there is considerable hike. In DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR and TDET, the outlay has almost been doubled.

2.8 The Committee during the course of examination pointed out that as against budget estimates for 2005-2006 of Rs. 1,399.44 both for plan and non-plan, Rs.1,053.43 crore were the revised estimate for the previous year showing an increase of Rs. 346.01 crore over the previous year. When Committee wanted to know the details of programmes/schemes for which enhanced funds were made available, the Department in a written note stated as under:

“The broad programmes/schemes of DoLR for which enhanced funds have been made in the outlay of 2005-2006 over the previous year 2004-2005 are given below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of the Programme	Outlay (2004-05)	Outlay (2005-06)	Percentage of increase
1.	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	448.00	565.00	26.12
2.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	300.00	353.00	17.67
3.	Desert Development Programme	215.00	268.00	24.65
4.	Computerization of Land Records	50.00	100.00	100.00
5.	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records	20.00	40.00	100.00
6.	Technology Development, Extension and Training	15.00	17.00	13.33
7.	Bio Fuels	10.00	50.00	400.00

The increment in respect of watershed/wasteland programmes *i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP are around 26, 18 and 25 per cent respectively for meeting the liabilities of on-going projects and sanctioning of new projects. The outlays of CLR and SRA & ULR schemes are doubled for taking up additional activities such as survey with the use of modern survey equipment and mapping



techniques, improvement in infrastructure facilities, etc. States will also require additional funds for completion of data entry work, organization of training programmes for revenue staff, covering of additional tehsils/taluks/blocks, setting up of monitoring cells at State Headquarters, etc.

Under the Bio Fuel Scheme, a tentative outlay of Rs.10 crore was earmarked during the year (2004-05). However, the preparation of DPR and subsequent clearance of the scheme by Planning Commission, EFC, etc. is likely to be obtained during the financial year (2005-2006) and hence a provision of Rs. 50 crore has been made."

2.9 As per the information furnished by the Department a lump-sum provision of Rs. 140 crore representing 10 per cent of the Plan Outlay has been earmarked for the North-Eastern States out of the total budget allocation of Rs. 1,396 crore made for the Department of Land Resources during 2005-2006. The allocation scheme-wise as furnished by the Department indicate that 10 per cent allocation to North-East is not scheme specific. Lump-sum 10 per cent of the total outlay of the Department is earmarked to North-Eastern States.

2.10 Clarifying about the reasons for underspending in respective schemes during 2004-2005, the Secretary, during evidence stated as under:

"In the Drought Prone Areas programme this year out of Rs. 300 crore we have spent Rs. 297.45 crore and remaining amount will be spent in the remaining days of the current year. Entire amount would be utilised. In Desert Development Programme there would be 100 per cent utilisation. In IWDP we are unable to utilise Rs. 34 crore reason being 10 per cent is earmarked for North-East. We have spoken a number of times to the concerned Ministry that since DPAP and DDP programmes are not being run in all the States but in selected blocks in a few States. We told them there is no need of earmarking 10 per cent for North-East. However, they have not accepted it till now. We have not received any proposal from their side. Therefore, this amount of Rs. 34 crore is not being spent. This matter is to be considered by the Committee and they may recommend that some amount should be earmarked for Drought Prone Areas Programme."

2.11 In reply to another question, the Ministry furnished the scheme-wise releases for 2004-2005 as on 31 March, 2005 as follows:

(Rs. in crore)

Scheme	BE	RE	Expenditure
Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	448.00	448.00	414.42
Drought Prone Areas Programme	300.00	300.00	300.19
Desert Development Programme	215.00	215.00	215.19
Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)	50.00	50.00	45.62
Strengthening of Revenue Adm. and Updating of Land Records	20.00	20.00	19.66
Technology, Development, Extension & Training	15.00	15.00	14.99
Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	200.00	—	—
Bio-fuels	10.00	0.20	—
Others	3.00	1.80	0.54
Total (Plan)	1261.00	1050.00	1010.61

**2.12 The Committee note that the concept of allocation of 10 per cent exclusive outlay of each Department/Ministry of the Union Government for North Eastern Region including Sikkim was started since 2000-2001. After that, whenever the attention of the Department has been drawn towards underspending, a common reply stating that allocation for two area specific programmes DDP and DPAP is being made every year, whereas these schemes are not in operation in these States has been furnished. The Committee while noting the concept of allocation for North Eastern Region find that 10 per cent lump-sum allocation of the overall outlay of a Department is earmarked exclusively for these areas. No scheme-wise allocation is being made. If that is the state of affairs, the Committee fail to understand the logic of the Department in this regard. The Committee feel that instead of furnishing such reasons, the Department should stress for increasing the scope of the schemes viz IWDP and land records. The position of land records in said States is very poor and hence need more attention. The detailed analysis in this regard has been done in the subsequent part of the report. Here the Committee would like to emphasise that the outlay can be used for this sector**

after having consultations with the concerned State Governments. The Committee would like the Department to explain the position in view of their aforesaid observation so as to enable them to analyse the position and comment further in this regard.

2.13 The Committee after analysing the data as indicated in the aforesaid paras of the report find that Rs. 561 crore has been allocated more than the proposed outlay during 10th Plan. Not only that, the outlay provided during 10th Plan is more than two times of the allocation made during 9th Plan. The scheme-wise analysis further indicates that the allocation during 2005-06 has been increased in all the schemes specifically under the schemes meant for computerisation and updation of land records where the hike is 100 per cent. However, if allocation scheme-wise is analysed in the context of proposed allocation, the data indicate that excepting scheme meant for land records the allocation provided is lesser than the proposed allocation. Further if the trends of what was proposed scheme-wise by the Department and what was eventually allocated scheme-wise during 10th Plan is compared to 9th Plan, the data indicate that the difference between proposed and agreed to allocation under each of the schemes is much less as compared to 9th Plan.

2.14 With regard to the position of expenditure, the Committee note that during 9th Plan the underspending was to the tune of Rs. 290 crore. The reasons as indicated by the Department include cut imposed by the Ministry of Finance at Revised Estimates stage. Further if the expenditure is compared to Revised Estimates during 9th Plan, the underspending comes to the tune of Rs. 36.48 crore. During 10th Plan the underspending is due to lesser utilisation in North Eastern States.

2.15 The Committee conclude from what has been stated above that the data indicate quite a favourable performance of the Department as compared to the other counterpart Departments of the Ministry of Rural Development *viz* the Department of Rural Development and Drinking Water Supply where the actual allocation is far less than the proposed outlay of those Departments. The better allocation position is also due to very good expenditure position shown by the Department under several schemes. The allocation and the efforts made by the Department need to be continued in a bigger way keeping in view the gigantic task of huge areas falling under wastelands in the country. The analysis in this regard has been made in the subsequent part of the Report.

2.16 The scheme wise analysis has also been made in the subsequent part of the report. Here the Committee may like to highlight that the Budget documents of the Department indicate that the releases to the State Governments/implementing agencies are considered as spending. There is no mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes due to long gestation period. Further the foreclosure of projects specifically under watershed schemes indicate that the physical performance of the projects may not be so satisfactory as the data with regard to financial achievement indicate. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to evolve some sort of mechanism for evaluating the performance of different projects. Some sort of grading indicating poor, satisfactory or very good may be indicated against the number of projects being undertaken in various States. Besides, another mechanism can be to have some system indicating the projects at First stage, Second stage, Third stage etc. Such type of analysis would enable a critical evaluation of the projects. The Committee would like the Department to consider the said aspect and apprise the Committee accordingly.

#### New Initiatives

2.17 Rs.1,000 crore have been earmarked for 'New Initiatives' during 10th Plan. As against this, Rs. 200 crore were allocated under 'Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana' (PMGJSY) during 2004-2005. However the utilisation was nil. Similarly during 2005-2006 a sum of Rs. 50 crore have been proposed under the scheme 'Bio fuel'. When asked for the reason for non-utilisation of Rs. 200 crore under PMGJSY during 2004-2005, the Department has stated as under:

"The Planning Commission had made a lumpsum provision of Rs.1,000 crore for 'New Initiatives' during the 10th Plan period out of which Rs. 210 crore was allocated for 2004-05 (Rs. 200 crore for PMGJSY and Rs. 10 crore for Biofuels). Two new schemes namely Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and Development of Bio-Fuel were proposed to be taken up under this head. ...."

2.18 The Department in a written note further clarified as under:

"The Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance were of the view that strengthening the water resource development component of watershed development programmes of the Department of Land Resources by supplementing the budget provisions of these programme would be a better proposition rather than launching a

separate scheme with the same objective. It was proposed to utilise the funds available for the purpose by supplementing the budgetary allocations to DPAP, DDP and IWDP.”

2.19 At this the Committee further pointed out that as per the document Implementation of Budget Announcements (2004-2005), the Scheme Renovation of Traditional Bodies linked with Agriculture was approved by the Government on 27th January, 2005. The Committee wanted to know the details for which Rs. 1000 crore allocated during 10th plan for ‘New Initiatives’ were made and the reasons for rethinking on the aforesaid new schemes Department has informed as under:

“.....In the Budget speech of the Union Finance Minister in July 2004 a massive scheme to repair, renovate and restore all the water bodies that is directly linked to Agriculture was announced. It was thought that PMGJSY could be tailored to this end. The Bio-Fuel Project was taken up when this Ministry was identified as the Nodal Ministry for processing the recommendations of the Report of the Planning Commission on Development of Bio-Fuel.

However, when the Ministry of Water Resources was finally identified for launching the scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies, the proposal of this Ministry on the same subject could not be pursued further. So far as the Development of the Bio-Fuel Project is concerned, the same is being actively followed-up. The Detailed Project Report (DPR) for bio-fuel is now ready and the case is being processed for obtaining clearance from the Planning Commission and the EFC. In this background, in the Performance Budget for 2004-2005, the allocation for New Initiatives was made for the Bio-Fuel Project. Nevertheless, no release/ expenditure can be booked against this allocation until the detailed programme is approved by the EFC and the Union Cabinet.

Due to non-pursuance of the PMGJSY scheme and following the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister in July 2004, it was proposed to utilize the allocation available under PMGJSY for the new scheme on renovation of traditional water bodies. This Ministry was aware that the Ministry of Water Resources (not the Ministry of Agriculture) was proposing to launch the same scheme as per FM’s announcement. The idea at that time was to take up for renovation of small village water bodies under the control of Gram Panchayats, which do not come under the purview of the Ministry of Water Resources/State Minor Irrigation Departments.”

2.20 On further enquiry regarding the justification of initiating a scheme and allocating an outlay for a scheme under the Department of Land Resources, which was basically related to Ministry of Water Resources, the Ministry in a written note informed as under:

“Water harvesting and conservation is one of the thrust areas for development under the watershed development programmes of this Ministry. Renovation/desilting of water bodies is, therefore, an integral component of this thrust area. Accordingly, it was felt that a new scheme exclusively for renovation of small traditional water bodies in the watershed areas would be appropriate to give added thrust to the efforts already being made by the Ministry in water harvesting and conservation. These small water bodies do not come under the purview of the Ministry of Water Resources.”

2.21 During the course of evidence of Department of Land Resources, the Secretary stated as under :

“The last point is about bio-fuel, the Planning Commission had prepared a report and submitted to the then Prime Minister, who had decided that the Department of Land Resources will be the nodal Department for implementing the scheme. As is required, we are following the procedure of preparing an EFC before which we need a detailed project report. Recently, we had asked TERI to prepare it. As soon as the scheme is sanctioned, we will be in a position to implement it.”

2.22 A representative of the Department of Land Resources further added:

“With the present increase in the consumption of fuel in the country, more so with the ever increasing imports of petroleum products, as part of energy security, the Government has decided to implement bio-fuel project. It is already there in vogue in most of the various countries like Europe, USA but the only difference is that in those countries, they are making use of edible oils for production of bio-fuel, while in our country since edible oil is very expensive and not so easily affordable, we have decided to go in for non-edible oils. There are several non-edible oils available in our country. Taking into account the production of oil-seed and oil content, we have more or less zeroed on a plant called Jatropha. Again, a peculiar feature about Jatropha crop is that this is not a crop whose origin is from India. It is basically from Brazil and other countries in South America. Though we are having this crop

for a long period in this country, still we do not have established research data.

Actually, this is area case where research is going to be simultaneously done with the development of the crop programme. It has already been mentioned that a detailed project report on this issue has been prepared. It is stated that even to meet a 5 per cent blending requirement of diesel we need about 2 million hectares of land under *Jatropha* cultivation. As a pilot project, this is something that has got to be done primarily by making use of the wastelands. So, it will be a wastelands development programme, and it will be done naturally by the farmers in this country. It is proposed that we take up initially a demonstration project with about 4 lakh hectares of land, and we are ready with our plans. This plan has already been sent to the Planning Commission for its approval. It is going to be a Rs.1,500 crore project after we secure the necessary clearance for it. As per the business rules further action will be taken with regard to this issue."

2.23 The Committee further wanted to know where the plant variety called *Jatropha* is being cultivated in the country, the representative of the Department of Land Resources clarified as under:

"It is being done in States like Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, etc."

2.24 The Committee also wanted to know about the policy with regard to the land use for cultivation of *Jatropha*, whether it has to be distributed to poor farmers so that they can grow and sell the products to Petroleum Companies, the Secretary informed that :

"We have to ensure that the seed received after cultivation of *Jatropha* is well remunerative. Therefore, we are pressurising the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas to recommend a price for bio diesel and communicate the same to us. Five rupees per kg. of *Jatropha* would not be remunerative thus higher must be given."

2.25 In reply to another question the Secretary, DoLR stated:

"This crop is not tested."

2.26 In reply to another question whether any other plant is being cultivated in other States, the Secretary, DoLR informed as under:

"Sir, each State has different arrangement. In Uttaranchal, the Government has evolved a programme for developing 2 lakh

hectares of degraded hills by cultivating Jatropha in it. They have formed Self-Help Groups in Van Panchayats. The Government will give the beneficiary maintenance charge for 2 hectares of land. The plant material will be provided free of cost to them, and three-year maintenance cost is also provided as a subsidy to the Self-help Groups."

2.27 The witness further added:

"There is one Pongamia tree in South India which produces similar kind of seed which is useful for the same purpose."

2.28 The Committee wanted to know whether the Jatropha cultivation require irrigation, the Secretary, Land Resources clarified as under:

"This is the biggest problem. Today's Jatropha plants do not require water. However, it has been mentioned in the Report that if 5 kg.of Jatropha is made available only then the scheme would be viable. For that irrigation is necessary. For this Rs.30,000 per hectare would be the expenditure. This poses a question whether we should go for Jatropha plantation with such huge expenditure."

2.29 At this the Committee also wanted to know who will bear the cost, the witness clarified.

"Initially the cost will be borne by the Government."

**2.30 The Committee disapprove the way the new schemes are proposed and outlay earmarked without any planning or preparedness on the part of the Government resulting in blockage of outlay in the resources starved economy of the country. They note that Rs.1,000 crore were earmarked during 10th Plan for the 'New initiative'. The two new schemes viz (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and (ii) Development of Bio-fuel were to be launched. Initially Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies was proposed to be under the Ministry of Land Resources but finally the Ministry of Water Resources was chosen as the Ministry to handle the aforesaid scheme. The Committee find that the handling of watershed projects by various Ministries of the Union Government viz Ministries of Agriculture, Water Resources and Land Resources is the main cause of such a state of affairs. The Committee in their earlier reports have been expressing their concern in this regard. The issue of convergence although decided in principle, is being delayed by the Government.**



2.31 There is uncertainty over the fate of another new scheme 'Bio fuel', for which Rs. 50 crore have been allocated during 2005-2006. The Secretary during the course of oral evidence acknowledged that Jatropha plantation envisaged under the scheme is neither proven nor cost effective. The use of Jatropha plant for Bio-fuel is still at the experimental stage and TERI is preparing the project report. Not only that, the viability of Jatropha plant and other issues relating to its plantation like the need for irrigation, farmers willingness to plantation etc. are still to be debated. Without examining all these issues, the detailed Project Report (DPR) for the scheme is being prepared for obtaining clearance from the Planning Commission. Although it is acknowledged that no expenditure can be made under the scheme, an allocation of Rs. 50 crore has already been made during 2005-2006, thereby blocking the resources. While the Committee are not against initiating novel schemes as part of energy security like Bio fuel, they feel that before launching the scheme, its viability should be ascertained. The technology should be tested and proven only then the decision to launch the scheme should be taken and allocation for the purpose provided.

2.32 In the aforesaid state of affairs the Committee express their strong reservations on the issue of handling of new schemes. They strongly recommend that before launching a new scheme Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance should analyse the proposals of the concerned Ministry. Only after initial home work is done, and all the things are ready for implementation, allocation should be made as blockage of outlay earmarked for non-viable schemes deprives the other established schemes of their due allocation. The Committee strongly recommend that their concerns in this regard should be duly communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance and also to the Cabinet Secretariat.

#### **Need for wastelands development in a big way**

2.33 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence while presenting the position of wastelands in the country stated as under:

"Total wastelands area is 63.85 million hectare out of which 14.06 million hectares is forest land and non-forest area is 36.98 million hectares we can treat. Besides if we can count rocky, stony and snow covered areas which cannot be developed. Around 30 million hectares remains to be treated. If we make a cost norm of Rs.6,000 per hectare, it will require Rs.17,000 crore for this purpose. A sum of Rs.1,000 crore is provided for wasteland treatment of treatable

wastelands area. For this we get the budget accordingly we frame the programme.”

2.34 While examining Demands for Grants (2004-2005), it has been indicated that the Department of Land Resources proposes to develop 40 million hectare as per the following schedule:

Sl.No.	By the end of the plan	Target (in million hectare)
1.	9th Plan (1997-2002)	5
2.	10th Plan (2002-2007)	15
3.	11th Plan (2007-2012)	20
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>

2.35 The Department of Land Resources had brought an Atlas indicating District wise details of Wastelands. The data was generated by employing scientific remote sensing satellite data products. On the issue of updating of such data, the Department has informed that a project for the purpose has been sanctioned to National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) during 2002, which is nearing completion now. Further updation of the Atlas can be taken as and when felt necessary.

2.36 On the issue of slippage of treated land again into wastelands, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that there is a provision in the guidelines for post project maintenance.

**2.37 The Committee find that total wastelands in the country is 63.85 million hectare. If forest area (under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Forest) and untreatable land is deducted, the total treatable area comes to around 30 million hectares. The Committee find that as informed earlier [reference para 2.18 of 2nd report (2004-2005)], the Government had planned development of wastelands amounting to 40 million hectares. Further as per Wastelands Atlas there are varying estimates of total wastelands in the country, however, no less than 37.5 million hectares are currently expected to be available for viable treatment.**

The Committee find from the position as given above that perhaps there is no clarity on the issue of minimum wastelands that could be developed in the country. The Committee would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard since the data with

regard to minimum treatable wastelands is the necessary input for future planning.

2.38 Besides the Committee find that Atlas indicating the district wise data of wastelands by employing the scientific remote sensing satellite data products was finalised on 9 March, 2000. Five years have passed since then, as per Department's reply, efforts are being made to update the data. The Committee would like to be apprised when the exercise of updation would be completed. Besides the Committee also feel that there should be some mechanism to update the data periodically so as to know how far the efforts of the Government could result in actual treatment of land. Besides updation of data would also make the position of slippage of treated land again into wastelands clear.

**Overall position of outlay *vis-à-vis* the position of coverage of wastelands**

2.39 As per the information provided by the Department the allocation position regarding wastelands development is as under:

		(Rs. in crore)
9th Plan allocation	-	2,769.90
Proposed outlay during 10th Plan	-	5,965
Agreed outlay during 10th Plan	-	6,526

The Department got Rs. 561 crore more than what was proposed.

Total projection for coverage of wastelands -

At the rate of Rs.6000 per hectare.	17,000
Average yearly allocation	1,000

2.40 During the course of examination, the Committee were informed that the area covered during a Plan period will depend upon the budget allocated.

2.41 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that it will take 17-18 years to treat the wastelands area at the existing place of allocation.

2.42 The detailed analysis of the allocation proposed by the Department, Budget Estimates indicating the availability of data and expenditure position has been made in the preceding part of the report. So far as the overall scenario of wastelands development *vis-a-vis* outlay required is concerned, the Committee find that there is an urgent need to allocate more funds to complete the development of total wastelands in a stipulated time frame. The Committee note that wastelands when developed can be a major economic resource for the country. Besides there is an urgent need for the proper and integrated planning for the purpose.

2.43 The Committee were informed that it will take 17- 18 years to develop the wastelands with the existing pace and outlay of the Department. The Committee find that other Ministries/Departments of the Union Governments *viz* Agriculture, Water Resources etc. are also having schemes for watershed development. Huge resources are being allocated to these Ministries also. Besides State Governments may be having some schemes for tackling the issue of development of wastelands. Unless there is some sort of coordinating mechanism, no meaningful conclusion indicating the position of coverage of wastelands in the country can be arrived at. As indicated in the preceding para, the final decision on the issue of convergence of the efforts being made by Union Government cannot be arrived at even after the concurrence of the Planning Commission in this regard. Pending decision in this regard, the Committee may like to recommend to the Department to evolve some sort of mechanism by which the efforts made by several Ministries/Department/State Government could be coordinated so as to have a clear cut position of scenario of wastelands development. Only when such a data is available, a time bound programme for tackling the issue of wastelands development can be made.

#### Stata-wise position of wastelands in the country

2.44 The position regarding the State-wise extent of wastelands identified has been given in *Appendix-IV*. The following are the State-wise districts having wastelands in major States:

Sl.No.	State	Wastelands (in terms of districts)
1	2	3
1.	Uttar Pradesh	83
2.	Bihar	55

1	2	3
3.	Madhya Pradesh	62
4.	Maharashtra	32
5.	Orissa	30
6.	Tamil Nadu	29
7.	Andhra Pradesh	23
8.	Gujarat	25

2.45 In view of the large number of wastelands in the country the Department had (28th December, 2004) informed that it is taking necessary steps to study international experiences in the field of wasteland development. When the Committee wanted to know the latest update in this regard the Department stated as under:

“Efforts are being made to send officers for international workshops/seminars for getting exposure to developments in the watershed area.”

2.46 The Committee find that a large part of wastelands to be treated are in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh in terms of districts. The Committee feel that there is a need to frame a State-wise and phase-wise programme for development of wastelands in consultation with the concerned State Governments on priority basis.

2.47 The Committee would also like to recommend to study international experience in the field of wastelands development so as to have exposure of the technologies and policy formulation being made in this regard in those countries. Such a study will help the Government to take the benefit of the positive experiences of these countries.

#### **Impact of Wastelands Development Programmes on employment generation**

##### **(i) Scope of employment in watershed programme in post National Rural Employment Guarantee Scenario**

2.48 The Government has introduced ‘The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2004’ in Lok Sabha which aims at

providing 100 days wage employment to each household below the poverty line in rural areas. The aforesaid Bill is being examined by the Standing Committee. During the course of examination it was found that around 60 per cent of the expenditure of wastelands development programmes of IWDP, DDP and DPAP in execution of watershed projects went into wage employment. While clarifying how the schemes of the Department can help in availing the objective of aforesaid legislation, the Department stated as under:

“About sixty per cent of the expenditure under all area development programmes of the Department of Land Resources goes for wage employment using indigenous technologies and active participation of the people of the project area. Since most of the works are simple in nature, the employment of unskilled adults for the project period may be ensured through area development programmes. The food grain component under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, will increase wage employment in water harvesting and conservation programmes. The support of the SHGs under watershed programmes would enhance the opportunity of self-employment.”

2.49 The Department has also informed that about 60 per cent of the expenditure under all area development programmes goes for wage employment in the project area.

**(ii) Convergence of various employment generation schemes**

2.50 On the issue of convergence of schemes at the field level the Department has informed as under:

“The Department of Land Resources in the Ministry of Rural Development has been emphasising for convergence of different Government of India schemes at the field level, which would enhance the sustainable economic development of village community. Accordingly, a provision has been made in the Hariyali Guidelines for implementation of watershed development programmes. The Para 39 of Hariyali Guidelines is reproduced as follows:—

As the Watershed Development Programmes aim at holistic development of watershed areas, the convergence of all other non-land based programmes of Government of India, particularly those of the Ministry of Rural Development would enhance the ultimate output and lead to sustainable economic development of the village

community. The ZP/DRDA, therefore, shall take all possible measures to ensure convergence of other programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development such as the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), the Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) and the Rural Drinking Water Supply Programme in the villages chosen for the implementation of the watershed development projects. It would also be worthwhile to converge programmes of similar nature of the other Ministries e.g. Health & Family Welfare, Education, Social Justice and Empowerment and Agriculture, as also of the State Governments, in these villages.

The State Government, while implementing programmes, have to ensure convergence of schemes at field level."

### **Impact Assessment Studies**

2.51 The Committee have been informed earlier that the Department had commissioned nation-wide studies on the impact of watershed development programmes *i.e.* DPAP, DDP and IWDP. For this purpose 230 districts in 16 States were covered on a sample basis and 20 independent Field Agencies were engaged.

2.52 The Department has informed that the reports of the studies were submitted in the first quarter of 2002.

2.53 On the issue of wage employment these studies revealed as under:

"The impact assessment studies have observed that there was an overall increase in employment opportunities due to watershed projects. The watershed development projects contributed to employment generation through an increase in agriculture production activities, dairy farming, poultry/piggery and other non-farm activities. In general, about sixty percent of the expenditure under watershed projects goes for wage employment during the project period."

2.54 When asked about the major outcomes of the aforesaid survey, the Department in a written note submitted as under:

"Major outcomes of the impacts assessment study are as given as under:—

### **Impact on land, water & biomass**

**Land Use**                      An overall improvement in land use was reported from all States following

implementation of the watershed development programmes. Increase in net sown area, gross cropped area and area sown more than once was reported from Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh.

- Irrigation** The number of irrigation options increased in all areas where watershed projects were undertaken. This was especially the case in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal.
- Fuelwood & fodder availability** Fuelwood and Fodder availability increased especially in IWDP areas where considerable attention was paid to wasteland development and catchment area treatment. Several States including Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh reported a positive increase in fuelwood and fodder availability.
- Cropping pattern** Several States reported change in cropping pattern from one to two crops annually. This was directly attributed to the availability of water in the dry season for irrigation. Some States have reported adoption of improved crop varieties. Only a few States have recorded pre and post-project yields for dominant crops in the annual cropping cycle. Where data is available, an increase in yields has been reported.
- Livestock** While there was some change in actual number of livestock owned reported from some States, there was a marked preference for improved breeds post-project. Some States also reported the development of fisheries potential following



the development of tanks and other water bodies.

### **Socio-economic impact**

#### **Income and employment generation**

Several States reported an increase in agriculture related employment opportunities among beneficiaries and in other sectors for non-beneficiaries. These included trade, dairy, poultry, masonry, artisans etc. The physical works carried out under the watershed development programme provided varying number of mandays of work in nearly all States. Changes in household income levels varied from none at all in some States to over 50% compared to pre-project levels in other States.

### **Capacity building & people's participation**

#### **Institutional arrangements**

All States reported having established institutional arrangements to undertake the watershed development programme. Watershed Development Advisory Committees were set up at the district level in all the watershed districts. Line departments including Forest, Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Soil Conservation, Planning, Revenue, Rural Development and Minor Irrigation assisted in the implementation of the projects. In some States, NGOs were also appointed as PIAs.

#### **People's Participation**

UGs/SHGs were set up in some States. Similarly WCs and WAs also were established in most watershed areas.

#### **Capacity building**

All States reported investing in capacity building at various levels including beneficiaries, WC and WA members and PIAs. In some States this led to a positive outcome while in others it was felt that the quality of training received needed to be improved and the frequency of training increased. Mostly State agriculture departments, universities and in some cases NGOs were engaged in capacity building.

2.55 The Committee are pleased to note the results of impact assessment studies commissioned by the Department in 16 States covering two hundred districts. These studies evaluated the impact of watershed programmes IWDP, DPAP and DDP in the areas covered. As revealed by said studies, the programmes have positive impact on net sown area, gross cropped area sown more than once, the increasing of option of irrigation, fuelwood and fodder availability. Besides the studies reveal favourable impact by way of increase in household income and wage employment. The Committee note that the favourable impact of these studies should be widely publicised. The various field level agencies, State Governments, NGOs and all those involved with the watershed programme should be made aware of the findings of the evaluation studies. Such an exercise will definitely motivate the State Governments and all other concerned to take more and more projects for the purpose. Besides emphatic reports should be presented to the Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance while presenting budget projections so that adequate outlay could be provided for different schemes.

2.56 The Committee further find that the Union Government has brought an ambitious legislation *viz.* 'The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2004' which is being examined by the Committee. The said legislation seeks to provide 100 days of wage employment to each BPL family in rural areas. The Committee find that 60 per cent of expenditure under all area development programmes goes for wage employment in the project area. Further the impact assessment studies have indicated a favourable impact on employment generation in the areas covered by the programmes of the Department. The Committee observe that the watershed programmes can help the Government in achieving the objectives of the aforesaid legislation. The related issues will be examined in detail while the aforesaid Bill will be examined by the Committee. The Committee would like to recommend here that the various revelations regarding wage employment should be discussed with the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission and the Department of Rural Development so as to have some integrated planning to achieve the objectives of the aforesaid legislation.

2.57 Further the Committee find that 'Hariyali' guidelines of the Department emphasise the convergence of all the programmes of not only of Union Government but also those being implemented by the State Governments at the field level. While appreciating the formulation of said guidelines the Committee feel that there is an

urgent need to implement the aforesaid guidelines since the other Ministries and State Governments are involved in this regard. There is an urgent need to discuss and debate this issue during the various conferences, seminars held where State Governments and other Ministries represent. Besides the said guidelines should be publicised widely. To motivate the State Governments, the impact of convergence should be studied carefully and the success of the States/districts which could have positive impact, should be replicated in other States/districts.

### Review of DPAP/DDP Blocks

#### DPAP Blocks

2.58 As per the Performance Budget, the basic objective of DPAP is to minimise the adverse effects of drought on production of crops and livestock and productivity of land, water and human resources ultimately leading to the drought proofing of the affected areas. 972 DPAP blocks were identified and DPAP programme is being implemented in the aforesaid blocks since 1994. These blocks were identified in the report submitted by Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao, ex-Member, Planning Commission.

2.59 When asked whether some of the States have requested for coverage of additional blocks, the Department has informed that since the implementation of DPAP on watershed basis in identified areas, an increase in the drought prone areas in the interregnum cannot be ruled out. Some States may require additional blocks under the programme. States like Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Rajasthan and Chhattisgarh have made requests in this regard.

#### DDP Blocks

2.60 DDP is being implemented in 235 DDP blocks in the country in 40 districts of 7 States.

2.61 On a query whether any of the State Government has requested for coverage of additional blocks, the Department has replied that since the implementation of DDP on watershed basis in identified areas, the spread of these areas in the intervening period, cannot be ruled out and programme States may require additional blocks under the programme. States like Gujarat have requested to include some more blocks. The Department of Land Resources (DoLR) has set up an Expert Committee recently to review the existing criteria of coverage identification and identify the coverage afresh.

2.62 During the course of oral evidence the Secretary further apprised the Committee that:

“...DPAP and DDP is being run in those blocks based on the recommendations of a Committee headed by Hanumantha Rao which identified these blocks. Now from the last few years a demand is being raised and the today’s situation is that there is a lot of difference evident between 1994 position and that of today. Therefore, the issue has to be seen a fresh. Accordingly Government recently on 14th February, 2005 has appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of a farmer Shri S. Partha Sarathi. He has been asked to submit the report within six months. The term and reference of the Committee include identification of blocks afresh. The inclusion, exclusion of the blocks from the existing blocks has also to be considered.”

**2.63 The Committee in their earlier reports have been recommending to review the position of DDP and DPAP blocks since these blocks were identified a decade back. Since then the situation may have changed. Many more blocks may need assistance under DDP & DPAP programmes. Besides, State Governments have been requesting for coverage of additional blocks. The Committee appreciate that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri S. Partha Sarathi has been appointed for this purpose. The said Partha Sarathi Committee will submit the report within six months. The Committee would like to be apprised of the recommendations of the said Committee when finalised.**

## CHAPTER III

### SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION

#### **Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)**

3.1 IWDP is a Centrally Sponsored Programme for the Department of Land Resources for the development of non-forest wastelands in the country. The basic approach in implementation of this programme has been modified from 1st April, 1995 when the guidelines for Watershed Development through Watershed Approach came into force. Since then, projects for development of wastelands on watershed basis are sanctioned. The projects have to be implemented over a period of five years at an overall cost of Rs. 4,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned up to 31st March, 2000 and at an overall cost of Rs. 6,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned after 1st April, 2000.

3.2 The Guidelines for Watershed Development have been revised in September, 2001. Consequent upon the revision of cost norm from Rs. 4,000 per hectare to Rs. 6000 per hectare, the funding pattern of IWDP has also been modified. The project cost would now be shared at the rate of Rs. 5,500 per hectare and Rs. 500 per hectare between Central and State Governments respectively. Previously, the total cost of the projects under the Programme was funded by the Central Government. The revised guidelines of 2001 were replaced by guidelines for Hariyali *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2003 with a view to empower Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in planning, execution and managing developmental activities relating to all watershed programmes.

#### **(i) Scenario during 9th Plan (1997-2002)**

##### **Allocations and Releases**

3.3 The details of funds and their releases during 9th Plan period are as detailed below:—

Sl.No.	Outlay/Expenditure	Amount (Rs. in crore)
1.	As proposed by Department	3360
2.	BE	1148.60
3.	RE	986.10
4.	Actual/Releases	962.27
5.	Shortfall	186.33

3.4 It is evident from the above figures that there has been a shortfall in utilisation of Budget allocation to the tune of Rs. 186.33 crore during 9th Plan.

#### **Funds for committed liabilities of on-going watershed programmes**

3.5 During the 9th Plan period 65 to 70 per cent funds were used for on-going projects. For instance during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 out of total outlays of Rs. 480 crore and Rs. 430 crore as much as Rs. 350 crore and Rs. 200 crore were for committed liabilities. As per information furnished by the Department, the gestation period of watershed project is four to five years. When asked about the number of projects under IWDP which are more than 5 years old, the Department has informed that there are 46 such projects the details of which are given as under :—

#### **On-going projects for more than five years during 9th Plan**

Year of Sanction	No. of Projects (on-going)
1997	15
1998	28
1999	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>

3.6 The Committee also wanted to know how the Department would achieve the targets of development of wastelands if the major portion of the allocation is earmarked for the committed liabilities. The Department in a written note stated as under:

“Committed liabilities are funds required for release of subsequent instalments for ongoing projects sanctioned in previous years. New projects form about 30 to 35 per cent of the budget allocation and the remaining funds are utilized for release of instalments for ongoing projects. Only 15 per cent of the total costs of the project is released as first instalment along with the sanction of the project. The total cost of the project is released in five instalments which follow in succeeding years. The sanction of new projects is demand driven depending upon the absorptive capacity of the States to undertake works under new projects as well as budget allocations.”

3.7 In reply to a query about committed liability to DoLR in a written note stated as under:

“Since the project period is for 5 years and funds are released in 7 instalments for projects sanctioned prior to 31.03.2003 and 5 instalments for projects sanctioned after 01.04.2003, first instalment amounting to 15 per cent is released along with Sanction Order of each project. Every subsequent instalment is released on receipt of Utilisation Certificate showing utilization of more than 50 per cent of previous instalment and full amount of earlier instalments released. Since projects are demand driven and based on participatory approach, next instalment is released as and when demanded by implementing agency (ZP/DRDA) fulfilling requirements of UC and other documents. Therefore, funds are required each year to account for projects of earlier four or more years (in case not completed in time due to the reasons stated above). The committed liability worked out for next five years is as given below:—

	(Rs. in crore)				
Programme	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
IWDP (on-going)	285.50	339.42	286.20	292.46	224.80
IWDP -new (1st instalment)	82.50	82.50	82.50	82.50	82.50
Subsequent instalments			165.00	330.00	330.00
Total for IWDP	368.000	421.920	533.700	704.960	637.300

3.8 From the above table, it is evident that on-going liability is on actual based on timely further release of instalment under ongoing projects. New Projects to be sanctioned have been worked out for treatment of 10 lakh Hectares area each year, and instalments due for this has been indicated above.

#### **Projects sanctioned/foreclosed/ongoing under IWDP since 1995-96**

3.9 Out of the 630 projects sanctioned to non-North Eastern States, 558 projects are continuing, funding has been completed in 59 projects

and 13 projects have been foreclosed due to unsatisfactory performance. The year-wise break-up is given below:—

Year of Sanction	No. of Sanctioned projects	No. of Projects Completed	No. of Projects Foreclosed/Closed	On-Going Projects
1995-96	7	4	1	2
1996-97	17	8	5	4
1997-98	38	19	5	14
1998-99	41	14	2	25
1999-2000	63	13	0	50
2000-01	78	1	0	77
2001-02	97	0	0	97
2002-03	8	0	0	8
2003-04	141	0	0	141
2004-05	140	0	0	140
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>558</b>

3.10 As regards data regarding sanctioned/completed/foreclosed and on-going projects in North-East Region the following data has been given:—

(as on 31.3.2005)

Year	No. of IWDP	Completed	Foreclosed	On-going
1	2	3	4	5
Projects sanctioned (as on 31.1.05)				
1995-96	1	1	0	0
1996-97	2	2	0	0
1997-98	7	3	1	3
1998-99	7	4	1	2
1999-2000	10	2	0	8
2000-01	29	0	0	29



1	2	3	4	5
2001-02	28	0	0	28
2002-03	41	0	0	41
2003-04	49	0	0	49
2004-05	25	0	0	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>185</b>

3.11 State-wise details of status of foreclosed of IWDP projects sanctioned prior to 01 April, 1995 and their financial performance is as under:—

<b>Funds</b>		<b>(Rs. in crore)</b>				
Sl.No.	States	Projects Cost	Released	Utilised	To be recovered	Recovered
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4.02	3.80	3.74	0.05	0.05
2.	Bihar	7.21	6.07	6.09	0.0	0.0
3.	Chhattisgarh	8.82	3.81	3.94	0.03	0.03
4.	Delhi	0.55	0.15	0.15	0.0	0.0
5.	Gujarat	24.40	11.82	8.84	3.25	1.35
6.	Haryana	3.04	1.96	2.02	0.0	0.0
7.	Jharkhand	10.66	5.94	4.37	1.58	0.00
8.	Karnataka	4.36	3.84	3.84	0.00	0.00
9.	Kerela	12.46	9.58	4.57	5.00	0.00
10.	Madhya Pradesh	14.52	5.89	5.17	0.77	0.66
11.	Orissa	13.55	7.84	7.55	0.25	0.34
12.	Punjab	6.96	3.19	2.13	1.67	0.00
13.	Rajasthan	15.06	9.86	8.50	0.63	0.64
14.	Tamil Nadu	9.16	5.58	3.97	2.69	1.13
15.	Uttar Pradesh	9.18	6.13	5.21	0.91	0.95
16.	West Bengal	12.14	8.07	6.87	1.29	0.65
	<b>North East</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.46</b>

3.12 The DoLR further stated that DPAP and DDP blocks are not in North-Eastern region and 10 per cent of the total funds under watershed development programmes are invested in IWDP projects for North-Eastern region. With the pro-active role of the Department, a large number of projects were sanctioned to the NE States in the last few years. These projects are still within the 5 year project implementation period for completion and that is why they are going on.

3.13 When asked how many projects were completed before time the Secretary, Land Resources stated as under:

“Every year some projects are completed and these are for this year.”

**(i) Scenario during 10th Plan (2002-2007)**

***Allocations and Releases***

3.14 The following are the BE, RE, Actual *vis-a-vis* target and actuals wasteland developed under IWDP (including Externally Aided Projects) during first three years of the 10th Plan.

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Releases	Target	Actual
2002-2003	450.00	440.00	413.45	05.17	03.35
2003-2004	401.00	384.28	368.17	11.00	10.06
2004-2005	448.00	448.00	331.48 (upto 28th Feb. 2005)	10.00	10.91
2005-2006	565.00	-	-	15.00	-

3.15 The Committee pointed out that releases during all the three years have been below the Budget and Revised Estimates. The Committee inform the reasons for lesser releases in all the three years the Department in a written note stated as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	RE			Releases		
	NNE	NE	Total	NNE	NE	Total
2002-03	357	83.00	440.00	357.00	56.45	413.45
2003-04	301.28	83.00	384.28	301.97	66.20	368.17
2004-05	333	115.00	448.00	332.99	77.63	410.62 (up to 22.3.2005)

3.16 It is evident from the above table that the funds allocated for non-North East Region were completely utilized in the last three years. However, the funds allocated to the North East Region could not be utilized fully due to the relative poor absorption capacity of these States.

3.17 The details of the financial/physical targets *vis-a-vis* achievements so far during the 10th Plan are as under:

“The information in respect of Physical/Financial targets and achievements during 10th Plan is given as below:

Year	Physical (in lac ha.)		Financial (Rs. in crores)	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
10th Plan (2002-07)	68.00		1800.00	
2002-03	5.17	3.35	450.00	413.45
2003-04	11.00	10.065	401.00	368.17
2004-05*	10.00	11.18	448.00	410.62
2005-06	15.00		565.00	

\*Upto 22.3.2005

3.18 The Committee also wanted to know whether the Department inter-act with implementing agencies to find their problems so that releases of instalment made to different State Government in time. The Department has replied as below:

“Yes, a proactive approach is followed. A continuous dialogue is maintained with State Governments and DRDAs/ZPs to release maximum funds and to sort out problems resulting in shift of areas/dropping of areas/taking up new projects/project formulation and problems related to planning and execution of the projects. Senior officers of the Department discuss and sort out the problems during their visits to the States, through video conferencing and when they participate in the workshops organized by the States.”

3.19 The Committee further enquired about the difficulties being faced by the implementing agencies, the Department of Land Resources in a written note has stated as under:—

- (i) Coordination with the State Governments.
- (ii) Shortage of trained staff for training and implementation of projects.
- (iii) Panchayats are dealing with a number of developmental schemes, so adequate attention may not be paid to watershed programmes.
- (iv) Coordination with departments/NGOs for constitution of multi disciplinary teams of experts from plant sciences, animal sciences, engineering and sociologist for capacity building.
- (v) Identification of the appropriate local institutions for imparting training to stake holders *viz.*, district, block, panchayat level functionaries and people residing in the project area.

3.20 While indicating the efforts made by several State Governments for effective implementation of IWDP, the Department has stated as under:

“Some of the States such as Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Nagaland have created special directorates/watershed missions/commissionerates/watershed development departments to deal with watershed development programmes. Others have yet to come up with such coordinating units at the State level. States are being requested to form such units at the State level. States should execute watershed projects in mission mode at the State level with a perspective plan. District Level Advisory Committees should have proper schedules for training to be imparted to the stake-holders in the project area for capacity building. Homogenous group formation (users group/self help groups) is essential for successful execution of works in the watershed projects. Management/improvement of livestock and pasture development should get due share in watershed projects. Formulation of a strong multi disciplinary team is very essential for implementation of the project. Some of the States such as Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh have identified district level institutes/NGOs and are drawing from their strength for imparting training skills to the stake-holders.”

3.21 The Committee note that around 65 percent to 70 per cent of IWDP funds are meant for committed liabilities for on-going projects during entire 9th Plan (1997-2002). For instance the Committee find that during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 out of the total outlay of Rs. 480 crore and Rs. 430 crore the major portion of Rs. 350 crore and Rs. 200 crore was for committed liabilities.

The Committee feel that with more and more committed liabilities for the ongoing projects, it will be difficult to achieve the set targets of development of wastelands. Since more and more money would be needed for committed liabilities, it would result in lesser new projects and similarly lesser coverage of additional wastelands.

The Committee further note that on an average the gestation period of a project is four to five years as indicated by the Department. However, the data show that some of the projects started in 1997, 1998 are yet to be completed. Thus a project may continue even after completion of seven to eight years. In this scenario the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to periodically evaluate the performance of projects. As recommended in the earlier part of the Report, the projects should be evaluated at certain specified stages, say first stage, second stage and some sort of grading should be given. The Committee urge for stricter monitoring on the lines suggested above.

3.22 The Committee note with concern the issue of foreclosure of projects. They find from the data made available to them that out of 630 projects sanctioned since 1995-1996, 13 projects were foreclosed. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds allocated for the said projects and the stage at which these were foreclosed. Beside the detailed reasons for foreclosure of the these projects should also be indicated so as to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion on wastage of national resources and comment further in this regard.

3.23 The Committee find from the State-wise data furnished by the Department that certain amount has been indicated as to be recovered and recovered from each of the States. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details on which account the outlay was to be recovered and recovered from these States to enable the Committee to review the position in this regard.

3.24 The Committee further note that in North-Eastern States during 2004-2005, the number of projects sanctioned is almost half of the number of projects sanctioned during previous year. Underspensing in North-Eastern region is the major area of concern as pointed out in the previous Reports, and indicated in the earlier part of the report. Not only that in North-Eastern States, 10 per cent of the allocation for DPAP and DDP is also being made available although no DDP and DPAP areas are there in that region. In view of the aforesaid position there is an urgent need to sanction more and more additional projects under IWDP in North-Eastern Areas. The Committee would like the Department to take the desired action in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

3.25 The Committee find that some of the States have taken laudable action like coordinating units at the State level as has been done by Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Nagaland, identification of district level Institutions/ NGOs as has been done by Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh need to be replicated by other States urgently. The Committee would like the Department to take desired steps in this regard.

#### **Special Area Programmes**

##### **(i) Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)**

3.26 The Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) was launched in 1973-74 to tackle the special problems faced by those fragile areas which are constantly affected by the drought conditions. These areas are characterized by large human and cattle population which are continuously putting heavy pressure on the already fragile natural resources base for food, fodder and fuel. This continuous biotic pressure is leading to fast and continuous depletion of vegetative cover, increasing soil erosion and fast receding ground water levels due to continuous exploitation without any effort to recharge the underground aquifers.

##### **Objectives**

3.27 The basic objective of the programme is to minimize the adverse effects of drought on production of crops and livestock and productivity of land, water and human resources ultimately leading to the drought proofing of affected areas. The programme also aims to promote overall economic development and improve the socio-economic conditions of the resource-poor and disadvantaged sections inhabiting the programme areas.

### Allocation and Releases

3.28 The year-wise allocation *vis-a-vis* release of DPAP projects during the 9th Plan (1997-2002) along with projects sanctioned is as detailed below:

Year	B.E.	Amount released	Percentage	Projects sanctioned
1997-1998	115.00	90.75	78.91	406
1998-1999	95.00	73.00	76.84	880
1999-2000	95.00	94.99	99.99	2278
2000-2001	190.00	189.58	99.77	3371
2001-2002	210.00	208.99	99.51	2052
<b>Total</b>				<b>8987</b>

3.29 The year-wise allocations and releases along with projects sanctioned during first three years of the 10th Plan are as detailed below:

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure	Target(no. of projects)	Projects sanctioned
2002-2003	250.00	250.00	250.00	2400	2478
2003-2004	295.00	295.00	295.00	2600	2535
2004-2005	300.00	300.00	297.00	2800	2550
2005-2006	353.00	—	—	2900	—

3.30 As regards 9th Plan performance, outlay during 2000-2001 was doubled, but equal number of increase is not seen in the number of projects. Similarly, during 2001-2002, the allocation has been increased by 20 crore, however, the number of projects sanctioned has decreased. The Department while clarifying the position in this regard stated as under:

“The allocated annual budget under DPAP is utilized to meet the committed liability of ongoing projects and towards sanctioning of new projects. DPAP being a demand driven programme, there may a year-to-year variations in proportion of funds released for ongoing projects thereby affecting the number of new projects sanctioned

in that year. It may, therefore, not be possible to establish a trend between allocated budget and number of new projects sanctioned."

3.31 When asked as to how far the objectives of the DPAP programme have been achieved during 9th Plan period, it has been stated that the concurrent Mid Term Evaluation Reports indicate that with the implementation of watershed projects the overall productivity of land, vegetative cover and water table have increased and there has been a positive and significant impact on overall economic development in the projects areas. The evaluation reveals positive outcome of the programme in consonance with the objective. The Central share is released in 5 annual instalments @15 per cent in the first year, 30 per cent each in the second and third years, 15 per cent in the fourth year and 10 per cent in the fifth year.

3.32 When asked about the targets of sanctioning DPAP projects during 9th Plan period the Department has stated that during five years of the 9th Plan, no targets were fixed under DPAP. However, a target of 5 million hectares was set for watershed programmes, against which 4.49 million hectares was sanctioned for treatment under DPAP alone. Further, new projects are sanctioned block-wise taking into account identified coverage, performance of ongoing projects, availability of budget and claims received to meet the committed liability of ongoing projects.

3.33 As per the information furnished to the Committee during the 9th Plan period 8987 projects were sanctioned. When asked about the number of projects completed, ongoing and foreclosed during 9th Plan period year-wise the Department in a written note has stated as under:

"The project period under DPAP is 5 years taken from the date of sanctioning of new projects. Accordingly, the project period for the projects sanctioned during 1999-2000 (V batch) 2000-01(VI batch) and 2001-02 (VII batch) is still continuing, yet 635 projects of these batches have claimed all the 7 instalments of the Central share and are deemed to be complete. The remaining 7,066 projects of these batches are at various stages of implementation. The projects sanctioned during 1997-98 (III batch) and 1998-99 (IV batch) have completed their project period. Of these 1,286 projects, 1,149 have been completed and 137 foreclosed."

3.34 The Department has informed that in total 21,353 projects have been sanctioned under DPAP till date, out of these 4,960 projects



have claimed the entire Central funds due to them and are deemed to be complete, 1,764 projects have been foreclosed, and 14,629 are ongoing.

3.35 On being asked as to how many blocks could actually be provided drought proofing since the inception of the scheme thereby achieving the ultimate aim of the scheme the Department has stated as under :

“The achievement of DPAP may not be visualized in terms of number of blocks totally covered for drought proofing. For equity considerations, every year, DoLR has been sanctioning number of projects to almost every block corresponding to its DPAP area and performance of ongoing projects subject to the available budget. The new watershed projects sanctioned to the blocks may be selected by the District Agencies in contiguity to another watershed that has already developed to realize a composite impact in the area. The Department has laid emphasis on adopting a cluster approach in choosing and treating the watersheds. A total of 21,353 projects for treating an area of 106.76 lakh hectares have been sanctioned to these identified blocks out of which 50.15 lakh hectares is estimated to be treated.”

3.36 The Department has further informed that under the latest guidelines applicable since 1st April, 2003, some amendments have been carried out giving more powers to Gram Sabha/Gram Panchayats. While giving details of these guidelines called Hariyali, the Department has stated as below:

“Under Hariyali Guidelines, an effort has been made to empower the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) by giving them a pivotal role in the implementation of the programme. The Gram Panchayats have been authorized to execute the projects in watersheds with Block/ Zila Panchayats acting as project Implementing Agencies (PIAs).”

3.37 When asked about the impact noticed in the implementation of DPAP projects after giving more power to Panchayats by Hariyali Guidelines, the Department has stated as under :

“It is only the second year of project implementation under the Hariyali Guidelines. The actual impact can be seen after some time only.”

3.38 When asked how the Department ensures post projects maintenance of completed DPAP projects, the Committee are informed that under the guidelines, there is a provision for exit protocol. The watershed projects are to be managed by the Watershed Committees/ Gram Panchayats after the project period is over and external supporting agencies have withdrawn. To support maintenance work, the Watershed Development Fund (WDF) raised under the provisions of the guidelines is utilized. The fund being organic in nature, keeps on accruing even during the post project period by way of charges paid by the community for the use of assets generated and contribution made by the village panchayat in respect of community property.

3.39 When asked whether any evaluation/review of DPAP has ever been made, the Department has informed that there is a provision in the guidelines for concurrent Mid Term Evaluation of ongoing projects through approved independent evaluators. Besides, the Department through independent Agencies has also commissioned Impact Assessment Studies. These Evaluation Studies, by and large indicate positive impact in rejuvenating the natural resource base of the project areas and socio-economic upliftment of the project villages.

3.40 The major findings of the concurrent Mid Term Evaluations of the 9th Plan as indicated by the Department are as under:

“Mid term evaluation is mandatory for all projects sanctioned under DPAP *w.e.f.* 1998-99. Fourth instalment of funds (3rd instalment in case of Hariyali projects sanctioned from 2003-04 onwards) is released only after receipt of mid term evaluation report showing satisfactory performance. As already stated, findings of the concurrent Mid Term Evaluation indicate that with the implementation of watershed projects, the overall productivity of land, vegetative cover and water table have increased and there has been a positive and significant impact on overall economic development in the projects areas.”

**(ii) Desert Development Programme (DDP)**

3.41 In pursuance of the recommendations of National Commission on Agriculture, the Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started in 1977-78 both in hot desert areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat, Haryana and cold desert areas of Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh for treatment of land with soil erosion and depletion of vegetative cover.

3.42 The Programme now covers 235 blocks in 40 districts of 7 States covering 4.58 lakh sq.km.

The State-wise details as an under:

S.No	State	Districts	Blocks	Area in (Sq.Km.)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	16	19,136
2.	Gujarat	6	52	55,424
3.	Haryana	7	45	20,524
4.	Himachal Pradesh	2	3	35,107
5.	J & K	2	12	96,701
6.	Karnataka	6	22	32,295
7.	Rajasthan	16	85	198,744

#### Allocation and Releases

3.43 The year-wise allocation and releases under DDP projects along with projects sanctioned during 9th Plan period is as under:

Year	B.E.	Amount released	Percentage	Projects sanctioned
1997-1998	70	70.01	100.01	36
1998-1999	90	79.80	88.66	400
1999-2000	85	84.99	99.99	1500
2000-2001	135	134.99	99.99	1659
2001-2002	160	149.88	93.67	1359
Total	-	-	-	4954

3.44 The year-wise allocation and releases under DDP projects along with physical performance so far during the 10th Plan period is as detailed below:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure	Target (no. projects)	Projects sanctioned
2002-2003	185.00	185.00	185.00	1600	1602
2003-2004	215.00	215.00	215.00	1700	1562
2004-2005	215.00	215.00	196.78*	1800	1600*
2005-2006	268.00	-	—	1800	—

\*Till 10.03.2005

3.45 As regards performance of DDP during 9th Plan the increased/decreased data with regard to the number of projects did not commensurate with increase/decrease in allocation in each of the year of the 9th Plan. During 1998-99, the sanctioned projects were more than 11 times whereas, there was marginal increase (*i.e.* Rs. 20 crore) in allocation. In the following year, there is three and half time increase in number of projects, whereas, the decrease in allocation Rs. 5 crore. During 2001-2002, the allocation is increased by Rs. 25 crore, but the number of projects sanctioned has decreased. When asked the reasons for said anomalies, the Department has stated that DDP being a demand driven scheme, that it may not be possible to establish a trend between allocated budget and number of new projects sanctioned. The number of new projects sanctioned within the allocated annual budget depends on the claims received towards ongoing projects.

3.46 The new projects are sanctioned block-wise taking into account identified coverage, performance of ongoing projects, availability of budget and claims received to meet the committed liability of ongoing projects.

3.47 When asked about the year-wise target of number of DDP projects sanctioned during 9th Plan period, the Department has stated that during five years of the 9th Plan, no targets were fixed under DDP. However, target of 5 million hectares was set for watershed programmes, against which 2.47 million hectares was sanctioned for treatment under DDP.

3.48 As regards the performance of DDP during first three years of 10th Plan the Committee pointed out that although utilisation of allocations during first two years of 10th Plan has been hundred per cent the physical achievement has been below the targets during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005.

3.49 When enquired about the reasons for under-achievement of targets during the above two years, the Department has stated that the number of projects sanctioned during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 is less than the envisaged number on account of meeting the committed liability of ongoing projects for which claim proposals were received from ZPs/DRDAs during these years.

#### **Review of DDP projects**

3.50 When asked whether any of the DDP blocks could convert into greener area thereby indicating that there was no need for help

under DDP programmes, the Department has stated that the achievement of DDP may not be appreciated in terms of number of blocks totally covered for control of desertification. For equity considerations, every year, DoLR has been sanctioning number of projects to almost every block corresponding to its DDP area and performance of ongoing projects subject to the available budget. The new watershed projects sanctioned to the blocks may be selected by the District Agencies in contiguity to another watershed that has already developed to realize a composite impact in the area. The Department has laid emphasis on adopting a cluster approach in choosing and treating watersheds. A total of 11,476 projects for treating an area of 57.38 lakh hectares have been sanctioned to these identified blocks out of which Rs. 24.41 lakh hectares is estimated as treated.

3.51 The details of State-wise number of DDP projects sanctioned/ completed/foreclosed and ongoing are as under:

State	No. of Projects sanctioned	No. of Projects completed	No. of Projects foreclosed	No. of ongoing projects
Andhra Pradesh	772	206	-	566
Gujarat	2272	542	-	1730
Haryana	890	180	50	660
Himachal Pradesh	458	80	-	378
Jammu & Kashmir	617	94	85	438
Karnataka	1164	65	165	934
Rajasthan	5303	1088	-	4215
Total	11476	2255	300	8921

3.52 As regards the position of review/evaluation of DDP programme the following information has been furnished:

“There is a provision for concurrent Mid Term Evaluation of the ongoing projects through approved independent evaluators. Besides, the Department through independent Agencies has also commissioned Impact Assessment Studies. These Evaluations/ Studies, by and large indicate that with the implementation of watershed projects the overall land and water table have gone up

and there has been a positive and significant impact on the overall economic development in the project areas. The studies also revealed that green vegetative cover has improved in watershed areas and there has been a positive impact in checking soil erosion by water and wind. The availability of fuel wood and fodder has also increased. The impact assessment studies reveal positive outcome of the programme."

3.53 The Committee find that though the utilisation performance under DPAP and DDP programme has been satisfactory during 9th Plan and first three years of the current plan, a lot more is to be done in DDP areas in some of the States. The Committee find that keeping in view the area as large as around 199 thousand square km. in Rajasthan, 96 square km. in J&K, 55 thousand square km. in Gujarat, the quantum of funds are barely sufficient to accomplish the task. In this connection there is a need to enhance the funds for DPAP and DDP programmes. The Committee hope that Government will do the needful in this regard.

3.54 The Committee find from the data furnished by the Department that the problems under three watershed programmes *viz.* IWDP, DDP and DPAP are common. As pointed out in the earlier part of the report relating to IWDP, the major area of concern is foreclosure of projects. Under DPAP 1764 projects have been foreclosed till date. Similarly under DDP, 300 projects have been foreclosed till date. The Committee feel that huge national resources are being wasted by foreclosing the projects under such important schemes of the Department. The Committee would like to be informed of the outlay spent on these projects, alongwith the stage at which these projects were foreclosed. The Committee would also like to be informed of the specific reasons for the foreclosure of these projects so as to enable them to analyse the position and comment further in this regard.

3.55 Another important area, the Committee would like to comment upon is the need for active involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in DPAP and DDP programmes. The Committee find that Mid Term Evaluation of DPAP and DDP programmes has indicated favourable results in covered blocks in terms of productivity of land, vegetative cover and water table. The Committee recommend that DPAP and DDP projects should be so framed which may take into account the needs of common man at grass roots level.

### Computerisation of Land Records

3.56 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) was started in 1988-1989 with 100 per cent grant-in-aid basis financial assistance as a pilot project in eight districts of the country to remove the problems and inherent flaws of the existing land records system and to bring transparency and easy accessibility of land records to the land holders. Keeping in view the encouraging results, this scheme was made separate Centrally Sponsored Scheme during the Eighth Plan Period. Its scope was enlarged to bring more districts under its coverage. So far 582 districts, 3286 Tehsils/Taluks/Blocks/Anchals and 509 Sub-Divisions have been covered under the Scheme. A sum of Rs. 343.33 crore (upto 10.03.2005) has been provided to States/Uts since inception (1988-1989) of the scheme.

### Underutilisation of funds

3.57 During the 9th Plan period, the outlay under the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) was Rs.150 and at RE stage it was reduced to Rs.171 crore, out of which the expenditure was Rs.169.14 crore.

During the 10th Plan funds provided under the scheme are as under:

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure
2002-2003	35.00	35.00	31.18
2003-2004	40.00	40.00	35.77
2004-2005	50.00	50.00	42.82*
2005-2006	100.00	-	—

\*As on 10.03.2005

3.58 When asked for the reasons for shortfall in expenditure during the first three years of the 10th Plan the Department has replied that the reason for shortfall of expenditure during 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05 is that the funds earmarked for the NE States could not be released fully as these States had not utilized the funds released earlier, and therefore, did not demand additional funds.

3.59 When asked about the position of funds earmarked for the North-Eastern States under the Scheme CLR during 9th and 10th Plan, the Department stated that upto the 9th Plan, there was no provision for earmarking funds under the scheme of CLR for the North Eastern States. However, during the first 4 years of the 10th Plan period, Rs. 26 crore were earmarked for the North Eastern States as per break up given below:-

Year	Funds earmarked for N.E. States (Rs. in crore)
2002-2003	5.00
2003-2004	5.00
2004-2005	6.00
2005-2006	10.00

3.60 The position of funds released to North- Eastern States and utilised by them under the Scheme of CLR is given below:-

(Rs. In lakh)

Name of the State	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	Total released since inception	Total utilized
Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.30	57.08
Assam	0.00	0.00	0.00	335.50	212.00
Manipur	0.00	0.00	0.00	188.23	68.07
Meghalaya	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.00	28.00
Mizoram	0.00	20.00	0.00	442.96	355.56
Nagaland	8.25	0.00	15.00	193.55	127.15
Sikkim	0.00	82.70	0.00	200.73	129.77
Tripura	0.00	0.00	148.00	491.80	289.22

3.61 As per Performance Budget since inception of the scheme, the Ministry has released Rs.344.86 crore as on 28 February 2005. The utilisation of funds reported by the States/Union Territories is Rs. 220.21 crore, which is approximately 65 per cent of the total funds released.



3.62 When asked about the reasons for huge under spending of the total funds released since the scheme was started, the Department has stated that under the scheme of CLR, the various activities viz., development of suitable software as per the State's requirements, undertaking basic data entry work, verification, validation and backlog of the data entry work, site preparation and setting up of computer centres at tehsil level, etc. are time consuming processes, therefore, States are taking time to utilize the funds released earlier. In addition to this, lack of administrative will and focus on early completion of the scheme has also resulted in underspending of the funds released. In order to expedite the pace of implementation of the scheme and timely utilization of funds, interim milestones/targets have been fixed under various activities which are also being reviewed at various fora. The Cabinet Secretary also had a review meetings on 13th August, 2004 and 22nd November, 2004 with State Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers wherein progress of CLR was reviewed.

3.63 The main findings of these Conferences are:

- (i) The overall pace of progress of implementation of the scheme was not satisfactory;
- (ii) The activities under the schemes were not taken up on mission mode;
- (iii) There was no clear-cut focus given by State level authorities to the Implementing Authorities to take up this scheme in earnest.
- (iv) Instability of tenure of Senior Officers of Revenue Department at State level.
- (v) No specific timeframe was fixed by States for completing the different activities under the scheme.

3.64 The Secretary further informed the Committee as under:

"As far as computerisation of land records is concerned, it is given hundred per cent by the Government of India, but for the other one SRA & ULR, it is 50:50 sharing between Centre and States. In fact, the most outstanding example in this regard is Bhumi Project in Karnataka which was funded under the same scheme.

...Cabinet Secretary had convened a meeting of Revenue Secretaries of all States. In that meeting three categories of States were framed.

In category 'A' States of Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Orissa, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Pondicherry, Sikkim and Andhra Pradesh and NCT Delhi were asked to complete the target by March, 2005. In category 'B' the States of Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Mizoram, Daman & Diu, Dadar Nagar Haveli were asked to complete the target by June, 2005. In category 'C' the States of Bihar, Punjab, Jharkhand, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland were directed to complete the target by December, 2005. However, I would like to inform the Committee that we will have to extend the time for another three months because the scheme is yet to be completed. However, in various States like Karnataka and Goa it has been completed. This is an important scheme."

3.65 As regards the proposal of the Department to utilise the outlay during 10th Plan, the Committee have been informed as under:

"During the financial year 2005-2006, it has been proposed to cover additional 500 tehsils/taluks/blocks and 500 sub-divisions, difference of the revised unit costs for already sanctioned tehsils/taluks, setting up of Monitoring Cell at the State Headquarters to monitor the progress of the implementation of the scheme, additional funds to States for completion of data entry work and imparting training to Revenue officials on software application and digitisation of Cadastral Survey/Village Maps, which will enable this Department to utilize increased outlay under the Scheme of CLR."

3.66 Pursuant to the recommendation of the Committee in their earlier reports, the Department has started State-wise targets for various activities i.e. simplification of rules, procedures/ registers/formats, completion of data entry, setting up of computer centres at tehsil level, imparting training to Revenue officials, according legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR, levying user charges, etc. under the scheme of CLR and the State Governments have been requested to adhere to these targets.

3.67 When asked about the names of districts which have no land records, the Department has stated that in Meghalaya most of the land belongs to the tribal community and ownership, distribution and its use are governed by their tribal customs. Management of land in 7 districts of this State is entirely different from the prevailing system in other States, and do not have proper land records, that is why this

scheme is not implemented in these districts. The Union territory of Lakshadweep also has no proper land records.

3.68 The Committee had pointed out while examining Demands for Grants (2004-2005) about slow performance in the States viz. Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Manipur and Uttaranchal are lagging behind in the implementation of the CLR scheme and these States have not shown much progress in the implementation of the scheme of CLR.

3.69 When asked about the latest position of the implementation of the scheme in the above mentioned States, it has been submitted by the Department that the States of Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, have started the basic data entry work and in the State of Uttaranchal, data entry work is at an advanced stage of completion.

3.70 According to DoLR Revenue Officials were not computer literate/friendly, which hindered the progress of implementation of the scheme of CLR. To change the mindset of Revenue officials in tune with the technology and environment, the Ministry has provided funds to many States to make their Revenue officials computer literate/friendly in order to update their land records through Tehsil computer centres on a regular basis and run these centres smoothly.

3.71 According to the information furnished to the Committee Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), Mussoorie has been entrusted to evaluate the implementation of the scheme of CLR in few States out of which it has completed evaluation study in the states of West Bengal and Karnataka and submitted the Report to the Department.

3.72 The evaluation study in the remaining States is being entrusted to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD). When asked about the reasons for assigning study to two different agencies LBSNAA and NIRD, it is submitted that Since LBSNAA, Mussoorie has a separate Centre for Rural Studies (CRS) funded by this Department, the work of evaluation has been entrusted to it for the States of Karnataka, West Bengal, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. If one organisation alone is to undertake evaluation work for all the States, it will take a long time, the possibility is also being explored to entrust evaluation studies to the National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad which is an autonomous body under this Ministry.

3.73 The Committee note that although Computerisation of Land Records is a cent percent Centrally Sponsored Scheme, the utilisation position since the inception of the scheme is not very encouraging. Out of Rs. 344.86 crore released, the utilisation position is Rs. 220.21 crore, which is approximately 65 percent of the total funds released. The Committee find that the scheme was recently reviewed at the meetings of Cabinet Secretary with the State Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers. The said review found that the overall pace of implementation of the scheme was not satisfactory. The various shortcomings enumerated include, lack of focus given by State level authorities to the implementing authorities, and instability of tenure of Senior Offices of Revenue Department at the State level. The Committee appreciate the initiative taken by the Cabinet Secretary in this regard and would like that a follow up of the various issues, as raised at the review meetings should be done.

3.74 The Committee further find that at the aforesaid review meeting convened by the Cabinet Secretary, the deadline for completing the targets was fixed. The States were divided into three categories. Category A States were to complete the target by March, 2005, Category B States by June, 2005, and Category C States by December, 2005. The Committee find that even after the intervention at the level of Cabinet Secretary, the targets were further spilled over by three months for States. Karnataka and Goa have completed the targets. The Committee feel that further pursuance and a more pro-active role of the Union Government is required in this regard. The Committee would like to be apprised of the further development of the said targets by the respective State Governments.

3.75 The Committee further note that in North Eastern States, the implementation of programme is even worse. Out of Rs. 491.80 lakhs, Rs. 289.22 lakhs is the utilisation position. The Committee find that the various issues, in case of North Eastern States need to be tackled in a different perspective keeping in view the fact that tribal ownership, distribution and its use is governed by the tribal customs. The Committee would like that various bottlenecks being faced in the implementation of the scheme should be reviewed in consultation with the State Governments and local bodies in such States which may be in a better position to suggest the remedial action.

3.76 The Committee further note that another issue which need to be tackled particularly for North-Eastern States is non-existence

of land records in some of the North-Eastern States for example Meghalaya State and Lakshadweep Union territory have no land records. In other non-Eastern States too, the land records may not be proper. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the success of computersiation programme depends on the position of land records in various States and Union territories. Thus some sort of coordination should be maintained with the two schemes of the Department SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records.

#### **Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)**

3.77 With a view to assisting the States/Union territories in the task of Updating of Land Records, a new Scheme was started in 1987-1988 namely, 'Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)' as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. Under this scheme, financial assistance is provided to the States on a 50:50 sharing basis between the Centre and the States. However, some Union territories are given 100 per cent financial assistance under the scheme. The funds are provided for early completion of survey and settlement operations by induction of new technology, strengthening of training infrastructure for pre-service and in-service training of revenue/survey and settlement staff, creation of facilities for maintenance and storage of land records, selective strengthening of revenue machinery at various levels etc.

3.78 During the 9th Plan period, the outlay of the scheme was Rs.40 crore but year-wise allocation was Rs.92.60 crore and at RE stage it is reduced to Rs.87.60 crore, out of which the expenditure was Rs.86.18 crore.

3.79 The details regarding BE, RE and expenditure incurred during the first-three years of 10th Plan and BE for the year 2005-2006 are as under:-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure
2002-2003	35.00	20.00	20.73
2003-2004	25.00	25.00	24.46
2004-2005	20.00	20.00	17.66*
2005-2006	40.00	-	-

\*As on 23.03.2005

3.80 As per information given in Performance Budget all the States/ Union territories have been covered under the Scheme and funds to the tune of Rs. 280.84 crore were provided to the States/ Union territories as Central share upto 28 February, 2005. The utilisation of funds reported by the States/ Union territories is Rs. 186.24 crore, which is approximately 66 per cent of the total funds released.

3.81 When asked about reasons for huge underspending with the States/ Union territories when compared to the releases, the Department has stated that due to resource crunch, the States of Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and most of the North-Eastern States are finding it difficult to provide their matching share of 50 per cent funds in time which has resulted in unspent balance with the States.

3.82 During the course of evidence the Secretary stated as under:

“Up till now we were looking only at the revenue record, but it has also been decided that we should integrate the registration of documents with the revenue record so that both are computerized and automatically the registration results in updation of record and *vice-versa*. When you are registering, you can see the revenue record also. In fact, a Committee has been constituted under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (WD) to look into this and integrate both registration process and revenue records because in many States, registration is done by a different Department and revenue records are maintained by a different Department. Both should be integrated so that the land owners can get information.”

3.83 The Department further elaborating on the plans to ensure cent percent utilisation of earmarked funds stated as under:

“States have been requested to undertake survey/revisional survey where it has not been done earlier with the use of modern technology like Total Station & GPS, which requires huge expenditure. Therefore, States may ask for more funds for the Survey & Settlement operations, which will enable this Department to utilise increased outlay under the Scheme of SRA & ULR.”

3.84 During the course of examination the Department has further informed that during the Conference of State Revenue Ministers/ Secretaries, organised by the Department from time to time, the Department has requested the States to make regular budgetary provision for the State share for proper implementation of the scheme

of SRA & ULR. The Planning Commission was once again requested to re-consider the proposal of the Department of Land Resources for enhancement of funding pattern from 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the States and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States under the scheme of SRA & ULR. The Department has informed that the 12th Finance Commission's Report provides more resources to States which should enable them to meet their matching contribution.

3.85 One of the main objective of the Scheme is setting up of survey and settlement organisations, especially in the North-Eastern Region, where no land records exist. The States of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Manipur, Mizoram and Nagaland have no proper land records.

3.86 When asked about the latest position of land records in North-Eastern States, the Department has informed that the system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal areas of the North-Eastern States, no cadastral survey has been carried out there. In some of these States, there is no proper legislation regarding land and land-related matters. Though individual ownership of land has developed in some areas, a good deal of land is still owned by the community. The North-Eastern States have been requested to carry out survey and settlement where it has not been done.

3.87 The position of funds released and utilised by the North-Eastern States since inception of the scheme of SRA & ULR is given below:

(Rs. in lakh)

Name of the States	Funds released	Funds utilized
Arunachal Pradesh	173.75	150.97
Assam	459.45	202.00
Manipur	60.18	0.15
Meghalaya	50.00	50.00
Mizoram	1465.79	1208.79
Nagaland	661.72	574.54
Sikkim	146.46	63.45
Tripura	630.83	267.14
Total	3648.18	2517.04

3.88 Funds have been provided to North-Eastern States for survey operations with the use of modern technology, construction of training institutes and record rooms and purchase of office equipment for the Revenue Department.

3.89 At this, the Committee pointed out that State Governments of Mizoram and Nagaland have started survey and settlement with the financial support from Government of India under the scheme of SRA and ULR. The Department has also informed that the Survey & settlement operation has not yet been completed in the States of Mizoram & Nagaland.

### **Monitoring**

3.90 The physical and financial progress of the scheme is being monitored by the Department through Quarterly Progress Report. The Department has stated that most of the States/Union territories are furnishing QPRs in this regard. However the States of Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Jammu & Kashmir and Union territories of Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli are not submitting QPRs regularly to the Department. These States have been requested to submit QPRs regularly.

3.91 The Committee find that the major problem being encountered by some of the States *viz.* Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and North Eastern States is the difficulty to provide matching share of 50 per cent. The Committee find that in most of the schemes of the Department of Rural Development and Land Resources Centre and State's share is 75:25. Moreover, another scheme related to land records *viz.* 'Computerisation of Land Records' is a 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The Committee observe that land records are the important documents not only for individuals but also for the Government which can be used for the purpose of making planning in different sectors. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to review the existing 50 per cent matching share by the State Governments.

3.92 The Committee understand that there is a proposal to review the existing funding pattern from 50:50 to 90:10 for North-Eastern States and 75:25 in case of other than North-Eastern States. The Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance should further be pursued in this regard and the Committee be apprised accordingly.



3.93 The Committee further find that the 12th Finance Commission has provided more resources for States which should enable them to meet their matching contribution. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the 12th Finance Commission's recommendations. The Committee note that during 2005-2006 the allocation for SRA and ULR has been doubled to Rs. 40 crore. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should take desired steps to ensure that objectives of maintenance of land records are achieved in different States. The issue regarding matching share as recommended should also be finalised expeditiously to enable the State Governments to maintain/update land records.

3.94 With regard to the North-Eastern States, the Committee find that cadastral survey has not been carried out and some of these States have no proper legislation regarding land and land related matters. As recommended earlier, these issues need to be tackled in a different way taking into account the tribal traditions there. The Committee recommend that the issue of land reforms should be discussed with the concerned State Governments/local bodies so that the improvement in the implementation of the programme can be achieved.

#### **Technology Development, Extension & Training (TDET) Scheme**

3.95 Technological support is very critical for development of wastelands. Proper area specific strategy has to be developed keeping in view the agro-climatic conditions and capability of the soil. The Central Sector Technology Development, Extension & Training (TDET) Scheme was launched during the year 1993-1994 to develop suitable technologies for development/reclamation of wastelands for sustainable production of food, fuel wood, fodder etc. The main objectives of the Scheme are as follows:

- (i) Development of database for wastelands;
- (ii) Operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies for development of various categories of wastelands; and
- (iii) Dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for promoting wastelands development.

3.96 The Scheme is being implemented through ICAR Institutes, State Agriculture Universities (SAUs), DRDAs and Government institutions having adequate institutional framework and organizational

backup. Successful implementation of the Scheme is expected to bridge the gap between the existing technologies and the need relevant to the latest situation. Under this Scheme, 100 per cent Central Grant is admissible to implement the projects on wastelands owned by the government, Public Sector undertakings including Universities, Panchayats etc. In case of the projects on wastelands of Private Farmers/Corporate Bodies, the cost of the project is required to be shared on the basis of 60:40 between the Department of Land Resources and the beneficiary.

3.97 The details of outlays and expenditure year-wise made under TDET Scheme during the 9th and 10th Plan so far, is as under:

**Ninth Plan (1997-2002)**

Sl. No.	Year	Outlay	Expenditure (Rs. Crore)	Percentage
1.	1997-1998	8	5.60	70.00
2.	1998-1999	8	8.05	106.25
3.	1999-2000	8	8.70	108.75
4.	2000-2001	12	10.98	91.50
5.	2001-2002	15	9.93	66.20

**Tenth Plan (2002-2007)**

Sl. No.	Year	Outlay	Expenditure (Rs. Crore)	Percentage
1.	2002-2003	17	13.70	80.59
2.	2003-2004	17	15.08	88.71
3.	2004-2005	15	8.12*	-
4.	2005-2006	17	-	-

\*As on 10.03.2005

3.98 When asked about the reasons for the aforesaid lower utilisation, the Department has stated that the lower utilization under the TDET scheme, generally, has been for two major reasons. Firstly, the allocation to NE States does not get utilized fully due to paucity of fresh proposals from the region and also slower pace of

implementation of ongoing projects there. Secondly, all TDET projects are being implemented by agencies like State Agricultural Universities, ICAR Research Institutes etc. The expenditure auditing procedure of these organizations is different than that of the Government agencies/ departments. As such, the Implementing Agencies of the TDET projects find it difficult to meet the norms and requirements prescribed by the Finance Division. It takes lot of persuasion and clarification before these agencies come up with acceptable release proposals. This process is time consuming and results in delays.

3.99 When asked as to how the Department would meet the enhanced outlay during 2005-2006 in view of lesser utilisation during the previous year, it has been replied that due to administrative reasons, sanction of projects started late this year. All out efforts have been made to fully utilise the allocation for the year and the Department will achieve this target successfully. It is also expected that the situation would improve in the next financial year and the Department is confident of full utilization of the proposed allocation of Rs.17 crore during 2005-2006.

#### **Project planning and implementation**

3.100 During the examination of Demands for Grants (2005-2006), it has been submitted that 22 projects were foreclosed on account of their poor performance and progress and on the basis of progress achieved and releases made out of 85 ongoing, 28 projects are likely to be completed during 2005-2006.

**3.101 The Committee find that Technology Development Extension and Training (TDET) scheme, is an important scheme. The Scheme aims at operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies for development of various categories of wastelands as well as dissemination of research finding and appropriate technologies for promoting wastelands development. The Committee further note that State Agricultural Universities and ICAR Research Institutes are the main implementing agencies of the Scheme. The Committee understand from the information provided by the Department that the main bottleneck in the effective implementation of the scheme is the norm and requirement prescribed by the Finance Division. The Committee would like the Department to simplify the said norm which are not acceptable to the research institutes, so as to help these Institutes to analyse the position and comment further. The Committee find that wastelands development is one of the**

greatest challenge before the Government and there is much scope in making cost effective technology for the purpose. To achieve this objective, there is a further need to interact with the research organisations through various meetings, seminars and persuade them to come forward. The Committee hope that the Department would take desired action in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

3.102 With regard to foreclosure of projects, the Committee note that this is a common problem with all the schemes related to wastelands development. Under TDET scheme, the number of foreclosed projects is much higher. As per the reply of the Government, out of 148 sanctioned projects, 22 projects were foreclosed. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for such a huge number of foreclosed projects. They would also like to be apprised of the total expenditure made for these projects so far, to enable the Committee to have an idea of the wastage of national resources due to the foreclosure of the projects.

NEW DELHI;  
15 April, 2005  
25 Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Rural Development.*

**APPENDIX I**

**DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES**

**STATEMENT SHOWING 9TH PLAN YEAR-WISE OUTLAY & EXPENDITURE**

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	9th Plan Outlay and Expenditure																	
		1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001			2001-2002			9th Plan (1997-2002)		
		BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	115.00	100.75	100.75	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.99	190.00	190.00	190.00	210.00	210.00	209.52	705.00	668.75	669.26
2.	Desert Development Programme	70.00	70.00	70.00	90.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	85.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	160.00	150.00	150.00	540.00	520.00	519.80
3.	I.W.D.P.	74.50	50.00	53.95	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	82.00	83.07	480.00	387.00	386.90	430.00	405.00	376.35	1148.60	986.10	962.27
4.	Computerisation of Land Records	20.00	20.00	20.19	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	32.69	50.00	48.00	47.85	45.00	45.00	44.36	178.00	171.00	169.84
5.	SRA&ULR	18.80	18.80	18.97	8.80	8.80	9.05	10.00	10.00	10.25	25.00	25.00	24.99	30.00	25.00	23.94	92.60	87.60	87.20
6.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	8.00	7.50	5.60	8.00	8.00	8.05	8.00	8.00	8.70	12.00	10.87	10.98	15.00	12.00	9.93	51.00	46.37	43.26

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
8.	Support to NGOs/Vas Scheme	4.00	4.00	2.60	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	8.40	7.02
9.	Wasteland Development Task Force	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.98
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.23	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.20	0.12	5.60	3.10	0.49
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	1.00	0.30	0.04	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.26	0.20	5.00	0.20	0.05	9.00	2.01	1.44
12.	Communication	4.00	1.50	1.42	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.00	0.92	0.86	0.50	0.50	0.26	12.50	6.67	5.90
13.	Board Secretariat	1.50	1.50	1.27	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.71	2.50	2.45	2.38	3.00	2.10	1.68	11.00	10.05	8.46
Total Plan		318.80	275.55	275.79	324.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	323.60	900.00	800.00	799.66	900.00	850.00	816.21	2767.30	2513.05	2476.92
Non-Plan																			
	Secretariat Economic Services	0.20	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.84	2.60	2.54	2.19
Total Plan & Non Plan		319.00	275.74	275.93	324.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	323.77	900.90	800.89	800.50	900.99	850.97	817.05	2769.90	2515.59	2479.11

**APPENDIX II**

**DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES**

**STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE  
DURING TENTH PLAN (FROM 2002-03 TO 2005-06)**

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	10th Plan			2002-2003		2003-2004			2004-05		2005-06		
		As Proposed	As agreed by Planning Commission	Exp. as on 22.3.2005	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp. as on 22.3.2005	BE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1.	Drought Prone Ares Programme	1600	1500	842.45	250.00	250.00	250.00	295.00	295.00	295.00	300.00	300.00	297.45	353.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	1200	1100	607.63	185.00	185.00	185.00	265.00	195.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	207.63	268.00
3.	I.W.D.P.	1900	1800	997.98	387.00	380.00	354.45	335.00	329.00	312.90	368.00	368.00	330.63	485.00
4.	Computerisation of Land Records	500	400	111.41	55.00	35.00	31.18	40.00	40.00	35.77	50.00	50.00	44.46	100.00
5.	SRA&ULR	200	200	61.60	35.00	20.00	20.73	25.00	25.00	24.46	20.00	20.00	16.41	40.00
6.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	365	365	194.28	63.00	60.00	59.00	66.00	51.00	55.28	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00
7.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	100	90	36.90	17.00	16.00	13.70	17.00	14.00	15.08	15.00	15.00	8.12	17.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
8.	Investment Promotional Scheme	100	71	4.51	1.00	0.10	3.13	0.10	0.10	0.96	0.10	0.10	0.42	0.10
9.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation				5.95	2.95		4.85	0.54		1.20	0.50		1.20
10.	Communication				1.05	0.95		1.05	0.36		1.70	1.20		1.70
	New Initiatives		1000					1.00	0.00	0.00				
11.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana										200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12.	Bio Fuels										10.00	0.20	0.00	50.00
	Total Plan	5965	6526	2856.76	1000.00	950.00	917.19	1050.00	950.00	954.45	1261.00	1050.00	985.12	1396.00
	Non-plan													
	Secretariat Economic Services			8.39	3.81	3.62	2.68	3.66	3.43	2.83	3.48	3.43	2.88	3.44
	Total Plan & Non Plan	5965	6526	2865.15	1003.81	953.62	919.87	1053.66	953.43	957.28	1264.48	1053.43	988.00	1399.44



**APPENDIX III**

OVERALL POSITION OF THE PROPOSED, AGREED TO ALLOCATION DURING  
EACH YEAR OF 9TH AND 10TH PLANS

(Rs. in Crore)

Scheme	9th Plan Allocations		10th Plan Allocations	
	Proposed	Agreed/ Actual	Proposed	Agreed/ Actual
IWDP	3360.00	1148.60	1900.00	1800.00
DPAP	700.00	705.00	1600.00	1500.00
DDP	1430.00	540.00	1200.00	1100.00
CLR	332.46	178.00	500.00	400.00
SRA & ULR	326.00	92.60	200.00	200.00
TDET	106.00	51.00	100.00	90.00
Others	291.00	52.10	100.00	71.00
Externally Aided Projects	—	—	365.00	365.00
New Initiatives	—	—	—	1000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>6545.46</b>	<b>2767.30</b>	<b>5965.00</b>	<b>6526.00</b>

**APPENDIX IV**  
**STATE-WISE WASTELANDS OF INDIA**

(Area in Sq. Kms.)

Sl. No.	State	No. of Districts Covered	Total Geog. Area of distts. Covered	Total Wastelands area in distts. Covered	% of Wastelands to total geog. Area
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	23	275068.00	51750.19	18.81
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	13	83743.00	18326.25	21.88
3.	Assam	23	78438.00	20019.17	25.52
4.	Bihar	55	173877.00	20997.55	12.08
5.	Goa	02	3702.00	613.27	16.57
6.	Gujarat	25	196024.00	43021.28	21.95
7.	Haryana	19	44212.00	3733.98	8.45
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12	55673.00	31659.00	56.87
9.	Jammu & Kashmir*	14	101387.00	75444.24	64.55

1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Karnataka	27	191791.00	20839.28	10.87
11.	Kerala	14	38863.00	1448.18	3.73
12.	M.P.	62	443446.00	69713.75	15.72
13.	Maharashtra	32	307690.00	53489.08	17.38
14.	Manipur	09	22327.00	12948.62	58.00
15.	Meghalaya	07	22429.00	9904.38	44.16
16.	Mizoram	03	21081.00	4071.68	19.31
17.	Nagaland	07	16579.00	8404.10	50.69
18.	Orissa	30	155707.00	21341.71	13.71
19.	Punjab	17	50362.00	2228.40	4.42
20.	Rajasthan	32	342239.00	105639.11	30.87
21.	Sikkim	04	7096.00	3569.58	50.30
22.	Tripura	04	10486.00	1276.03	12.17
23.	Tamil Nadu	29	130058.00	23013.90	17.70

1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	Uttar Pradesh	83	294411.00	38772.80	13.17
25.	West Bengal	18	88752.00	5718.48	6.44
26.	Union Territories	20	10973.00	574.30	5.23
Total		584	3166414.00	638518.31	20.17

- UN-Surveyed area (J&K) 120849.00
- Total geographical area 3287263.00

Source: 1:50,000 scale wasteland maps prepared from Landsat Thematic Mapper/IRS LISS II/III Data 10,000 sq. kms = 1 Million Ha.

## APPENDIX V

### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

#### MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 29 MARCH, 2005

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Mohan Jena
5. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
6. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
7. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
8. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
9. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
10. Shri Mohan Singh
11. Shri Sita Ram Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

#### *Rajya Sabha*

14. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
15. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
16. Shri Penumalli Madhu
17. Dr. Chandan Mitra
18. Dr. Faguni Ram
19. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A. K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development  
(Department of Land Resources)**

1. Shri M. Shankar, Secretary
2. Shri V.S. Sampath, Additional Secretary
3. Smt. Lalitha Kumar, Joint Secretary
4. Shri M. Aslam, Joint Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2005-2006).

*[The representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development), were then called in]*

3. The Chairman thereafter welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources to the sitting. He drew their attention to direction 55 (1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2005-2006). The Secretary, Land Resources briefly explained to the Committee the overall position with regard to the allocation and expenditure during the 9th Plan (1997-2002) period as well as the projections of the Department during the 10th Plan (2002-2007) period. He also dealt with various issues and enumerated the problems being faced with regard to the implementation of various schemes of the Department. The Committee then discussed in detail the issues related to the examination of the Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department with special emphasis on major Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department. The representatives of the Department clarified to the queries of the Members and were asked to send written replies thereto which could not be answered during the sitting.

A verbatim record of proceedings was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX VI

### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

#### EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SIXTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 8 APRIL, 2005

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1345 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
3. Shri Mohan Jena
4. Shri Subhash Maharia
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
7. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
8. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
9. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
10. Shri Mohan Singh
11. Shri Sita Ram Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

#### *Rajya Sabha*

14. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
15. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
16. Shri Penumalli Madhu
17. Shri Kalraj Mishra
18. Dr. Chandan Mitra
19. Dr. Faguni Ram
20. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

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

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

3. The Committee, thereafter, considered and adopted the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) with a slight modifications.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid draft Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\*\*Minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.



## APPENDIX VII

### STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl.No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.12	<p>The Committee note that the concept of allocation of 10 per cent exclusive outlay of each Department/Ministry of the Union Government for North Eastern Region including Sikkim was started since 2000-2001. After that, whenever the attention of the Department has been drawn towards underspending, a common reply stating that allocation for two area specific programmes DDP and DPAP is being made every year, whereas these schemes are not in operation in these States has been furnished. The Committee while noting the concept of allocation for North Eastern Region find that 10 per cent lump-sum allocation of the overall outlay of a Department is earmarked exclusively for these areas. No scheme-wise allocation is being made. If that is the state of affairs, the Committee fail to understand the logic of the Department in this regard. The Committee feel that instead of furnishing such reasons, the Department should stress for increasing the scope of the schemes <i>viz.</i> IWDP and land records. The position of land records in said States is very poor and hence need more attention. The detailed analysis in this regard has been done in the subsequent part of the report. Here the Committee would like to emphasise that the outlay can be used for this sector after having consultations with the concerned</p>

1	2	3
		State Governments. The Committee would like the Department to explain the position in view of their aforesaid observation so as to enable them to analyse the position and comment further in this regard.
2.	2.13	The Committee after analysing the data as indicated in the aforesaid paras of the report find that Rs. 561 crore has been allocated more than the proposed outlay during 10th Plan. Not only that, the outlay provided during 10th Plan is more than two times of the allocation made during 9th Plan. The scheme-wise analysis further indicates that the allocation during 2005-2006 has been increased in all the schemes specifically under the schemes meant for computerisation and updation of land records where the hike is 100 per cent. However, if allocation scheme-wise is analysed in the context of proposed allocation, the data indicate that excepting scheme meant for land records the allocation provided is lesser than the proposed allocation. Further if the trends of what was proposed scheme-wise by the Department and what was eventually allocated scheme-wise during 10th Plan is compared to 9th Plan, the data indicate that the difference between proposed and agreed to allocation under each of the schemes is much less as compared to 9th Plan.
3.	2.14	With regard to the position of expenditure, the Committee note that during 9th Plan the underspending was to the tune of Rs. 290 crore. The reasons as indicated by the Department include cut imposed by the Ministry of Finance at Revised Estimates stage. Further if the expenditure is

1	2	3
		<p>compared to Revised Estimates during 9th Plan, the underspending comes to the tune of Rs. 36.48 crore. During 10th Plan the underspending is due to lesser utilisation in North Eastern States.</p>
4.	2.15	<p>The Committee conclude from what has been stated above that the data indicate quite a favourable performance of the Department as compared to the other counterpart Departments of the Ministry of Rural Development <i>viz.</i> the Department of Rural Development and Drinking Water Supply where the actual allocation is far less than the proposed outlay of those Departments. The better allocation position is also due to very good expenditure position shown by the Department under several schemes. The allocation and the efforts made by the Department need to be continued in a bigger way keeping in view the gigantic task of huge areas falling under wastelands in the country. The analysis in this regard has been made in the subsequent part of the Report.</p>
5.	2.16	<p>The scheme-wise analysis has also been made in the subsequent part of the report. Here the Committee may like to highlight that the Budget documents of the Department indicate that the releases to the State Governments/ implementing agencies are considered as spending. There is no mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes due to long gestation period. Further the foreclosure of projects specifically under watershed schemes indicate that the physical performance of the projects may not be so satisfactory as</p>

1	2	3
		<p>the data with regard to financial achievement indicate. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to evolve some sort of mechanism for evaluating the performance of different projects. Some sort of grading indicating poor, satisfactory or very good may be indicated against the number of projects being undertaken in various States. Besides, another mechanism can be to have some system indicating the projects at First stage, Second stage, Third stage etc. Such type of analysis would enable a critical evaluation of the projects. The Committee would like the Department to consider the said aspect and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p>
6.	2.30	<p>The Committee disapprove the way the new schemes are proposed and outlay earmarked without any planning or preparedness on the part of the Government resulting in blockage of outlay in the resources starved economy of the country. They note that Rs. 1,000 crore were earmarked during 10th Plan for the 'New initiative'. The two new schemes <i>viz.</i> (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies, and (ii) Development of Bio-fuel' were to be launched. Initially Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies was proposed to be under the Ministry of Land Resources but finally the Ministry of Water Resources was chosen as the Ministry to handle the aforesaid scheme. The Committee find that the handling of watershed projects by various Ministries of the Union Government <i>viz.</i> Ministries of Agriculture, Water Resources and Land Resources is the main cause of such a state of affairs. The Committee in their earlier reports have been</p>

1	2	3
		expressing their concern in this regard. The issue of convergence although decided in principle, is being delayed by the Government.
7.	2.31	There is uncertainty over the fate of another new scheme 'Bio fuel', for which Rs. 50 crore have been allocated during 2005-2006. The Secretary during the course of oral evidence acknowledged that Jatropha plantation envisaged under the scheme is neither proven nor cost effective. The use of Jatropha plant for Bio-fuel is still at the experimental stage and TERI is preparing the project report. Not only that, the viability of Jatropha plant and other issues relating to its plantation like the need for irrigation, farmers willingness to plantation etc. are still to be debated. Without examining all these issues, the detailed Project Report (DPR) for the scheme is being prepared for obtaining clearance from the Planning Commission. Although it is acknowledged that no expenditure can be made under the scheme, an allocation of Rs. 50 crore has already been made during 2005-2006, thereby blocking the resources. While the Committee are not against initiating novel schemes as part of energy security like Bio fuel, they feel that before launching the scheme, its viability should be ascertained. The technology should be tested and proven only then the decision to launch the scheme should be taken and allocation for the purpose provided.
8.	2.32	In the aforesaid state of affairs the Committee express their strong reservations on the issue of handling of new schemes. They strongly recommend that before launching a new scheme Planning

1	2	3
		<p>Commission/Ministry of Finance should analyse the proposals of the concerned Ministry. Only after initial home work is done, and all the things are ready for implementation, allocation should be made as blockage of outlay earmarked for non-viable schemes deprives the other established schemes of their due allocation. The Committee strongly recommend that their concerns in this regard should be duly communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance and also to the Cabinet Secretariat.</p>
9.	2.37	<p>The Committee find that total wastelands in the country is 63.85 million hectare. If forest area (under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Forest) and untreatable land is deducted, the total treatable area comes to around 30 million hectares. The Committee find that as informed earlier [reference para 2.18 of 2nd report (2004-2005)], the Government had planned development of wastelands amounting to 40 million hectares. Further as per Wastelands Atlas there are varying estimates of total wastelands in the country, however, no less than 37.5 million hectares are currently expected to be available for viable treatment.</p> <p>The Committee find from the position as given above that perhaps there is no clarity on the issue of minimum wastelands that could be developed in the country. The Committee would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard since the data with regard to minimum treatable wastelands is the necessary input for future planning.</p>

1	2	3
10.	2.38	<p>Besides the Committee find that Atlas indicating the district-wise data of wastelands by employing the scientific remote sensing satellite data products was finalised on 9 March, 2000. Five years have passed since then, as per Department's reply, efforts are being made to update the data. The Committee would like to be apprised when the exercise of updation would be completed. Besides the Committee also feel that there should be some mechanism to update the data periodically so as to know how far the efforts of the Government could result in actual treatment of land. Besides updation of data would also make the position of slippage of treated land again into wastelands clear.</p>
11.	2.42	<p>The detailed analysis of the allocation proposed by the Department, Budget Estimates indicating the availability of data and expenditure position has been made in the preceding part of the report. So far as the overall scenario of wastelands development <i>vis-a-vis</i> outlay required is concerned, the Committee find that there is an urgent need to allocate more funds to complete the development of total wastelands in a stipulated timeframe. The Committee note that wastelands when developed can be a major economic resource for the country. Besides there is an urgent need for the proper and integrated planning for the purpose.</p>
12.	2.43	<p>The Committee were informed that it will take 17- 18 years to develop the wastelands with the existing pace and outlay of the Department. The Committee find that other</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Ministries/Departments of the Union Governments <i>viz.</i> Agriculture, Water Resources etc. are also having schemes for watershed development. Huge resources are being allocated to these Ministries also. Besides State Governments may be having some schemes for tackling the issue of development of wastelands. Unless there is some sort of coordinating mechanism, no meaningful conclusion indicating the position of coverage of wastelands in the country can be arrived at. As indicated in the preceding para, the final decision on the issue of convergence of the efforts being made by Union Government cannot be arrived at even after the concurrence of the Planning Commission in this regard. Pending decision in this regard, the Committee may like to recommend to the Department to evolve some sort of mechanism by which the efforts made by several Ministries/Department/State Government could be coordinated so as to have a clear cut position of scenario of wastelands development. Only when such a data is available, a time bound programme for tackling the issue of wastelands development can be made.</p>
13.	2.46	<p>The Committee find that a large part of wastelands to be treated are is in the States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh in terms of districts. The Committee feel that there is a need to frame a State-wise and phase-wise programme for development of wastelands in consultation with the concerned State Governments on priority basis.</p>



1	2	3
14.	2.47	<p>The Committee would also like to recommend to study international experience in the field of wastelands development so as to have exposure of the technologies and policy formulation being made in this regard in those countries. Such a study will help the Government to take the benefit of the positive experiences of these countries.</p>
15.	2.55	<p>The Committee are pleased to note the results of impact assessment studies commissioned by the Department in 16 States covering two hundred districts. These studies evaluated the impact of watershed programmes IWDP, DPAP and DDP in the areas covered. As revealed by said studies, the programmes have positive impact on net sown area, gross cropped area sown more than once, the increasing of option of irrigation, fuelwood and fodder availability. Besides the studies reveal favourable impact by way of increase in household income and wage employment. The Committee note that the favourable impact of these studies should be widely publicised. The various field level agencies, State Governments, NGOs and all those involved with the watershed programme should be made aware of the findings of the evaluation studies. Such an exercise will definitely motivate the State Governments and all other concerned to take more and more projects for the purpose. Besides emphatic reports should be presented to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance while presenting budget projections so that adequate outlay could be provided for different schemes.</p>

1	2	3
16.	2.56	<p>The Committee further find that the Union Government has brought an ambitious legislation <i>viz.</i> 'The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2004' which is being examined by the Committee. The said legislation seeks to provide 100 days of wage employment to each BPL family in rural areas. The Committee find that 60 per cent of expenditure under all area development programmes goes for wage employment in the project area. Further the impact assessment studies have indicated a favourable impact on employment generation in the areas covered by the programmes of the Department. The Committee observe that the watershed programmes can help the Government in achieving the objectives of the aforesaid legislation. The related issues will be examined in detail while the aforesaid Bill will be examined by the Committee. The Committee would like to recommend here that the various revelations regarding wage employment should be discussed with the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission and the Department of Rural Development so as to have some integrated planning to achieve the objectives of the aforesaid legislation.</p>
17.	2.57	<p>Further the Committee find that 'Hariyali' guidelines of the Department emphasise the convergence of all the programmes of not only of Union Government but also those being implemented by the State Governments at the field level. While appreciating the formulation of said guidelines the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to implement the aforesaid guidelines since the other Ministries and</p>

1	2	3
		<p>State Governments are involved in this regard. There is an urgent need to discuss and debate this issue during the various conferences, seminars held where State Governments and other Ministries represent. Besides the said guidelines should be publicised widely. To motivate the State Governments, the impact of convergence should be studied carefully and the success of the States/districts which could have positive impact, should be replicated in other States/districts.</p>
18.	2.63	<p>The Committee in their earlier reports have been recommending to review the position of DDP and DPAP blocks since these blocks were identified a decade back. Since then the situation may have changed. Many more blocks may need assistance under DDP &amp; DPAP programmes. Besides, State Governments have been requesting for coverage of additional blocks. The Committee appreciate that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri S. Partha Sarathi has been appointed for this purpose. The said Partha Sarathi Committee will submit the report within six months. The Committee would like to be apprised of the recommendations of the said Committee when finalised.</p>
19.	3.21	<p>The Committee note that around 65 per cent to 70 per cent of IWDP funds are meant for committed liabilities for on-going projects during entire 9th Plan (1997-2002). For instance the Committee find that during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 out of the total outlay of Rs. 480 crore and Rs. 430 crore the major portion of Rs. 350 crore and Rs. 200 crore was for committed liabilities.</p>

1	2	3
		<p>The Committee feel that with more and more committed liabilities for the ongoing projects, it will be difficult to achieve the set targets of development of wastelands. Since more and more money would be needed for committed liabilities, it would result in lesser new projects and similarly lesser coverage of additional wastelands.</p>
		<p>The Committee further note that on an average the gestation period of a project is four to five years as indicated by the Department. However, the data show that some of the projects started in 1997, 1998 are yet to be completed. Thus a project may continue even after completion of seven to eight years. In this scenario the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to periodically evaluate the performance of projects. As recommended in the earlier part of the Report, the projects should be evaluated at certain specified stages, say first stage, second stage and some sort of grading should be given. The Committee urge for stricter monitoring on the lines suggested above.</p>
20.	3.22	<p>The Committee note with concern the issue of foreclosure of projects. They find from the data made available to them that out of 630 projects sanctioned since 1995-1996, 13 projects were foreclosed. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds allocated for the said projects and the stage at which these were foreclosed. Beside the detailed reasons for foreclosure of the these projects should also be indicated so as to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion on wastage of national resources and comment further in this regard.</p>

---

1	2	3
21.	3.23	The Committee find from the State-wise data furnished by the Department that certain amount has been indicated as to be recovered and recovered from each of the States. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details on which account the outlay was to be recovered and recovered from these States to enable the Committee to review the position in this regard.
22.	3.24	The Committee further note that in North-Eastern States during 2004-2005, the number of projects sanctioned is almost half of the number of projects sanctioned during previous year. Underspensing in North-Eastern region is the major area of concern as pointed out in the previous Reports, and indicated in the earlier part of the report. Not only that in North-Eastern States, 10 per cent of the allocation for DPAP and DDP is also being made available although no DDP and DPAP areas are there in that region. In view of the aforesaid position there is an urgent need to sanction more and more additional projects under IWDP in North-Eastern Areas. The Committee would like the Department to take the desired action in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.
23.	3.25	The Committee find that some of the States have taken laudable action like coordinating units at the State level as has been done by Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Nagaland, identification of district level Institutions/NGOs as has been done by Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh need to be replicated by other States urgently.

---

1	2	3
		The Committee would like the Department to take desired steps in this regard.
24.	3.53	The Committee find that though the utilisation performance under DPAP and DDP programme has been satisfactory during 9th Plan and first three years of the current plan, a lot more is to be done in DDP areas in some of the States. The Committee find that keeping in view the area as large as around 199 thousand square km. in Rajasthan, 96 square km. in J&K, 55 thousand square km. in Gujarat, the quantum of funds are barely sufficient to accomplish the task. In this connection there is a need to enhance the funds for DPAP and DDP programmes. The Committee hope that Government will do the needful in this regard.
25.	3.54	The Committee find from the data furnished by the Department that the problems under three watershed programmes <i>viz.</i> IWDP, DDP and DPAP are common. As pointed out in the earlier part of the report relating to IWDP, the major area of concern is foreclosure of projects. Under DPAP 1764 projects have been foreclosed till date. Similarly under DDP, 300 projects have been foreclosed till date. The Committee feel that huge national resources are being wasted by foreclosing the projects under such important schemes of the Department. The Committee would like to be informed of the outlay spent on these projects, alongwith the stage at which these projects were foreclosed. The Committee would also like to be informed of the specific reasons for the foreclosure of these projects so as to enable them to

1	2	3
		analyse the position and comment further in this regard.
26.	3.55	Another important area, the Committee would like to comment upon is the need for active involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in DPAP and DDP programmes. The Committee find that Mid Term Evaluation of DPAP and DDP programmes has indicated favourable results in covered blocks in terms of productivity of land, vegetative cover and water table. The Committee recommend that DPAP and DDP projects should be so framed which may take into account the needs of common man at grass roots level.
27.	3.73	The Committee note that although Computerisation of Land Records is a cent percent Centrally Sponsored Scheme, the utilisation position since the inception of the scheme is not very encouraging. Out of Rs. 344.86 crore released, the utilisation position is Rs. 220.21 crore, which is approximately 65 per cent of the total funds released. The Committee find that the scheme was recently reviewed at the meetings of Cabinet Secretary with the State Revenue Secretaries and Revenue Ministers. The said review found that the overall pace of implementation of the scheme was not satisfactory. The various shortcomings enumerated include, lack of focus given by State level authorities to the implementing authorities, and instability of tenure of Senior Offices of Revenue Department at the State level. The Committee appreciate the initiative taken by the Cabinet Secretary in this regard and would like that a follow up of the various issues, as raised at the review meetings should be done.

1	2	3
28.	3.74	<p>The Committee further find that at the aforesaid review meeting convened by the Cabinet Secretary, the deadline for completing the targets was fixed. The States were divided into three categories. Category A States were to complete the target by March, 2005, Category B States by June, 2005, and Category C States by December, 2005. The Committee find that even after the intervention at the level of Cabinet Secretary, the targets were further spilled over by three months for States. Karnataka and Goa have completed the targets. The Committee feel that further pursuance and a more pro-active role of the Union Government is required in this regard. The Committee would like to be apprised of the further development of the said targets by the respective State Governments.</p>
29.	3.75	<p>The Committee further note that in North Eastern States, the implementation of programme is even worse. Out of Rs. 491.80 lakhs, Rs. 289.22 lakhs is the utilisation position. The Committee find that the various issues, in case of North Eastern States need to be tackled in a different perspective keeping in view the fact that tribal ownership, distribution and its use is governed by the tribal customs. The Committee would like that various bottlenecks being faced in the implementation of the scheme should be reviewed in consultation with the State Governments and local bodies in such States which may be in a better position to suggest the remedial action.</p>
30.	3.76	<p>The Committee further note that another issue which need to be tackled particularly</p>



1	2	3
		<p>for North-Eastern States is non-existence of land records in some of the North-Eastern States for example Meghalaya State and Lakshadweep Union territory have no land records. In other non-Eastern States too, the land records may not be proper. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the success of computersiation programme depends on the position of land records in various States and Union territories. Thus some sort of coordination should be maintained with the two schemes of the Department SRA &amp; ULR and Computerisation of Land Records.</p>
31.	3.91	<p>The Committee find that the major problem being encountered by some of the States <i>viz.</i> Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and North Eastern States is the difficulty to provide matching share of 50 per cent. The Committee find that in most of the schemes of the Department of Rural Development and Land Resources Centre and State's share is 75:25. Moreover, another scheme related to land records <i>viz.</i> 'Computerisation of Land Records' is a 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The Committee observe that land records are the important documents not only for individuals but also for the Government which can be used for the purpose of making planning in different sectors. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to review the existing 50 per cent matching share by the State Governments.</p>
32.	3.92	<p>The Committee understand that there is a proposal to review the existing funding pattern from 50:50 to 90:10 for North-</p>

1	2	3
		Eastern States and 75:25 in case of other than North-Eastern States. The Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance should further be pursued in this regard and the Committee be apprised accordingly.
33.	3.93	The Committee further find that the 12th Finance Commission has provided more resources for States which should enable them to meet their matching contribution. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the 12th Finance Commission's recommendations. The Committee note that during 2005-2006 the allocation for SRA and ULR has been doubled to Rs. 40 crore. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should take desired steps to ensure that objectives of maintenance of land records are achieved in different States. The issue regarding matching share as recommended should also be finalised expeditiously to enable the State Governments to maintain/update land records.
34.	3.94	With regard to the North-Eastern States, the Committee find that cadastral survey has not been carried out and some of these States have no proper legislation regarding land and land related matters. As recommended earlier, these issues need to be tackled in a different way taking in to account the tribal traditions there. The Committee recommend that the issue of land reforms should be discussed with the concerned State Governments/local bodies so that the improvement in the implementation of the programme can be achieved.

---

1	2	3
35.	3.101	<p>The Committee find that Technology Development Extension and Training (TDET) scheme, is an important scheme. The Scheme aims at operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies for development of various categories of wastelands as well as dissemination of research finding and appropriate technologies for promoting wastelands development. The Committee further note that State Agricultural Universities and ICAR Research Institutes are the main implementing agencies of the Scheme. The Committee understand from the information provided by the Department that the main bottleneck in the effective implementation of the scheme is the norm and requirement prescribed by the Finance Division. The Committee would like the Department to simplify the said norm which are not acceptable to the research institutes, so as to help these Institutes to analyse the position and comment further. The Committee find that wastelands development is one of the greatest challenge before the Government and there is much scope in making cost effective technology for the purpose. To achieve this objective, there is a further need to interact with the research organisations through various meetings, seminars and persuade them to come forward. The Committee hope that the Department would take desired action in this regard and apprise them accordingly.</p>
36.	3.102	<p>With regard to foreclosure of projects, the Committee note that this is a common problem with all the schemes related to wastelands development. Under TDET scheme, the number of foreclosed projects</p>

---

---

1

2

3

---

is much higher. As per the reply of the Government, out of 148 sanctioned projects, 22 projects were foreclosed. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for such a huge number of foreclosed projects. They would also like to be apprised of the total expenditure made for these projects so far, to enable the Committee to have an idea of the wastage of national resources due to the foreclosure of the projects.

---