

**16**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2005-2006)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA**

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

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

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained  
in the Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on  
Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

**SIXTEENTH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

SIXTEENTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2005-2006)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2005-2006)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained  
in the Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on  
Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 21.12.2005*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 21.12.2005*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*December, 2005/Agrahayana, 1927 (Saka)*

**C.R.D. No. 019**

*Price : Rs. 34.00*

© 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 (2005-2006) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	28
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	39
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	41
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	60
APPENDICES	
I. Summary of recommendations of the 12th Finance Commission .....	62
II. Extract of the minutes of the Ninth Sitting of the Committee held on 12 December 2005 .....	76
III. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Tenth Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha) .....	78

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

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. Pallani Shamy
- \*12. Shri Prabodh Panda
13. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
14. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
15. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
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

---

\*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shri Prabodh Panda, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Water Resources to Standing Committee on Rural Development *vide* para no. 1580, Lok Sabha Bulletin part II dated 23 August, 2005.

*Rajya Sabha*

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shrimati Vanga Geetha\$
24. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
25. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
26. Shri Penumalli Madhu
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri John Joseph — *Secretary*
2. Shri S. K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
3. Shri V. K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
5. Shri A. K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

---

\$Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha has changed the nomination of Shrimati Vanga Geetha, MP (RS) from Standing Committee on Industry to Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 23 August, 2005 *vide* Committee Branch-I note dated 25.8.2005.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Sixteenth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Tenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 25 August, 2005.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 12 December, 2005.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Tenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in *Appendix III*.

NEW DELHI;  
12 December, 2005  
21 Agrahayana, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Tenth Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 36 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.31, 2.32, 2.46, 2.47, 2.55, 2.56, 3.25, 3.53, 3.55, 3.73, 3.74, 3.94 and 3.101.

- (ii) Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply:

Para No. 2.37

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

Para Nos. 2.12, 2.16, 2.30, 2.43, 2.57, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.54, 3.75, 3.76, 3.91, 3.92, 3.93 and 3.102.

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

Para Nos. 2.38, 2.42 and 2.63

**3. The Committee desire that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.**

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



**A. Underutilisation of outlay earmarked for different schemes in North-Eastern Region**

**Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.12, 3.24, 3.75 & 3.76)**

5. The Committee had noted as below:

“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 in 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 upon increasing the scope of the schemes viz. IWDP and land records. The position of land records in said States is very poor and hence needs more attention. The detailed analysis in this regard has been done in the subsequent part of the report. Here the Committee would like to emphasis 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)*

“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. Underspending 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)*

“The Committee further note that in North-Eastern States, the implementation of programme IWDP 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.75)*

“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 computerization 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.76)*

6. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“The observation of the Committee for increasing the scope of the schemes of IWDP and Land Records in the North East is very valid. It is submitted that the Department is making all efforts in this direction. The position of release of funds under IWDP is as follows:

(Rs. in Crore)		
Year	Allocation to NE States	Expenditure in NE States
2002-03	82.00	56.45
2003-04	84.24	66.20
2004-05	115.00	81.43
2005-06	119.00	—

From the above table, it is evident that the expenditure in the NE States under IWDP is steadily increasing. There is continuous effort to stimulate the demand and expenditure in these States.

To increase capacity building, efforts are being made to organise seminars and workshops. One such workshop was organised on 12th and 13th July 2005 which was chaired by AS (LR). The States have also been asked to prepare their perspective plans indicating their annual projections so that advance planning for the earmarked funds for NE States can be taken up and scarce resources are meaningfully utilised.

During the Tenth Plan period, the performance of the Scheme of 'Computerisation of Land Records' in NE States is as below:

(Rupees in crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Funds earmarked for NE States	Released to NE States	Balance amount in the Non-lapsable pool of resources
2002-03	55.00	5.00	0.08	4.92
2003-04	55.00	5.00	1.03	3.97
2004-05	50.00	6.00	1.63	4.37
2005-06	100.00	10.00	—	—

Due to non-receipt of proposals from the N.E. States, funds could not be fully utilized. The reason is that States have not utilized the funds released during the previous years, therefore, they have not requested for additional funds.

The performance of the Scheme on 'Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR)' during the first four years of the Tenth Plan period, for the North-Eastern States is given below:

(Rupees in crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Funds earmarked for NE States	Released to NE States	Balance amount in the Non-lapsable pool of resources
2002-03	35.00	5.00	4.42	0.58
2003-04	35.00	5.00	4.91	0.09
2004-05	20.00	2.00	3.44	—
2005-06	40.00	4.00	2.92	—

It may be seen from above that the funds earmarked for the NE States were almost fully released during 2002-03 & 2003-04. However, during 2004-05 more than the earmarked funds were released to N.E. States. There is scope for enhancement of outlay for the NE States during the financial year 2005-2006 as some more States may request for release of additional funds under the Scheme of SRA & ULR.

The Committee of Revenue Secretaries of selected States constituted by this Department under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Land Resources in its report has recommended that the component of Survey & Settlement operations with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS & Total Stations which is presently being taken under the 50 : 50 Scheme of SRA & ULR could be made a part of the 100 per cent funded Scheme of CLR so that updated land records data may be used for Computerisation. This will enable this Department to utilise the funds fully earmarked for the Scheme of CLR.”

The Committee while considering the action taken replies had desired that the name of selected States whose Revenue Secretaries are represented in the Committee constituted by the Department of Land Resources for the purpose of updating of land records should be obtained from the Department of Land Resources. The Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) vide their O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2005-GC (Vol. II) dated 13 December, 2005 has informed that the Revenue Secretaries/ Commissioners of the following States are represented in the said Committee:

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Madhya Pradesh
3. Maharashtra
4. Karnataka
5. Tamil Nadu
6. Uttaranchal
7. West Bengal

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)*

“..... the Department is making all efforts to stimulate the demand and expenditure in North Eastern States. More new

projects have been sanctioned in subsequent years as it is evident from the increasing expenditure. The States have also been asked to prepare their perspective plans indicating their annual projection so that advance planning can be done for the earmarked funds for North Eastern States."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)*

"The Hon'ble Minister of Rural development has written to Chief Ministers of all the North-Eastern States to take expeditious steps for implementation of the scheme of CLR and completion of various activities within the timeframe fixed by this Ministry. The progress of the scheme was further reviewed in the Ministry with the NE States during the months of May & June, 2005. The NE States were requested to conduct survey with the use of modern equipments and techniques for the un-surveyed areas so that land records with ownership details can be first prepared and then computerized. In this regard, the States of Tripura, Sikkim, Mizoram (plain areas) and Assam have shown considerable progress under the scheme of CLR. Out of the total releases of Rs. 1,956.07 lakh to NE States under the Scheme of CLR, utilization reported by these States is Rs. 1,470.36 lakh (75 per cent). Other States were requested to speed up their implementation."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.75)*

"The State of Meghalaya and Union territory of Lakshadweep have been requested to undertake survey work with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS (Global Positioning System) and Electronic Total Stations under the Scheme of SRA & ULR to create the land records data and then start computerisation of land records. All the States including the North-Eastern States have been requested to submit information about un-surveyed areas, which have never been surveyed (District/Tehsil/Revenue Village-wise), to this Department.

The Department of Land Resources, in the case of North-Eastern States and other States where land has not been surveyed, co-ordinates between the Schemes of SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records. The effort is to provide financial support for surveying those areas which are not surveyed so far and, thereafter, computerise the land records created by survey."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.76)*

7. The Committee have persistently been recommending to the Department to expand the area of operation of different schemes like IWDP, SRA and ULR and Computerisation of Land Records in North-Eastern Region so as to ensure 100 per cent exclusive allocation made for the said Region. From the replies, it seems that efforts in the right direction have been made by the Department. The Department has been playing a pro-active role. State Governments, Union territory Administrations are being motivated through correspondence, seminars and conferences. The Union Minister of Rural Development has also taken the initiative to write to Chief Ministers for effective implementation of the schemes.

Inspite of the best efforts being made by the Department, the utilisation position is not very encouraging as is evident from the analysis of the data given in the replies as given below:

- (i) the Department has clarified that through the continuous efforts the expenditure in North-Eastern Region is steadily increasing. The data indicates that the expenditure is increasing if the data of a year is compared to previous years in absolute terms. However, if the expenditure made in a year is compared in the light of the allocation, the gap between the allocation and expenditure is rather increasing. This gap, which was Rs. 18.04 crore during 2003-2004, increased to Rs. 33.57 crore during 2004-2005; and
- (ii) the position of expenditure under the scheme 'Computerisation of Land Records' is further disturbing. The underspending which is the balance amount deposited in the Non-lapsable pool of resources ranges between 80 per cent to 90 per cent in the years 2002-2003 to 2004-2005.

While noting the efforts being made by the Department, the Committee find that a lot more needs to be done in order to expand the base of activities of different schemes of the Department in North-Eastern Region. The Committee would like the Department to continue the efforts being made in this regard more vigorously so as to achieve the objective of 10 per cent exclusive allocation being made by the Department.

The Committee further find that certain initiatives have been taken by the Department to improve the position of land records in North-Eastern States. The Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development has written to Chief Ministers of all the North-Eastern States to take

expeditious steps for implementation of the schemes of CLR and completion of various activities within the framework fixed by the Department. The Committee would like to be apprised of the deadline of the Department in this regard. Besides, the State of Meghalaya and Union territory of Lakshadweep have been requested to undertake survey work with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS (Global Positioning System) and ETS (Electronic Total Stations) under the Scheme of SRA & ULR to create the land records data and then start computerisation of land records. All the States including the North-Eastern States have been requested to submit information about areas which have never been surveyed (District/ Tehsil/Revenue Village-wise), to the Department. The Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter further with these States so that the position of land records can be made better in these States. The Committee may be kept apprised of the position in this regard.

Besides, the Committee find that the Committee of Revenue Secretaries of selected States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Uttaranchal and West Bengal constituted by the Department under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Land Resources in its report has recommended that the component of survey and settlement operations with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS and Total Stations which is presently being taken under the 50 : 50 Scheme of SRA and ULR could be made a part of the 100 per cent funded Scheme of CLR so that updated land records data may be used for computerisation. The Committee would like to be informed whether the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee of Revenue Secretaries relates to all the States or only to North Eastern States. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the status of implementation of the recommendation of the aforesaid Committee.

#### **B. Monitoring mechanism for different watershed projects**

##### **Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.16 and 3.21)**

8. The Committee had noted as below:

“\*\* \*\* 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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)*

"The Committee note that around 65 per cent to 70 per cent of IWDP funds are meant for committed liabilities for ongoing 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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)*



9. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“There is a period of five years for completion of watershed projects and the total project cost is released in instalments. There is an inbuilt mechanism to monitor the fund utilization under which the next instalment of central share is released only when more than 50 per cent of the Central and State share released earlier has been utilised. Hence, the number of instalments released is a parameter to determine the performance and the implementation status of the projects. Accordingly, the Department maintains the data of release of instalments of each project to evaluate their performance. The analysis of the data gives a clear picture on performance ratings of different projects. The data is reviewed continuously and the States/Districts which are found slow in implementation are persuaded and directed to ensure timely implementation of projects.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)*

“It may be clarified that watershed projects are sanctioned for a period of five years and the total project cost is released in five instalments, *i.e.* only 15 per cent funds are released during first year, 30 per cent during 2nd year, 30 per cent during 3rd year, 15 per cent during 4th year and 10 per cent during 5th year. To ensure completion of the sanctioned projects about 65 to 70 per cent of the budget for the Area Development Programmes is spent on ongoing projects. Therefore, only the balance funds are utilized for sanction of new projects after fulfilling the requirement of ongoing projects. Thus approximately 30 per cent of the total funds is utilised for sanctioning new projects.

There is an inbuilt mechanism to monitor the fund utilisation, under which the next instalment of Central share is released only when more than 50 per cent of the Central and State share released earlier, has been utilised. Hence, the number of instalments released in a project is an indicator of the pace of implementation of the project. The Department maintains the data of release of various instalments of each project. The performance is periodically reviewed and the States/Districts which are found slow in implementation of projects are persuaded and directed to ensure timely completion of projects.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)*

10. The Committee in their earlier recommendations had noted that although average gestation period of a watershed project is five years, the projects started in 1997-1998 are still continuing. Besides the Committee had also found that there was no system of monitoring the physical performance of watershed projects. The Committee had suggested a mechanism to evaluate the physical performance of such projects. Some system of grading the performance of projects indicating poor, satisfactory or very good was suggested by the Committee. Besides, to know the status of the projects, these could be evaluated by indicating the progress at first stage, second stage, third stage etc. The Department instead of working on the formula suggested by the Committee has given a vague reply indicating the already known procedure of releasing outlay for these projects. The Committee strongly deplore the way their recommendations have been dealt with by the Department. The Committee find that due to lack of proper mechanism of judging the physical and qualitative performance of projects, a number of projects are being foreclosed thus wasting the national resources. The issue of foreclosure has been dealt with in the subsequent para of the report. Here, the Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation that proper monitoring mechanism as spelt out by the Committee be evolved at the earliest even though there is continuous reviewing of data of watershed projects at Ministry level.

C. Need for convergence of various watershed and other related programmes under one umbrella

Recommendations (Para Nos. 2.30, 2.43 and 2.57)

11. The Committee had recommended as below:

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.30)*

“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 Government 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/Departments/State Governments 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.43)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 2.57)*

12. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“In view of the Standing Committee’s recommendations to expedite the issue of converging various watershed and other related programmes as well as the concern expressed by the Committee on the undue delay in the matter, a fresh Cabinet Note was prepared explicitly mentioning the recommendations and concerns of the Committee. This Cabinet Note was put up for approval in November, 2004. However, a decision was taken at the highest level not to pursue this Cabinet Note for the present, as the Planning Commission had set up an Inter-Ministerial Task Group for the same purpose.

The Inter-Ministerial Task Group, under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Planning Commission, was set up by the Planning Commission in August 2004. The Task Group Report has since been finalised by the Planning Commission in October, 2005. The Report recognised the need to bring all watershed programmes under one Ministry and implement them in a mission mode. Alternatively, it was recommended that a separate mission under the Prime Minister may be created with four mini-missions under the Ministries of Agriculture, Rural Development, Environment & Forests and Water Resources.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.30)*

“It is true that watershed development programmes are being implemented by various Ministries and, therefore, coordination is needed to have a clear position on wasteland development. Ministry of Rural Development has asked the State Governments to prepare five-year perspective plans for each district in their States clearly indicating the wastelands so far covered under various programmes of the Government and the target set for the next five years. It will ensure convergence among different programmes of watershed development.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.43)*

“The guidelines for Hariyali for implementation of watershed development programmes have been circulated to the State Governments. The nodal agency at District level for implementation of Programmes/Schemes administered by the Ministry of Rural Development is the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). Accordingly, the guidelines provide that the ZP/DRDA shall take all possible measures to ensure convergence of other Programmes of the Ministry of Rural development in the villages chosen for the implementation of the watershed development projects. In addition, they are to converge programmes of similar nature of other Ministries in the villages selected under watershed

development schemes. The issue of integrating DPAP, DDP and IWDP with their financial allocations as additionality with related Area Development and Poverty Alleviation Programmes such as National Watershed Development Programme for the Rainfed Areas (NWDPRAs), National Wasteland Development Programme for Degraded Forest Lands, Food for Work Programme, Employment Guarantee Scheme etc. is also being examined by the Expert Committee constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri S. Parthasarathy. The Committee would recommend a suitable strategy for convergence of different programmes. Ministry of Rural Development has also asked the States to prepare five-year perspective plans for each district indicating the wastelands covered so far under various Government programmes and the target set for the next five years. It will ensure convergence at the district level."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.57)*

**13. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending for convergence of different watershed development schemes being handled by different Ministries/Department. The issue of convergence, although agreed to in principle by the Government, is being delayed. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had insisted on some mechanism to coordinate the activities related to watershed development being handled by different Ministries pending the final decision on the issue of convergence. The Committee find from the replies that the inter-Ministerial Task Group under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, Planning Commission in the report submitted in October, 2004 had recommended for bringing all watershed programmes under one mission or alternatively creation of a separate mission under the Prime Minister with four mini-missions under different Ministries dealing with the scheme of watershed development. Further, the Department has mentioned that a Cabinet Note was prepared explicitly mentioning the recommendations and concerns of the Committee. The Cabinet Note was put up for approval in November, 2004. However, a decision was taken at the highest level not to pursue the Cabinet Note for the present, as the Planning Commission had set up an inter-Ministerial Task Group for the same purpose. The Committee fail to understand the stand taken by the Department particularly when the Task Group has made recommendations on same lines as suggested by the Committee. The Committee would like the Department to explain its stand clearly. Further, the Committee would like to stress that the matter of convergence may further be pursued in the light of the repeated recommendations of the Committee as well as the suggestion of the Task Group and issue should be settled expeditiously.**

The Committee in their earlier recommendation had also stressed upon the need for implementation of Hariyali guidelines scrupulously so as to ensure convergence of watershed activities at the field level. The Committee had also suggested a mechanism to implement the guidelines which include publicising the same widely, replicating the positive impact of convergence in a State/District in other States/Districts. The Department instead of addressing the matter has chosen to reproduce the extract from the guidelines. The Committee would like the Department's categorical response in this regard.

The Committee further note that the Department has asked the State Governments to prepare five year Perspective Plan for each district clearly indicating the wastelands covered so far under various programmes of the Government and set targets for the next five years. The Committee would like the Department to ensure that the said Perspective Plan is prepared in consultation with the local bodies in respective districts/States. The Committee would also like the Department to pursue the matter further and apprise the Committee about the feed back received from the State Governments in this regard.

#### **D. Expeditious updation of Wasteland Atlas**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.38)**

14. The Committee had recommended as below:

"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 9th 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."

15. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"The exercise of updation of the Wasteland Atlas is to be completed by the end of the current financial year i.e. 2005-06 and it would reflect the current status of various categories of wastelands in the country. The observation of the Committee for developing a mechanism for periodic updation of data is valid and the Department would examine the proposition and work out its modalities."

16. The Committee find that updation of Wasteland Atlas is still to be completed even after finalisation of data of wastelands way back in March, 2000. The Committee further note that their recommendation for developing a mechanism for periodic updation of data has principally been agreed to by the Department. The Department has assured examination of the proposition and to workout its modalities. The Committee would like to hear about the final position in this regard.

#### **E. Perspective plan for development of wastelands in the country**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.42)**

17. The Committee had recommended as below:

“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.”

18. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Committee has very rightly noted that the wastelands when properly developed can be a major economic resource for the country. The State Governments have been asked to prepare a district-wise Perspective Plan for their respective States for a period of five years for tackling wastelands. This will ensure that funds from the Ministry of Rural Development are planned judiciously and the convergence among different programmes of the Ministry is meaningfully implemented.”

19. The Committee appreciate the efforts made by the Department pursuant to the recommendation for proper and integrated planning for the purpose of development of wastelands in the country. The State Governments have been asked to prepare a district-wise perspective plan for their respective States for a period of five years for tackling the problem of wastelands. The Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter further with the State Governments. The Committee again emphasise the need for an



**integrated plan for the development of wastelands in the country which can be a major economic resource for the country.**

**F. Scope of wage employment under three areas development schemes under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.56)**

20. The Committee had recommended as below:

“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.’

21. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The recommendation of the Committee has been forwarded to the Department of Rural Development who are dealing with the Legislation viz. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2004 so that the same could be kept in view while processing the Bill.”

**22. The Committee find that their observation regarding exploring the possibility of using watershed programmes (60 per cent of expenditure of which goes for wage employment) in achieving the objectives of the National Rural Employment Guarantee legislation has been forwarded to the nodal Department of Rural Department. The Committee note that the said legislation has now been enacted. In view of this, the Department should pursue the matter with the sister Department and apprise the Committee about the stand taken by them in this regard.**



**G. Findings of Parthasarathy Committee on review of DDP and DPAP blocks in the country**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.63)**

23. The Committee had recommended as below:

“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 and 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. Parthasarathy has been appointed for this purpose. The said Parthasarathy Committee will submit the report within six months. The Committee would like to be apprised of the recommendations of the said Committee when finalised.”

24. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Report of the Parthasarathy Committee is to be submitted by 31 October, 2005. The Department will be pleased to apprise the Standing Committee of the recommendations of the Parthasarathy Committee.”

**25. The Committee find that the report of the Parthasarathy Committee which was set up to review the position of DDP and DPAP blocks was expected by 31 October, 2005. The Committee hope that the report would have been finalised by now and would like to be apprised of the findings of the said report.**

**H. Foreclosure of projects under IWDP, DDP, DPAP and TDET Schemes**

**Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.22, 3.23, 3.54 and 3.102)**

26. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee note with concern the issue of foreclosure of (IWDP) projects. They find from the data made available to them that out of 630 projects sanctioned since 1995-96, 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. Besides the detailed reasons for foreclosure

of 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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.22)*

"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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.23)*

"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, 1,764 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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.54)*

"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."

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.102)*

27. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“It may be clarified that a project may be foreclosed at any stage, when there is inordinate delay in implementation of the project. When a decision for foreclosure is taken, the subsequent instalments are stopped and the utilisation certificate for the funds already released is obtained. Thus there is no question of wastage of the entire investment made on the project. If the funds released are not properly utilized, recoveries are effected. 13 projects were closed for various reasons such as conflict amongst various groups, cases being sub-judice leading to undue delay etc. In most cases, foreclosed projects are followed by fresh projects to avoid deprivation of benefits to the people of that area. The project-wise details are given as below:

(Rs. in Lakh)

Year of Sanction	State	District	Area	Total cost	Funds released	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1995-96	<b>Bihar</b>	Nalanda	1000	40.00	6.00	Funds were given to Rajendra Prasad University, Pusa. As per records, most of the funds were utilised for plantation etc. without participatory approach. University has been asked to refund balance amount with interest.
1996-97	<b>M.P.</b>	Datia-II	532	21.28	17.01	Demonstration project created by ICAR, funds not fully utilised.
	<b>U.P.</b>	Azamgarh	7982	319.28	143.68	Performance of PIAs not satisfactory.
	<b>U.P.</b>	Firozabad	11479	459.16	403.70	State govt. has recommended for foreclosure of the project.
	<b>Orissa</b>	Dhenkanal-II	2515	100.60	89.08	In absence of revised approved work plan, no further request for release of next instl. received.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1996-97	Orissa	Koraput-III	317	12.68	8.19	Demonstration project, final Report submitted. No further funds sought.
1997-98	UP	Unnao	12041	481.64	216.73	Performance of NGO PIAs not satisfactory, State Govt. black-listed PIAs, under CBI enquiry.
	UP	Raebareli-I	12100	484.00	172.60	-do-
	UP	Unnao-II	12054	482.16	172.32	-do-
	UP	Sultanpur	12039	481.56	72.23	Project remained non-starter, money refunded.
1998-99	J&K	Kathua	8650	346.00	86.50	Performance of NGO PIA not satisfactory. CAPART has also black-listed the NGO.
	Orissa	Sambalpur	1025	41.00	10.25	Sub-judice.

*Replies to Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.22 & 3.23)*

“Department of Land Resources has been impressing upon programme States/DRDAs/ZPs from time to time, the need for timely completion of ongoing projects for effective delivery of benefits to the resource poor. In spite of repeated efforts to improve performance 1,764 projects under DPAP and 300 projects under DDP were foreclosed due to excessive delay in their implementation.

The reasons for delayed implementation of such projects are:

- (a) time taken in understanding the new watershed approach and selection and prioritization of watersheds
- (b) delay in selecting suitable Project Implementation Agencies (PIAs)
- (c) non-availability of adequate technical support, locally, in implementing watershed activities
- (d) severe climatic conditions/difficult terrain of project sites

- (e) local community conflicts as the projects are essentially implemented through Community Based Organizations (CBOs).

It may be brought to the notice of the Committee that the term foreclosure gives an impression of total wastage of project money. The fact of the matter, however, is that the investment made in these projects till the time of their closure is utilized in implementing various activities of soil conservation, water harvesting, afforestation, pasture development, creation of livelihood opportunities, training of stake holders, etc., and corresponding benefits are delivered to the community. In fact, foreclosure only implies that the projects, being slow in implementation, could not claim the entire Central share within the prescribed period and project activities could only be implemented to the extent of funds claimed.

Since, funds are released in 7 instalments (15%, 10%, 20%, 20%, 15%, 10% and 10%) over a period of five years, the number of instalments claimed is the indicator of the stage of implementation. The details regarding instalments released and total Central funds claimed in respect of foreclosed projects are given as under:

**Number of instalments and funds released in respect of foreclosed projects DPAP**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Total No. of Projects foreclosed	Number of instalments released							Total funds released
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60	—	—	—	60	—	—	390.00	
2.	Bihar	101	—	22	14	65	—	—	540.50	
3.	Chhattisgarh	112	—	—	—	—	112	—	896.00	
4.	Gujarat	27	—	—	—	20	7	—	186.00	
5.	Himachal Pradesh	00								
6.	J&K	32				22		10	233.00	
7.	Jharkhand	244	51		108	69	16		1139.00	
8.	Karnataka	114				21		93	973.50	
9.	Madhya Pradesh	00								

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.	Maharashtra	657		8		235	227	187	5046.50
11.	Orissa	162			12	132		18	1074.00
12.	Rajasthan	19					8	11	151.00
13.	Tamil Nadu	40		8			12	20	296.00
14.	Uttaranchal	00							
15.	Uttar Pradesh	61						61	549.00
16.	West Bengal	135			8	127			861.50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1764</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>12336.00</b>
<b>DDP</b>									
1.	Haryana	50	—	—	—	—	14	36	1033.11
2.	Jammu and Kashmir	85	—	—	—	—	61	24	1735.35
3.	Karnataka	165	—	9	82	—	24	50	1760.01
	<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>4528.47</b>

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.54)*

“Out of 148 projects sanctioned under TDET, 22 projects were foreclosed. In this connection, it may be pointed out that pilot projects sanctioned under TDET have the specific purpose of validating appropriate technologies for wastelands development. If for some reason, this focus is not maintained, certain sanctioned projects are foreclosed since they are not expected to realise the intended purpose. The main reasons for these foreclosures were deviation from approved work plan, non-realisation of beneficiary/ institutional contribution, delay in further release of funds by the implementing organizations, particularly Universities and delay in project implementation leading to expiry of sanctioned project period. In a few cases, all project works were completed at less than the estimated project cost, but the projects were shown as incomplete due to pendency of refund of unspent balances.

An amount of about Rs. 2.03 crore was released to these 22 foreclosed projects, out of which an expenditure of about Rs. 1.74 crore was made. An amount of Rs. 19.49 lakh has already been refunded by the implementing agencies out of the unspent balance of Rs. 29 lakh.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.102)*

28. The Committee in their earlier recommendations had expressed serious concerns over the foreclosure of projects under different watershed schemes of the Department *viz.* IWDP, DDP, DPAP and TDET.

The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that some projects were foreclosed at the last stage when major portion of the allocated outlay was already released. For example under IWDP, in Firozabad Rs. 403.70 lakh out of the total cost of Rs. 459.16 lakh were released and in case of Dhenkanal II (Orissa) out of the total cost of Rs. 100.60 lakh Rs. 89.08 lakh were already released. As regards the observation of the Committee with regard to waste of national resources, the Department has responded that the investment made in these projects is not wasted. It is utilized in implementing various activities of some conservation, water harvesting, afforestation, pasture development, creation of livelihood opportunities, training of stake holders etc.

The Committee deplore the way their recommendation on such a serious issue like fore closure of projects has been responded to by the Department. Instead of taking certain corrective measures, the foreclosure has been justified by the Department. On the one hand it has been stated that the foreclosure does not amount to national wastage, on the other hand it is stated that the reason for foreclosure (in case of TDET projects) was non-achievement of the intended purpose. Further, regarding recoveries the Department has clarified on the one hand that recoveries are effected if funds released are not properly utilised and on the other hand the reply is silent on the recommendation of the Committee to furnish the details of the recoveries effected from States (*refer* recommendation para no. 3.23 of 10th Report-14th Lok Sabha). Further, the reason of foreclosure of TDET projects has been stated as pendency of refund of unspent balances.

The Committee express serious concern at the casual manner, in which the Department has addressed such a serious issue of foreclosure of projects. The Committee feel that foreclosure indicates some problems in implementing the projects. As such, there is no question of achievement of the objective of the projects. Foreclosure certainly amounts to wastage of huge national resources of the starved economy. The Committee while strongly reiterating their earlier recommendation would like that the reasons for foreclosure, the stage at which the project was foreclosed, the total cost of the project and the funds released at the stage of foreclosure, recovery, if any, made,

etc. should invariably be analysed periodically and indicated in the Budget documents like Performance Budget. A proper system of monitoring should be evolved as suggested by the Committee in the earlier para of the report.

**I. Reviewing the funding pattern for schemes meant for land records  
i.e. SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records.**

**Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.91, 3.92 & 3.93)**

29. The Committee had noted as below:

“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. ‘Computerization 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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.91)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.92)*

“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.”

*Recommendation (Para No. 3.93)*

30. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“Under the 50:50 funded Scheme of SRA & ULR, financial assistance is provided to States for construction of survey & settlement training institutes, Patwar Ghar, Record rooms and undertaking survey & settlement operations with the use of modern survey equipments. However under the 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Scheme of CLR, funds are provided to States for undertaking data entry work, setting up of computer centers at tehsil/taluk and sub-division level, imparting training to Revenue officials on application software & computerization technology.

The Committee of Revenue Secretaries of selected States constituted by this Department under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Land Resources in its report has recommended that the component of Survey & Settlement operations with the use of Modern Survey equipments like GPS & Total Stations which is presently being taken under the Scheme of SRA & ULR could be made a part of the Scheme of CLR so that updated land records data may be used for Computerization. The other components of the Scheme of SRA & ULR will continue to be funded on the existing pattern of 50:50.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.91)*

“The matter for change in the funding pattern of the scheme of SRA & ULR from 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and States and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States was taken up with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission in their reply has mentioned that the 12th Finance Commission’s Report provides more resources to states, which should assist them in meeting their matching contribution. Therefore, the existing funding pattern of 50:50 under the scheme of SRA & ULR should continue.

The matter will further be taken up with the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for their consideration.”

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.92)*

"A copy of the summary of recommendations of the 12th Finance Commission's is enclosed at *Appendix-I*.

During the conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries of States organised by this department from time-to-time, States are being requested to undertake survey/revisonal survey for creation & continuous updation of land records & cadastral maps with the use of latest technologies and equipments. It has also been emphasised to States to provide their matching share of 50 per cent and also take appropriate action for modernisation of Revenue Administration and updation of land records on regular basis."

*Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 3.93)*

31. The Committee, in their earlier recommendation, while noting the problems being faced by some of the State Governments in providing 50 per cent of matching contribution for SRA and ULR, had recommended to finalise the proposal of the Government to review the funding pattern for 50:50 to 90:10 for North Eastern States and 75:25 in cases other than North Eastern States. The Committee had also noted the views of the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance on the said issue according to which 12th Finance Commission had provided more resources to the States which should enable them to meet their matching contribution. The Department in the action taken reply has assured to take up the matter again with the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

The Committee find from the details of 12th Finance Commission recommendations that on certain specific matters like health, education, road, bridges and local bodies etc., additional allocation has been earmarked to State Governments. However no additional amount seems to have been earmarked for the purpose of land records. The Committee further find that although two schemes *i.e.* SRA and ULR and Computerisation of Land Records are inter-related, the Centre-State allocation criteria is altogether different. For Computerisation of Land Records 100 per cent Central assistance is provided and for SRA and ULR the allocation is 50:50. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation in the light of the aforesaid observations and would like the Department to take up the matter with Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission in the light of the above observations as well as observations made in the earlier recommendations. The Committee may be kept apprised of the follow up action in this regard.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 differences between proposed and agreed to allocation under each of the scheme is much less as compared to 9th Plan.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 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.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Since the recommendations contained in the above three paras are regarding outlay and expenditure of the Department, the reply is accordingly being furnished at one place as under:

The Committee has rightly observed that compared to the Ninth Plan, the difference between proposed and agreed to allocation scheme-wise during Tenth Plan is much less. Further, the reasons for under-spending during Ninth Plan and during the first three years of the Tenth Plan have also been correctly reflected and are acknowledged.

As rightly suggested by the Committee, efforts are being made to seek increased allocation each year under the Area Development Programmes *viz.* DPAP, DDP and IWDP so that more area falling under the category of wastelands/degraded lands in the country could be covered under these schemes.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 initially 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.

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

In fact, the launching of new scheme of Bio-fuel in the demonstration phase is intended to establish the viability and economic feasibility of utilising the oils from Jatropha for bio-fuel production. Keeping in view the lack of sufficient research data on various aspects of Jatropha cultivation and the ensuing uncertainties to the farmers, the demonstration phase of the project provided for a major component of R&D and awareness campaigns. After the successful implementation of the project in the demonstration phase, establishing its viability, the project will be enlarged and implemented on a full scale.

It is submitted that the issues related to technological and economic viability of the project have been discussed in the review meeting of the Planning Commission. These issues will be carefully examined and duly incorporated in the proposal that would be submitted to the Planning Commission and the Department of Expenditure for their approval. It may also be mentioned that a provision for a new scheme in the Budget Estimate is one of the essential criteria for approval. Accordingly, a provisional outlay in the budget estimate is earmarked when it is proposed to launch a new scheme during a financial year. However, the scheme is launched only after due approval of the Planning Commission & the Ministry of Finance.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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, Tamilnadu, 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.

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

To overcome the problem of tackling wastelands by different departments, the Ministry of Rural Development has asked the State Governments to prepare a district-wise Perspective Plan for their respective States for a period of 5 years for tackling wastelands. This will ensure that funds from the Ministry of Rural Development are utilised for the purpose and are well reflected in a single document avoiding commonalities amongst the different departments.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

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

The sharing of experience with other countries on watershed management and cooperation in technology transfer would greatly benefit the country in strengthening and improving our programmes. The Department appreciates the recommendation of the Committee. The officers of the Department will be sent on study tours, participation in international seminars/workshops to benefit from the positive experiences of those countries.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.55)**

The Committee are please 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Evaluation Studies carried out by the Ministry in respect of the Programmes are conducted with the assistance of the State Governments. The findings of the Evaluation Studies are shared with the State Governments at various fora including the workshops of Project Directors of District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs).

The publication of these evaluation studies in periodicals, journals will also be encouraged. The success stories of different schemes are widely published through 'Grameen Bharat'. The IEC Division in the Ministry of Rural Development takes various initiatives for wide publicity of the programmes.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

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

The recommendation of the Committee has been forwarded to the Department of Rural Development who are dealing with the Legislation *viz.* The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2004 so that the same could be kept in view while processing the Bill.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 22 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

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

The need for a coordinating unit at the State level, is being emphasised and the remaining States are being motivated for similar action. Results are forthcoming in respect States like Orissa, Kerala, Maharashtra, Uttaranchal and Uttar Pradesh.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]



### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) has been pursuing the issue of enhancing the funds for DPAP & DDP programmes with the Planning Commission. As a result, substantial increase has been made in the outlay for the current financial year for both the programmes. A budget allocation of Rs. 353.00 crore for DPAP and Rs. 268.00 crore for DDP has been made during 2005-06, as against Rs. 300.00 crore and Rs. 215.00 crore respectively provided last year. However, efforts will be made to impress upon the Planning Commission, the need to enhance the investment in future so as to cover the entire estimated and identified areas in the country within a suitable time frame.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 root level.

### **Reply of the Government**

DPAP and DDP aim at improving the economic and social condition of the resource poor and disadvantaged sections with the

objectives of combating desertification and mitigating adverse effects of drought on crops and livestock and restoration of ecological balance in the long run.

The Watershed Development Guidelines envisage a focused role for Panchayati Raj Institutions and greater community participation in project planning, implementation, post project maintenance of assets and their equitable sharing. Under the new umbrella Guidelines "Hariyali" which have been made applicable to projects sanctioned from 1.4.2003, an effort has been made to empower the Panchayati Raj Institutions by giving them a pivotal role in implementation of the programmes. The Gram Panchayats have been authorised to execute the projects with block/Zila Panchayats to act as Project Implementation Agencies. Thus, Department of Land Resources has taken measures to ensure total participation of the local people, right from the planning stage of watershed projects so that these programmes fulfil the aspirations and the needs of the people at the grass roots level.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.73)**

The Committee note that although Computerisation of Land Records is a cent per cent 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.

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

The Cabinet Secretary reviewed the progress of the scheme of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) during the Workshop of Revenue Secretaries of States held on 13th August, 2004 at New Delhi, wherein he emphasized that interim milestones may be fixed for

completion of various activities under this scheme. The scheme was further reviewed by Minister (RD) during the Conference of Revenue Ministers of States held on 22.11.2004 at New Delhi wherein he requested the State Governments that the targets fixed by this Ministry for various activities may be achieved on a Mission Mode. The Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development has also written to Chief Ministers of poor performing States requesting them to give personal attention so that the CLR project may be completed within the stipulated timeframe.

In view of the concerted efforts by this Department, the utilization position has improved from 66% to 70% (Rs. 243.30 crore, out of the total releases of Rs. 346.13 crore, till 31.3.2005).

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.74)**

The Committee further find that at the aforesaid review meeting convened by 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.

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

During the Conference of the Revenue Ministers of States held on 22.11.2004, some of the States requested Minister (RD) that the time fixed for completion of various activities under the scheme of CLR may be further extended. Accordingly, this Department extended the time for fulfilment of targets by three months for different categories of States. The States of Karnataka, Goa, Tamil Nadu and Gujarat have successfully achieved the targets. Other States like Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Delhi and Sikkim have also completed major activities within the stipulated time. However, the States could not stop the manual distribution of computerized copies of Record of Rights (RoR). During the months of May & June, 2005, this Department further reviewed

the progress of the implementation of the scheme of CLR with the poor-performing States and requested them to give high priority so that the targets fixed by this Department may be achieved within the stipulated timeframe.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.94)**

With regard to 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 tradition 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.

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

North-Eastern States have been requested in various fora to chalk out an Action Plan to complete survey, re-survey and settlement operations within a stipulated time frame. They have been requested to submit the information about the areas which have never been surveyed to this Department so that a strategy could be worked out for completion of this activity at the earliest. It has also been proposed to call a meeting of the Revenue Secretaries of States including North-Eastern States shortly to discuss the programmes/Schemes of Land Reforms.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.101)**

The Committee find the 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 organizations 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.

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

In general, the expenditure auditing procedures prescribed by the Finance Division for processing release proposals are also applied to the projects sanctioned under TDET. However, the Implementing Agencies of the TDET projects, particularly agencies like Universities, ICAR institutes etc., have different procedures for audit than that prescribed by the Finance Division. Keeping this in view, the Department has now been coordinating with the Finance Division to clear release proposals on the basis of the Audit reports submitted by the Implementing Agencies as per their own procedures.

The Committee has rightly pointed out that there is much scope for making cost effective technology for wastelands development and for this purpose intensive interaction with research organizations is necessary to persuade them to come forward. For this purpose, the Department has been in regular contact with various research organizations.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### CHAPTER III

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

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

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

As per Wastelands Atlas of India (2000), the wastelands categories can be broadly grouped as given below:

---

(i)	Degraded Forests	14.07 million hectares
(ii)	Non-forest wastelands	
	(a) Treatable wastelands	36.98 million hectares
	(b) Untreatable wastelands	12.80 million hectares
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63.85 million hectares</b>

---

The data of Land Sat imagery has been worked out at 1:50,000 scale and it can not be delineated into Government, Community and Private wastelands. Various estimates provided by Ministry of

Agriculture, Planning Commission and Department of Land Resources have different criteria for identification of wastelands as per their requirements. For the purpose of DoLR, 36.98 mha. of treatable wastelands is the acceptable figure for planning.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### Recommendation (Para No. 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 upon increasing the scope of the schemes *viz.* IWDP and land records. The position of land records in said States is very poor and hence needs 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.

#### Reply of the Government

“The observation of the Committee for increasing the scope of the schemes of IWDP and Land Records in the North East is very valid. It is submitted that the Department is making all efforts in this direction. The position of release of funds under IWDP is as follows:

(Rs. in Crore)

Year	Allocation to NE States	Expenditure in NE States
2002-03	82.00	56.45
2003-04	84.24	66.20
2004-05	115.00	81.43
2005-06	119.00	—



From the above table, it is evident that the expenditure in the NE States under IWDP is steadily increasing. There is continuous effort to stimulate the demand and expenditure in these States.

To increase capacity building, efforts are being made to organise seminars and workshops. One such workshop was organised on 12th and 13th July 2005 which was chaired by AS (LR). The States have also been asked to prepare their perspective plans indicating their annual projections so that advance planning for the earmarked funds for NE States can be taken up and scarce resources are meaningfully utilised.

During the Tenth Plan period, the performance of the Scheme of 'Computerisation of Land Records' in NE States is as below:

(Rupees in crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Funds earmarked for NE States	Released to NE States	Balance amount in the Non-lapsable pool of resources
2002-03	55.00	5.00	0.08	4.92
2003-04	55.00	5.00	1.03	3.97
2004-05	50.00	6.00	1.63	4.37
2005-06	100.00	10.00	—	—

Due to non-receipt of proposals from the N.E. States, funds could not be fully utilized. The reason is that States have not utilized the funds released during the previous years, therefore, they have not requested for additional funds.

The performance of the Scheme on 'Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR)' during the first four years of the Tenth Plan period, for the North-Eastern States is given below:

(Rupees in crore)

Year	Budget Estimate	Funds earmarked for NE States	Released to NE States	Balance amount in the Non-lapsable pool of resources
2002-03	35.00	5.00	4.42	0.58
2003-04	35.00	5.00	4.91	0.09
2004-05	20.00	2.00	3.44	—
2005-06	40.00	4.00	2.92	—

It may be seen from above that the funds earmarked for the NE States were almost fully released during 2002-03 & 2003-04. However, during 2004-05 more than the earmarked funds were released to N.E. States. There is scope for enhancement of outlay for the NE States during the financial year 2005-2006 as some more States may request for release of additional funds under the Scheme of SRA & ULR.

The Committee of Revenue Secretaries of selected States constituted by this Department under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Land Resources in its report has recommended that the component of Survey & Settlement operations with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS & Total Stations which is presently being taken under the 50:50 Scheme of SRA & ULR could be made a part of the 100 per cent funded Scheme of CLR so that updated land records data may be used for Computerisation. This will enable this Department to utilise the funds fully earmarked for the Scheme of CLR.”

The Committee while considering the action taken replies had desired that the name of selected States whose Revenue Secretaries are represented in the Committee constituted by the Department of Land Resources for the purpose of updating of land records should be obtained from the Department of Land Resources. The Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) vide their O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2005-GC (Vol. II) dated 13 December, 2005 has informed that the Revenue Secretaries/Commissioners of the following States are represented in the said Committee:

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Madhya Pradesh
3. Maharashtra
4. Karnataka
5. Tamil Nadu
6. Uttaranchal
7. West Bengal

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)**

The scheme-wise analysis has also been made in the subsequent part of the report. Hence the Committee may like to highlight that the Budget document 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

There is a period of five years for completion of watershed projects and the total project cost is released in instalments. There is an inbuilt mechanism to monitor the fund utilization under which the next instalment of central share is released only when more than 50 per cent of the Central and State share released earlier has been utilised. Hence, the number of instalments released is a parameter to determine the performance and the implementation status of the projects. Accordingly, the Department maintains the data of release of instalments of each project to evaluate their performance. The analysis of the data gives a clear picture on performance ratings of different projects. The data is reviewed continuously and the States/Districts which are found slow in implementation are persuaded and directed to ensure timely implementation of projects.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 10 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

In view of the Standing Committee's recommendations to expedite the issue of converging various watershed and other related programmes as well as the concern expressed by the Committee on the undue delay in the matter, a fresh Cabinet Note was prepared explicitly mentioning the recommendations and concerns of the Committee. This Cabinet Note was put up for approval in November, 2004. However, a decision was taken at the highest level not to pursue this Cabinet Note for the present, as the Planning Commission had set up an Inter-Ministerial Task Group for the same purpose.

The Inter-Ministerial Task Group, under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Planning Commission, was set up by the Planning Commission in August 2004. The Task Group Report has since been finalised by the Planning Commission in October, 2004. The Report recognised the need to bring all watershed programmes under one Ministry and implement them in a mission mode. Alternatively, it was recommended that a separate mission under the Prime Minister may be created with four mini-missions under the Ministries of Agriculture, Rural Development, Environment & Forests and Water Resources.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 Government *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/Departments/State Governments 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

It is true that watershed development programmes are being implemented by various Ministries and, therefore, coordination is needed to have a clear position on wasteland development. Ministry of Rural Development has asked the State Governments to prepare five-year perspective plans for each district in their States clearly indicating the wastelands so far covered under various programmes of the Government and the target set for the next five years. It will ensure convergence among different programmes of watershed development.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 States 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The guidelines for Hariyali for implementation of watershed development programmes have been circulated to the State Governments. The nodal agency at District level for implementation of Programmes/Schemes administered by the Ministry of Rural Development is the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). Accordingly, the guidelines provide that the ZP/DRDA shall take all possible measures to ensure convergence of other Programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development in the villages chosen for the implementation of the watershed development projects. In addition, they are to converge programmes of similar nature of other Ministries in the villages selected under watershed development schemes. The issue of integrating DPAP, DDP and IWDP with their financial allocations as additionality with related Area Development and Poverty Alleviation Programmes such as National Watershed Development Programme for the Rainfed Areas (NWDPA), National Wasteland Development Programme for Degraded Forest Lands, Food for Work Programme, Employment Guarantee Scheme etc. is also being examined by the Expert Committee constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri S. Parthasarathy. The Committee would recommend a suitable strategy for convergence of different programmes. Ministry of Rural Development has also asked the States to prepare five-year perspective plans for each district indicating the wastelands covered so far under various Government programmes and the target set for the next five years. It will ensure convergence at the district level.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.21)**

The Committee note that around 65 per cent to 70 per cent of IWDP funds are meant for committed liabilities for ongoing 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

It may be clarified that watershed projects are sanctioned for a period of five years and the total project cost is released in five instalments, *i.e.* only 15 per cent funds are released during first year, 30 per cent during 2nd year, 30 per cent during 3rd year, 15 per cent during 4th year and 10 per cent during 5th year. To ensure completion of the sanctioned projects about 65 to 70 per cent of the budget for the Area Development Programmes is spent on ongoing projects. Therefore, only the balance funds are utilized for sanction of new projects after fulfilling the requirement of on-going projects. Thus approximately 30 per cent of the total funds is utilised for sanctioning new projects.

There is an inbuilt mechanism to monitor the fund utilisation, under which the next instalment of Central share is released only when more than 50 per cent of the Central and State share released earlier, has been utilised. Hence, the number of instalments released in a project is an indicator of the pace of implementation of the project.

The Department maintains the data of release of various instalments of each project. The performance is periodically reviewed and the States/Districts which are found slow in implementation of projects are persuaded and directed to ensure timely completion of projects.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 10 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 1995-96, 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. Besides the detailed reasons for foreclosure of 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.

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

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

It may be clarified that a project may be foreclosed at any stage, when there is inordinate delay in implementation of the project. When a decision for foreclosure is taken, the subsequent instalments are stopped and the utilisation certificate for the funds already released is obtained. Thus there is no question of wastage of the entire investment made on the project. If the funds released are not properly utilized, recoveries are effected.

13 projects were closed for various reasons such as conflict amongst various groups, cases being sub-judice leading to undue delay etc. In most cases, foreclosed projects are followed by fresh projects to avoid



deprivation of benefits to the people of that area. The project-wise details are given as below:

(Rs. in Lakh)

Year of Sanction	State	District	Area	Total cost	Funds released	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1995-96	Bihar	Nalanda	1000	40.00	6.00	Funds were given to Rajendra Prasad University, Pusa. As per records, most of the funds were utilised for plantation etc. without participatory approach. Univ. has been asked to Refund balance amount with Interest.
1996-97	M.P.	Datia-II	532	21.28	17.01	Demonstration project created by ICAR, funds not fully utilised.
	U.P.	Azamgarh	7982	319.28	143.68	Performance of PIAs not satisfactory.
	U.P.	Firozabad	11479	459.16	403.70	State govt. has recommended for foreclosure of the project.
	Orissa	Dhenkanal II	2515	100.60	89.08	In absence of revised approved work plan, no further request for release of next instl. received.
	Orissa	Koraput-III	317	12.68	8.19	Demonstration project, final Report submitted. No further funds sought.
1997-98	UP	Unnao	12041	481.64	216.73	Performance of NGO PIAs not Satisfactory, State Govt. black-listed PIAs, under CBI enquiry.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	UP	Raebareli-I	12100	484.00	172.60	-do-
	UP	Unnao-II	12054	482.16	172.32	-do-
	UP	Sultanpur	12039	481.56	72.23	Project remained non-starter, money refunded
1998-99	J&K	Kathua	8650	346.00	86.50	Performance of NGO PIA not satisfactory. CAPART has also black-listed the NGO.
	Orissa	Sambalpur	1025	41.00	10.25	Sub-judice.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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. Underspending 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.

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

As replied in earlier paragraph, the Department is making all efforts to stimulate the demand and expenditure in North Eastern States. More new projects have been sanctioned in subsequent years as it is evident from the increasing expenditure. The States have also been asked to prepare their perspective plans indicating their annual

projection so that advance planning can be done for the earmarked funds for North Eastern States.”

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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, 1,764 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Department of Land Resources has been impressing upon programme States/DRDAs/ZPs from time to time, the need for timely completion of ongoing projects for effective delivery of benefits to the resource poor. In spite of repeated efforts to improve performance 1,764 projects under DPAP and 300 projects under DDP were foreclosed due to excessive delay in their implementation.

The reasons for delayed implementation of such projects are:

- (a) time taken in understanding the new watershed approach and selection and prioritization of watersheds.
- (b) delay in selecting suitable Project Implementation Agencies (PIAs)
- (c) non-availability of adequate technical support, locally, in implementing watershed activities
- (d) severe climatic conditions/difficult terrain of project sites

- (e) local community conflicts as the projects are essentially implemented through Community Based Organizations (CBOs).

It may be brought to the notice of the Committee that the term foreclosure gives an impression of total wastage of project money. The fact of the matter, however, is that the investment made in these projects till the time of their closure is utilized in implementing various activities of soil conservation, water harvesting, afforestation, pasture development, creation of livelihood opportunities, training of stake holders, etc., and corresponding benefits are delivered to the community. In fact, foreclosure only implies that the projects, being slow in implementation, could not claim the entire Central share within the prescribed period and project activities could only be implemented to the extent of funds claimed.

Since, funds are released in 7 instalments (15%, 10%, 20%, 20%, 15%, 10% and 10%) over a period of five years, the number of instalments claimed is the indicator of the stage of implementation. The details regarding instalments released and total Central funds claimed in respect of foreclosed projects are given as under:

**Number of instalments and funds released in respect of foreclosed projects**

**DPAP**

Sl. No.	Name of State	Total No. of Projects foreclosed		Number of instalments released					Total funds released (Rs. in lakhs)	
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60	—	—	—	60	—	—	390.00	
2.	Bihar	101	—	22	14	65	—	—	540.50	
3.	Chhattisgarh	112	—	—	—	—	112	—	896.00	
4.	Gujarat	27	—	—	—	20	7	—	186.00	
5.	Himachal Pradesh	00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
6.	J&K	32	—	—	—	—	22	10	233.00	
7.	Jharkhand	244	51	—	108	69	16	—	1139.00	
8.	Karnataka	114	—	—	—	—	21	93	973.50	
9.	Madhya Pradesh	00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.	Maharashtra	57		8		235	227	187	5046.50
11.	Orissa	162			12	132		18	1074.00
12.	Rajasthan	19					8	11	151.00
13.	Tamil Nadu	40		8			12	20	296.00
14.	Uttaranchal	00							
15.	Uttar Pradesh	61						61	549.00
16.	West Bengal	135			8	127			861.50
<b>Total</b>		<b>1764</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>12336.00</b>

#### DDP

1.	Haryana	50	—	—	—	—	14	36	1033.11
2.	Jammu and Kashmir	85	—	—	—	—	61	24	1735.35
3.	Karnataka	165	—	9	82	—	24	50	1760.01
<b>Total</b>		<b>300</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>4528.47</b>

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

#### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development has written to Chief Ministers of all the North-Eastern States to take expeditious steps for implementation of the scheme of CLR and completion of various activities within the timeframe fixed by this Ministry. The progress of the scheme was further reviewed in the Ministry with the NE States during the months of May & June, 2005. The NE States were requested to conduct survey with the use of modern equipments and techniques for the un-surveyed areas so that land records with ownership details can be first prepared and then computerized. In this regard, the States of Tripura, Sikkim, Mizoram (plain areas) and Assam have shown considerable progress under the scheme of CLR. Out of the total releases of Rs. 1,956.07 lakh to NE States under the Scheme of CLR, utilization reported by these States is Rs. 1,470.36 lakh (75 per cent). Other States were requested to speed up their implementation.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 computerization 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The State of Meghalaya and Union territory of Lakshadweep have been requested to undertake survey work with the use of modern survey equipments like GPS (Global Positioning System) and Electronic Total Stations under the Scheme of SRA & ULR to create the land records data and then start computerisation of land records. All the States including the North-Eastern States have been requested to submit

information about un-surveyed areas, which have never been surveyed (District/Tehsil/Revenue Village-wise), to this Department.

The Department of Land Resources, in the case of North-Eastern States and other States where land has not been surveyed, co-ordinates between the Schemes of SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records. The effort is to provide financial support for surveying those areas which are not surveyed so far and, thereafter, computerise the land records created by survey.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.* 'Computerization 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Under the 50:50 funded Scheme of SRA & ULR, financial assistance is provided to States for construction of survey & settlement training institutes, Patwar Ghar, Record Rooms and undertaking survey & settlement operations with the use of modern survey equipments. However under the 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Scheme of CLR, funds are provided to States for undertaking data entry work, setting up of computer centres at tehsil/taluk and sub-division level, imparting training to Revenue officials on application software & computerization technology.

The Committee of Revenue Secretaries of selected States constituted by this Department under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Land Resources in its report has recommended that the component of Survey & Settlement operations with the use of Modern Survey equipments like GPS & Total Stations which is presently being taken under the Scheme of SRA & ULR could be made a part of the Scheme of CLR so that updated land records data may be used for Computerization. The other components of the Scheme of SRA & ULR will continue to be funded on the existing pattern of 50:50.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

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

The matter for change in the funding pattern of the scheme of SRA & ULR from 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and States and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States was taken up with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission in their reply has mentioned that the 12th Finance Commission's Report provides more resources to States, which should assist them in meeting their matching contribution. Therefore, the existing funding pattern of 50:50 under the scheme of SRA & ULR should continue.

The matter will further be taken up with the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for their consideration.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)



### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

A copy of the summary of recommendations of the 12th Finance Commission's is enclosed at Appendix-I.

During the conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries of States organised by this department from time-to-time, States are being requested to undertake survey/revisional survey for creation & continuous updation of land records & cadastral maps with the use of latest technologies and equipments. It has also been emphasised to States to provide their matching share of 50 per cent and also take appropriate action for modernisation of Revenue Administration and updation of land records on regular basis.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

Out of 148 projects sanctioned under TDET, 22 projects were foreclosed. In this connection, it may be pointed out that pilot projects sanctioned under TDET have the specific purpose of validating appropriate technologies for wastelands development. If for some reason, this focus is not maintained, certain sanctioned projects are foreclosed since they are not expected to realise the intended purpose. The main reasons for these foreclosures were deviation from approved work plan, non-realisation of beneficiary/institutional contribution, delay in further release of funds by the implementing organizations, particularly Universities and delay in project implementation leading to expiry of sanctioned project period. In a few cases, all project works were completed at less than the estimated project cost, but the projects were shown as incomplete due to pendency of refund of unspent balances.

An amount of about Rs. 2.03 crore was released to these 22 foreclosed projects, out of which an expenditure of about Rs. 1.74 crore was made. An amount of Rs. 19.49 lakh has already been refunded by the implementing agencies out of the unspent balance of Rs. 29 lakh.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Paragraph No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

## CHAPTER V

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

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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 9th 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.

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

The exercise of updation of the Wasteland Atlas is to be completed by the end of the current financial year i.e. 2005-06 and it would reflect the current status of various categories of wastelands in the country. The observation of the Committee for developing a mechanism for periodic updation of data is valid and the Department would examine the proposition and work out its modalities.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

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

(Please see Paragraph No. 16 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 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.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Committee has very rightly noted that the wastelands when properly developed can be a major economic resource for the country. The State Governments have been asked to prepare a district-wise Perspective Plan for their respective States for a period of five years for tackling wastelands. This will ensure that funds from the Ministry of Rural Development are planned judiciously and the convergence among different programmes of the Ministry is meaningfully implemented.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 19 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para No. 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. Parthasarathy has been appointed for this purpose. The said Parthasarathy Committee will submit the report within six months. The Committee would like to be apprised of the recommendations of the said Committee when finalised.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Report of the Parthasarathy Committee is to be submitted by 31 October, 2005. The Department will be pleased to apprise the Standing Committee of the recommendations of the Parthasarathy Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)  
OM No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 24 August, 2005]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 25 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;  
12 December, 2005  
21 Agrahayana, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Rural Development.

## APPENDIX I

### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 12TH FINANCE COMMISSION

#### **Plan for Restructuring Public Finances**

1. By 2009-10, the combined tax-GDP ratio of the centre and the states should be increased to 17.6 per cent, primary expenditure to a level of 23 per cent of GDP and capital expenditure to nearly 7 per cent of GDP.  

(Para 4.52)
2. The combined debt-GDP ratio with external debt measured at historical exchange rate should, at a minimum, be brought down to 75 per cent by the end of 2009-10.  

(Para 4.45)
3. The system of on-lending should be brought to an end over time and the long term goal for the centre and states for the debt-GDP ratio should be 28 per cent each.  

(Para 4.45)
4. The fiscal deficit to GDP ratio targets for the centre and the states may be fixed at 3 per cent of GDP each.  

(Para 4.45)
5. The centre's interest payment relative to revenue receipts should reach about 28 per cent by 2009-10. In the case of states, the level of interest payments relative to revenue receipts should fall to about 15 per cent by 2009-10.  

(Para 4.54)
6. The revenue deficit relative to GDP for the centre and the states, for their combined as well as individual accounts should be brought down to zero by 2008-09.  

(Para 4.51)
7. States should follow a recruitment and wage policy, in a manner such that the total salary bill relative to revenue expenditure net of interest payments and pensions does not exceed 35 per cent.  

(Para 4.63)

8. Each state should enact a fiscal responsibility legislation, which should, at a minimum, provide for
  - (a) eliminating revenue deficit by 2008-09;
  - (b) reducing fiscal deficit to 3 per cent of GSDP or its equivalent, defined as the ratio of interest payment to revenue receipts;
  - (c) bringing out annual reduction targets of revenue and fiscal deficits;
  - (d) bringing out annual statement giving prospects for the state economy and related fiscal strategy; and
  - (e) bringing out special statements along with the budget giving in detail the number of employees in government, public sector, and aided institutions and related salaries.

(Para 4.79)

#### **Sharing of Union Tax Revenues**

9. The share of the states in the net proceeds of shareable central taxes shall be 30.5 per cent. For this purpose, additional excise duties in lieu of sales tax are treated as apart of the general pool of central taxes. If the tax rental arrangement is terminated and the states are allowed to levy sales tax (or VAT) on these commodities without any prescribed limit, the share of the states in the net proceeds of shareable central taxes shall be reduced to 29.5 per cent.

(Para 7.22)
10. If any legislation is enacted in respect of service tax after the eighty eighth Constitutional amendment is notified, it must be ensured that the revenue accruing to a state under the legislation should not be less than the share that would accrue to it, had the entire service tax proceeds been part of the shareable pool.

(Para 7.22)
11. The indicative amount of over all transfers to states may be fixed at 38 per cent of the central gross revenue receipt.

(Para 7.22)
12. The states should be given a share as specified in the following table in the net proceeds of all the shareable Union taxes in

each of the five financial years during the period 2005-06 to 2009-10.

(Para 7.35, 7.36)

State	Share (all shareable taxes excluding service tax) (per cent)	Share of Service Tax (per cent)
1	2	3
Andhra Pradesh	7.356	7.453
Arunachal Pradesh	0.288	0.292
Assam	3.235	3.277
Bihar	11.028	11.173
Chhattisgarh	2.654	2.689
Goa	0.259	0.262
Gujarat	3.569	3.616
Haryana	1.075	1.089
Himachal Pradesh	0.522	0.529
Jammu & Kashmir	1.297	Nil
Jharkhand	3.361	3.405
Karnataka	4.459	4.518
Kerala	2.665	2.700
Madhya Pradesh	6.711	6.799
Maharashtra	4.997	5.063
Manipur	0.362	0.367
Meghalaya	0.371	0.376
Mizoram	0.239	0.242
Nagaland	0.263	0.266
Orissa	5.161	5.229
Punjab	1.299	1.316

1	2	3
Rajasthan	5.609	5.683
Sikkim	0.227	0.230
Tamil Nadu	5.305	5.374
Tripura	0.428	0.433
Uttar Pradesh	19.264	19.517
Uttaranchal	0.939	0.952
West Bengal	7.057	7.150
All States	100.000	100.000

#### Local Bodies

13. A total grant of Rs. 20000 crore for the panchayati raj institutions and Rs. 5000 crore for the urban local bodies may be given to the states for the period 2005-10 with *inter se* distribution as indicated in Table 8.1

(Para 8.38)

14. The PRIs should be encouraged to take over the assets relating to water supply and sanitation and utilize the grants for repairs/ rejuvenation as also the O&M costs. The PRIs should, however, recover at least 50 percent of the recurring costs in the form of user charges.

(Para 8.40)

15. Out of the grants allocated for the panchayats, priority should be given to expenditure on the O&M costs of water supply and sanitation. This will facilitate panchayats to take over the schemes and operate them.

(Para 8.41)

16. At least 50 per cent of the grants provided to each state for the urban local bodies should be earmarked for the scheme of solid waste management through public-private partnership. The municipalities should concentrate on collection, segregation and transportation of solid waste. The cost of these activities, whether carried out in house or out sourced, could be met from the grants.

(Para 8.42)



17. Besides expenditure on the O&M costs of water supply and sanitation in rural areas and on the schemes of solid waste management in urban areas, PRIs and ULBs should, out of the grants allocated, give high priority to expenditure on creation of data base and maintenance of accounts through the use of modern technology and management systems, wherever possible. Some of the modern methods like GIS (Geographic Information Systems) for mapping of properties in urban areas and computerization for switching over to a modern system of financial management would go a long way in creating strong local governments, fulfilling the spirit of the 73rd and 74th Constitutional amendments.

(Para 8.43)

18. The States may assess the requirement of each local body on the basis of the principles stated by us and earmark funds accordingly out of the total allocation recommended by us.

(Para 8.43)

19. Grants have not been recommended separately for the normal and the excluded areas under the fifth and sixth schedule of the Constitution. The States having such areas may distribute the grants recommended by us to all local bodies, including those in the excluded areas, in a fair and just manner.

(Para 8.51)

20. The Central Government should not impose any condition other than those prescribed by us, for release or utilization of these grants, which are largely in the nature of a correction of vertical imbalance between the Centre and the States.

(Para 8.52)

21. The normal practice of insisting on the utilization of amounts already released before further releases are considered, may continue and the grants may be released to a state only after it certifies that the previous releases have been passed on to the local bodies. The amounts due to the States in the first year of our award period *i.e.* 2005-06 may be released without such an insistence.

(Para 8.52)

22. State Governments should not take more than 15 days in transferring the grants to local bodies after these are released by the Central Government. The Centre should take a serious view of any undue delay on the part of the State.

(Para 8.53)

23. The Central Government should take note of our views on the issues listed in para 8.23, while formulating or revising various policy measures. In particular, action may be taken to raise the ceiling on profession tax.

(Para 8.23)

24. The state should adopt the best practices listed in para 8.19 to improve the resources of the panchayats.

(Para 8.19)

25. The suggestions made by us in respect of State Finance Commissions in paras 8.29 to 8.37 and 8.54 should be acted upon with a view to strengthening the institution of SFCs, so that it may play an effective role in the system of fiscal transfers to the third tier of government.

(Para 8.29 to 8.37, 8.54)

#### **Calamity Relief**

26. The scheme of CRF be continued in its present form with contributions from the Centre and the States in the ratio of 75:25.

(Paras 9.10, 9.11)

27. The size of the CRF for our award period is worked out at Rs. 21333.33 crore.

(Para 9.11)

28. The scheme of NCCF may continue in its present form with core corpus of Rs. 500 crore. The outgo from the fund may continue to be replenished by way of collection of National Calamity Contingent Duty and levy of special surcharges.

(Para 9.16, 9.17)

29. The definition of natural calamity, as applicable at present, may be expanded to cover landslides, avalanches, cloud burst and pest attacks.

(Para 9.12)

30. The Centre may continue to make allocation of foodgrains to the needy States as a relief measure, but a transparent policy in this regard is required to be put in place.

(Para 9.18)

31. A committee consisting of scientists, flood control specialists and other experts be set up to study and map the hazards to which several States are subject to.

(Para 9.14)

32. The provision for disaster preparedness and mitigation needs to be built into the State plans, and not as a part of calamity relief.

(Para 9.14)

#### **Grants-in-aid to States**

33. The system of imposing a 70:30 ratio between loans and grants for extending plan assistance to non-special category States (10:90 in the case of special category states) should be done away with. Instead, the centre should confine itself to extending plan grants to the States, and leave it to the States to decide how much they wish to borrow and from whom.

(Para 10.4)

34. A total non-plan revenue deficit grant of Rs. 56855.87 crore is recommended during the award period for fifteen States (*vide* Table 10.4).

(Paras 10.12, 10.13)

35. Eight States have been recommended for grants amounting to Rs. 10171.65 crore over the award period for the education sector, with a minimum of Rs. 20 crore in a year for any eligible State (*vide* Table 10.5).

(Para 10.17)

36. Seven States have been recommended for grants amounting to Rs. 5887.08 crore over the award period for the health sector (major heads 2210 and 2211), with a minimum of Rs. 10 crore a year for any eligible State (*vide* Table 10.6).

(Para 10.18)

37. The grants for the education and health sectors are an additionality, over and above the normal expenditure to be incurred by the States in these sectors. These grants should be utilised only for the respective sectors (non-plan), *i.e.*, major head 2202 in the case of education and major heads 2210 and 2211 in the case of health. Conditionalities governing the releases

and utilisation of these grants have been specified in annexures 10.1 to 10.3. No further conditionalities should be imposed by the Central or the State Government for the release or utilisation of these grants. Monitoring of the expenditure relating to these grants will rest with the State Government concerned.

(Para 10.19)

38. A grant of Rs. 15,000 crore over the award period is recommended for maintenance of roads and bridges. This amount will be in addition to the normal expenditure which the States would be incurring on maintenance of roads and bridges. This amount will be provided in equal instalments over the last four years (*i.e.*, 2006-07 to 2009-10) of the award period, so that the States get a year for making preparations to absorb these funds.

(Para 10.21)

39. An amount of Rs. 5000 crore is recommended as grants for maintenance of public buildings.

(Para 10.22)

40. The maintenance grants for roads and bridges, and for buildings, are an additionality, over and above the normal maintenance expenditure to be incurred by the States. These grants should be released and spent in accordance with the conditionalities indicated in annexures 10.4 to 10.6.

(Para 10.23)

41. A grant of Rs. 1000 crore spread over the award period 2005-10 is recommended for maintenance of forests. This would be an additionality over and above what the States would be spending through their forest departments. It should also result in increased expenditure to the extent of this grant, in addition to the normal expenditure of the forest department.

(Para 10.25)

42. A grant of Rs. 625 crore spread over the award period is recommended for heritage conservation. This grant will be used for preservation and protection of historical monuments, archaeological sites, public libraries, museums and archives, and also for improving the tourist infrastructure to facilitate visits to these sites.

(Para 10.26)

43. An amount of Rs. 7100 crore has been recommended as grant for State specific needs. While these grants have been phased out equally over the last four years, this phasing should be taken as indicative in nature. The States may communicate the required phasing of grants to the Central Government (*vide* Table 10.11).

(Para 10.28)

#### **Fiscal Reform Facility**

44. The scheme of Fiscal Reform Facility may not continue over the period 2005-10, as the scheme of debt relief, as described in chapter 12 obviates the need for a separate Fiscal Reform Facility.

(Para 11.25)

#### **Debt Relief and Corrective Measures**

45. Each State must enact a fiscal responsibility legislation prescribing specific annual targets with a view to eliminating the revenue deficit by 2008-09 and reducing fiscal deficits based on a path for reduction of borrowings and guarantees. Enacting the fiscal responsibility legislation on the lines indicated in chapter 4 will be a necessary pre-condition for availing of debt relief.

(Para 12.36)

46. Debt relief may not be linked with performance in human development or investment climate.

(Para 12.38)

47. The central loans to states contracted till 31.3.04 and outstanding on 31.3.05 (amounting to Rs. 128795 crore) may be consolidated and rescheduled for a fresh term of 20 years (resulting in repayment in 20 equal instalments), and an interest rate of 7.5 per cent be charged on them. This will be subject to the state enacting the fiscal responsibility legislation and will take effect prospectively from the year in which such legislation is enacted.

(Para 12.42)

48. A debt write-off scheme linked to the reduction of revenue deficit of States may be introduced. Under the scheme, the repayments due from 2005-06 to 2009-10 on central loans contracted up to 31.3.04 and recommended to be consolidated will be eligible for write off. The quantum of write off of

repayment will be linked to the absolute amount by which the revenue deficit is reduced in each successive year during the award period. The reduction in the revenue deficit must be cumulatively higher than the cumulative reduction attributable to the interest relief recommended by us. Also, the fiscal deficit of the State must be contained at least to the level of 2004-05. In effect, if the revenue deficit is brought down to zero, the entire repayments during the period will be written off. The enactment of the fiscal responsibility legislation would be a necessary pre-condition for availing the debt relief under this scheme also with the benefit accruing prospectively. Details of the scheme have been outlined in para 12.44

(Para 12.43)

49. The Central Government should not act as an intermediary for future lending and allow the States to approach the market directly. If some fiscally weak States are unable to raise funds from the market, the Centre could borrow for the purpose of on lending to such states, but the interest rates should remain aligned to the marginal cost of borrowing for the Centre.

(Para 12.46)

50. External assistance may be transferred to States on the same terms and conditions as attached to such assistance by external funding agencies, thereby making Government of India a financial intermediary without any gain or loss. The external assistance passed through to States should be managed through a separate fund in the public account.

(Para 12.49)

51. The moratorium on repayments and interest payments on the outstanding special term loan amounting to Rs. 3772 crore as on 31.3.2000 given to Punjab may continue for another two years *i.e.* up to 2006-07, by which time the Central Government must finalize the quantum of debt relief to be allowed in terms of the recommendations of the EFC.

(Para 12.51)

52. In respect of relief and rehabilitation loans given to Gujarat from ADB and World Bank through the Central Government, the Central Government may, if the Government of Gujarat so desires, alter the terms and conditions of these loans, so that these are available to Gujarat on the same terms on which the external agencies have extended these loans.

(Para 12.55)

53. All States should set up sinking funds for amortization of all loans including loans from banks, liabilities on account of NSSF etc. The fund should be maintained outside the consolidated fund of the States and the public account and should not be used for any other purpose, except for redemption of loans.

(Para 12.59)

54. States should set up guarantee redemption funds through earmarked guarantee fees. This should be preceded by risk weighing of guarantees. The quantum of contribution to the fund should be decided accordingly.

(Para 12.60)

#### **Profit Petroleum**

55. The Union should share the profit petroleum from NELP areas with the States from where the mineral oil and natural gas are produced. The share should be in the ratio of 50 : 50.

(Para 13.31)

56. There need not be sharing of profits in respect of nomination fields and non-NELP blocks.

(Para 13.32)

57. The revenues earned by the Central Government on contracts signed under the coal bed methane policy may be shared with the producing States in the same manner as profit petroleum.

(Para 13.33)

58. In respect of any mineral, if a loss of revenue is anticipated for a State in the process of implementation of a policy, which involves production sharing, a similar compensation mechanism should be adopted by the Central Government.

(Para 13.34)

#### **A Permanent Secretariat for the Finance Commission**

59. The finance commission division of the Ministry of Finance should be converted into a full-fledged department, serving as the permanent secretariat for the finance commissions. This secretariat should be vested with the powers of a full-fledged department of the Government, with Ministry of Finance only as its nodal ministry for the purpose of linkage with the Parliament.

(Paras 14.6, 14.7)

60. The expenditure of finance commissions should be treated as expenditure "charged" on the consolidated fund of India.  
(Para 14.9)
61. A research committee should be set up with adequate funding to organize studies relevant to fiscal federalism.  
(Para 14.8)
62. The finance commissions should have a tenure of at least 3 years to enable them to do their work adequately.  
(Para 14.8)
63. The Thirteenth Finance Commission should be set up at the beginning of 2007 and appropriate and adequate arrangements for the office and residence of the chairman and members of the Commission must be made before the appointment of the Commission, so that Commission's time is not wasted in routine administrative matters.  
(Para 14.8)

#### **Monitoring Mechanism**

64. Every State should set up a high level monitoring committee headed by the Chief Secretary with the Finance Secretary and the Secretaries/heads of departments as members for monitoring proper utilization of finance commission grants.  
(Paras 14.11, 14.12)
65. The monitoring committee should meet at least once in every quarter to review the utilization of the grants and to issue directions for mid-course correction, if considered necessary.  
(Para 14.12)
66. The monitoring committee should be responsible for monitoring both financial and physical targets and for ensuring adherence to the specific conditionalities in respect of each grant, wherever applicable.  
(Para 14.11)
67. In the beginning of the year, the monitoring committee should approve finance commission assisted projects to be undertaken in each sector, quantify the targets, both in physical and financial terms and lay down the time period for achieving specific milestones.  
(Para 14.11)



### **Accounting Procedure**

68. Central Government should gradually move towards accrual basis of accounting.

(Para 14.16)

69. In the interim period, additional information in the form of statements should be appended to the present system of cash accounting to enable more informed decision-making. The additional information may relate to subsidies, expenditure on salaries, expenditure on pensions, committed liabilities, maintenance expenditure, segregation of salary and non-salary portions and liabilities and repayment schedule on outstanding debts.

(Para 14.16)

70. The definition of revenue and fiscal deficits be standardized and instructions for a uniform classification code down to the object head may be issued to all the States.

(Para 14.17)

71. A National Institute of Public Financial Accountants be set up by the Government of India and its charter be decided in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General.

(Para 14.18)

**C. Rangarajan**  
*Chairman*

**Shankar N. Acharya**  
*Member*

**T. R. Prasad**  
*Member*

**D. K. Srivastava**  
*Member*

**G. C. Srivastava**  
*Member Secretary*

**New Delhi**  
November 30, 2004

I am happy to record my deep appreciation of the unstinted cooperation and support provided by Members of the Commission. The Report is a joint effort and has benefited from the wealth of knowledge and experience brought to bear on it by each Member. I also wish to thank Shri Som Pal, who was a member of the Commission till May, 2004. He articulated his views with great clarity and sincerity in the various discussions that the Commission had. I must place on record the exemplary services rendered by the Member Secretary, Dr. G.C. Srivastava, who, besides making a substantive contribution to the Report, provided effective leadership to the Secretariat and organized meticulously the multifarious work related to the Commission. His experience at the various levels of Government was a great asset to the Commission.

**New Delhi;**  
*November 30, 2004*

**C. Rangarajan**  
*Chairman*

## APPENDIX II

### COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

#### EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 12 DECEMBER, 2005

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room 'E',  
Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Hannan Mollah
3. Shri Dawa Narbula
4. Shri Prabodh Panda
5. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
6. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

#### *Rajya Sabha*

7. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
8. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
9. Shri Penumalli Madhu
10. Dr. Chandan Mitra
11. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
12. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration Memorandum No. 4 alongwith the draft Action Taken Report on Tenth Report of the Committee, on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development). While considering para No. 7 of the draft Report, the Committee desired that name of selected States whose Revenue Secretaries are represented in the Committee of Revenue Secretaries constituted by the Department of Land Resources for the purpose of updation of land records be obtained from the Department of Land Resources and incorporated suitably in the recommendation. After deliberations the Committee adopted the draft Action Taken Report with slight modifications.

3. \*\*\*

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid draft Action Taken 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.*

---

\*\*\*Relevant portions of the minutes are not related to the subject have been kept separately.

### APPENDIX III

(Vide Para 4 of the Introduction)

#### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE TENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (14TH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	36
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos. 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.31, 2.32, 2.46, 2.47, 2.55, 2.56, 3.25, 3.53, 3.55, 3.73, 3.74, 3.94 and 3.101	16
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(44.44%)
III.	Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies: Para No. 2.37	1
	Percentage to the total recommendation	(2.79%)
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Para Nos. 2.12, 2.16, 2.30, 2.43, 2.57, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.54, 3.75, 3.76, 3.91, 3.92, 3.93 and 3.102	16
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(44.44%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited: Para Nos. 2.38, 2.42 and 2.63	3
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(8.33%)