

19

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

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2006-2007)**

NINETEENTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

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

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2006-2007)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 18.5.2006

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 18.5.2006



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

May, 2006/Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)

C.R.D. No. 25

Price : Rs. 106.00

© 2006 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

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

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory.....	1
CHAPTER II	Analysis of the overall allocation of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	4
CHAPTER III	Major issues related to wastelands development in the country	14
CHAPTER IV	Analysis of schemes under Wastelands Development Division	31
CHAPTER V	Analysis of schemes under Land Reforms Division	44

APPENDICES

I.	Statement showing Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditure during 9th Plan by the Department of Land Resources ..	54
II.	Statement showing proposed outlay, outlay agreed to, Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure, during 10th Plan by the Department of Land Resources	56
III.	Recommendation para no. 28, 16th Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)	58
IV.	Statement showing State-wise and Year-wise IWDP Projects sanctioned during 9th Plan.....	60
V.	Statement showing State-wise and Year-wise IWDP Projects sanctioned during 10th Plan.....	61

	PAGE
VI. Statement showing details of District/Tehsil/sub-Division in which CLR Programme has been sanctioned and completed.....	63
VII. Extracts of the Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 21 March, 2006.....	66
VIII. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 12 April, 2006	69
IX. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 8 May, 2006.....	72
X. Statement of recommendations and observations ..	74

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. Vacant
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.

@Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil, MP (LS) and member of the Committee ceased to be member of the Lok Sabha *vide* Notification No. 21/5/2005/T *w.e.f.* 23.12.2005 (AN).

Rajya Sabha

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Vacant
24. Vacant
25. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
26. Shri Penumalli Madhu
27. Vacant
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. 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.

#Shrimati Vanga Geetha, MP (RS), Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar, MP(RS), Shri Kalraj Mishra, MP(RS), Dr. Faguni Ram MP(RS) and Prof. R.B.S. Varma, MP (RS) and members of the Committee on Rural Development ceased to be members of the Rajya Sabha due to completion of the tenure of the members of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 2.4.2006 *vide* Coordination Cell note dated 23.3.2006.

ABBREVIATIONS

BE	—	Budget Estimates
BPL	—	Below Poverty Line
CLR	—	Computerisation of Land Records
CSIR	—	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DDP	—	Desert Development Programme
DFID	—	Department for International Development
DOAC	—	Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
DoLR	—	Department of Land Resources
DoWD	—	Department of Wastelands Development
DPAP	—	Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
EFC	—	Expenditure Finance Committee
IAY	—	Indira Awaas Yojana
ICAR	—	Indian Council for Agricultural Research
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
LBSNAA	—	Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration
NABARD	—	National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development
NALRM	—	National Agency on Land Resources Management
NIC	—	National Informatics Centre
NIRD	—	National Institute of Rural Development
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NREGS	—	National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
NWDB	—	National Wastelands Development Board
PLA	—	Project Implementation Agency
PMGJSY	—	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
RoR	—	Record of Rights
SAUs	—	State Agriculture Universities
SGSY	—	Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SHGs	—	Self-Help Groups
SRA&ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	—	Technology Development Extension and Training
TERI	—	The Energy and Resources Institute
UGs	—	User Groups
UT	—	Union Territory
WA	—	Watershed Association
WC	—	Watershed Committee
WDF	—	Watershed Development Fund
ZP	—	Zilla Parishad

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Committee examined the Demands for Grants pertaining to the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) for the year 2006-2007 which were laid on the Table of the House on 11 March, 2006.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 12 April, 2006.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 8 May, 2006.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
17 May, 2006

27 Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

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

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

1.3 The following functions have been assigned to the Department of Land Resources as per the Allocation of Business Rules:

- (i) National Land Use and Wasteland Development Council;
- (ii) Promotion of Rural Employment through Wastelands Development;
- (iii) Promotion of production of fuel-wood, fodder and timber on non-forest lands, including private wastelands;
- (iv) Research and development of appropriate low cost technologies for increasing productivity of wastelands in sustainable ways;
- (v) Inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary coordination in programme planning and implementation of the Wastelands Development Programme including training;
- (vi) Promotion of people's participation and public cooperation and co-ordination of efforts of Panchayats and other voluntary and non-Government agencies for Wastelands Development;
- (vii) Area specific development programmes to counter endemic problems due to adverse climatic conditions and degeneration of the eco-system (DPAP, DDP);

- (viii) Administration of Land Acquisition Act, 1894; and matters relating to acquisition of land for the purpose of the Union.
- (ix) Land reforms, land tenures, land records, consolidation of holding and other related matters.
- (x) Recovery of claims in a State in respect of taxes and other public demands, including arrears of land revenue and sums recoverable as such arrears, arising outside that State.
- (xi) Land that is to say, collection of rents, transfer and alienation of land, land improvement and agricultural loans excluding acquisition of non-agricultural land or buildings, town planning improvements;
- (xii) Land revenue, including the assessment and collection of revenue, survey of revenue purposes, alienation of revenues; and
- (xiii) Duties in respect of succession to agricultural land.

1.4 With a view to carry out the assigned functions, the department of Land Resources implements the following Schemes:

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

1.5 The Department of Land Resources comprises of two divisions namely Wastelands Development Division and Land Reforms Division.

1.6 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for the year 2006-2007 are Rs. 1,421.70 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.7 The Demands for Grants of the Department were presented to Lok Sabha under Demand No. 79.

1.8 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in Lok Sabha on 11 March, 2006.

1.9 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the overall analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demands for Grants (2006-2007).

CHAPTER II

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

Status of Implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in their Second and Tenth Reports under direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha

As per direction 73A of the Directions of the Speaker, Lok Sabha, the Minister concerned shall make once in six months a statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Reports of Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry.

2.2 Second Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2004-05) was presented to Parliament on 18 August, 2004. Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development made a statement in the House in pursuance of direction 73A on 6 May, 2005. On examination of the statement it was found that the status of action taken on each of the 41 recommendations was not indicated in the statement. The general remarks on the action taken by the Government on few recommendations was made. As such the statement was found to be deficient of the set procedure. Further the Committee presented Tenth Report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) of the Department of Land Resources to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005. The statement with regard to this Report has fallen due on 19 October, 2005.

2.3 The Department of Land Resources was requested to take necessary action for tabling the revised statement with regard to Second Report and making a statement by Hon'ble Minister in respect of Tenth Report *vide* Lok Sabha Secretariat OM dated 20 January, 2006 and subsequent reminders dated 24 February, 2006 and 14 March, 2006. Besides the format in which the statement has to be made was also sent to the Department for their use. In spite of this revised statement in respect of Second Report and the statement in respect of Tenth Report is yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister.

2.4 When asked about the reasons for delay in making the statements on the status of implementation of recommendations of the Committee made in Second and Tenth Reports, it has been submitted that after receipt of O.M. dated 20 January, 2006 from Lok Sabha Secretariat, Department is preparing revised statement. The revised statement regarding status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Second Report and statement regarding status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Tenth Report shall be tabled in the ensuing sitting of the Parliament.

2.5 The Committee note that the primary objective of inserting direction 73A in the Directions by the Speaker was to make the Government more accountable for implementation of the various recommendations of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that even after elapse of around six months when the statement on Tenth Report has fallen due and about three months when the Ministry was requested for making the revised statement in respect of Second Report, the statements are yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister. The Committee find that the Department is taking the desired action to make the statements in the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements are made at the earliest during the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee further strongly recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements on each of the reports are made within the specified period i.e., six months after the presentation of the Report to Parliament as per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, in future.

Ninth Plan (1997-2002) and Tenth Plan (2002-2007)

(Allocations, Releases and Unspent Balances)

2.6 The information regarding 9th Plan (1997-2002) outlay and expenditure, 10th Plan (2002-2007) outlay as proposed by the Department and as agreed to by Planning Commission, BE, RE and expenditure as on 31.3.2006 and BE 2006-2007 overall as well as scheme-wise has been indicated in Appendices-I & II.

2.7 The following is the analysis of comparative proposed/agreed to outlay and shortfall between the two and underspending during

9th Plan (1997-2002) and during first four years of the 10th Plan (2002-2007):

		(Rs. in crore)	
		9th Plan	10th Plan
(i)	Proposed outlay	6545.46	5965.00
(ii)	Agreed Outlay	2767.30	6526.00
(iii)	Difference between proposed and agreed outlay	3778.16	+561.00
(iv)	Expenditure	2479.11	4289.97 (upto 31.3.2006)
(v)	Likely allocation during 10th Plan		Rs. 4289.97 (exp. upto 31.3.06)+ Rs. 1421.70 (BE 2006-07) =5711.67

2.8 The following conclusions can be drawn by analyzing the aforesaid data:

- (i) The proposed outlay during 10th Plan is Rs. 580.46 crore lesser than proposed outlay during 9th Plan;
- (ii) The agreed outlay during 10th Plan is more than double of 9th Plan agreed outlay;
- (iii) During 9th Plan, the agreed allocation is Rs. 3,778.16 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. However, during 10th Plan, Rs. 561 crore more have been allocated than the proposed outlay.

2.9 With regard to getting almost 40 per cent of the proposed allocation during 9th Plan, the representative of Department of Land Resources during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

“In the Ninth Plan, there has been a slow utilisation especially in the first two years. That is one of the reasons why new guidelines were formulated. It took quite sometime for the field agencies to adapt to these new guidelines. That is one of the reasons for this. This took off in the subsequent years.”

2.10 When asked the reasons for lesser projections during 10th Plan as compared to 9th Plan, the representative further stated as under:

“It is finalized in the Planning Commission after some interaction thereafter, it is learnt from the Planning Commission which areas are to be prioritized Rs. 1,000 crore were provided for ‘New Initiatives’ during the Tenth Plan period. I have some information with me regarding Tenth Plan and that is around to Rs. 5,500 crore. We have planned a new programme on Bio-fuel. It is still in formative stage and is not fully operational.”

2.11 At this the Committee further wanted to know whether the Department of Land Resources are not sending proposals to the Planning Commission and in other words the Planning Commission is doing the work of the Department of Land Resources or somewhere the mistake has been on the part of the Department in not sending proper proposals to Planning Commission, the Secretary, Land Resources admitting candidly informed as under:

“Mistakes can be committed.....”

2.12 As reported in the Mid-Term Appraisal of 10th Plan, availability of land per person has decreased from 0.44 hectares in 1991 to 0.20 hectares in 2001 due to increase in population. The other issues which need to be examined are poor participation of women, satisfactory level of people’s participation, lack of coordination between different Ministries/Organisations involved in watershed schemes lack of direct flow of benefits to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and other landless poor masses.

The Report of the Technical Committee on watershed programmes in India

2.13 The Technical Committee on Watershed Programmes in India’ was constituted by the Department of Land Resources on 14 February, 2005. The Committee was required to submit its report by 31 October, 2005 but with a spill over beyond that date and two months extension granted, the report was finally approved on 16 January, 2006. In Chapter I of the report, it has been stated that it is the rainfed parts of Indian agriculture that have the weakest, and the one that contain the greatest unutilized potential for growth. Further it has been stated that the production of dryland agriculture needs to be developed if food security demands of the year 2020 are to have a realistic chance of being met.

2.14 Another issue that came up for examination was huge unspent balances available with Department of Land Resources. The Committee during the course of evidence pointed out that although good utilisation position has been shown by the Department in the Budget Document, yet there has been an unspent balance to the tune of Rs. 1,405.20 crore in different schemes.

Priorities fixed for 11th Five Year Plan

2.15 The Department has informed that the Planning Commission constitutes working groups to prepare approach paper and action plan in respect of each Department. The approach paper and action plan for the total plan period are discussed and finalized in the Steering Committee. Planning Commission has constituted two working groups on 'Land Relations' and 'Rainfed Areas' for 11th Five Year Plan which include activities related to DoLR.

2.16 The Secretary during the course of briefing before the Committee on the Demands for Grants 2006-07 has informed that some private corporates have evidenced interest in the field of development of wastelands. She also informed that the participation of private sector in the field of wastelands development was at a discussion state and it will have a new strategy for Eleventh Plan. Further she informed that in some of the Western States there is an interest shown by the corporate bodies in wastelands development. The strategy with regard to the private sector participation is not finalised. It need not be a corporate body, it can be other kinds of private-public participation.

2.17 The Committee find from the data indicated for 9th and 10th Plan that there is huge mismatch between the proposed allocation and agreed to allocation. Whereas during 9th Plan, the allocation as agreed to is around 40 per cent of the proposed outlay, the agreed to allocation during 10th Plan is Rs. 561 crore more than the proposed outlay. The department has submitted new guidelines as a reason for slow utilisation and getting lesser allocation during 9th Plan. The reasons put forth by the Department for getting around 40 per cent of the proposed allocation during 9th Plan are not convincing. The plea accorded by the Department for getting more than the proposed allocation during Tenth Plan is that Rs. 1,000 crore was provided for 'New Initiatives' and thus the outlay agreed for Tenth Plan would come up to Rs. 5,526 crore which is Rs. 439 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. Even if it is accepted, the projected outlay during 10th Plan was Rs. 580.46 crore lesser than proposed outlay during 9th Plan.

The Committee are surprised to find that the proposed allocation during 9th Plan was higher when the guidelines were new but during 10th Plan, the projections were reduced, even when the field agencies had adapted themselves to the new guidelines. The Committee conclude that the projections are not properly presented to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for different plans. Even the Secretary during the course of the oral evidence has admitted that somewhere the mistake is there. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should take utmost care while making projections for 11th Plan. The perspective plans for wastelands development should be prepared by the various State Governments after due consultations with the Implementing Agencies. Not only that district level plans should be prepared after taking into consideration the total work to be undertaken keeping in view the area of wastelands in that area, the capacity of the implementing agencies etc., while holding key consultation at the grass-root level and at the Panchayat level. With regard to other schemes for land records also the projections should be made keeping in view the work completed and the pending work. The projections should be realistic to the extent possible. Besides, the outlay, strategy and priorities during 11th Plan should be chalked out well before the start of the 11th Plan i.e. the year 2007-2008, so as to ensure meaningful utilisation of outlay. The early finalisation of outlay for the 11th Plan would further enable the State Governments/ implementing agencies to make timely allocations under different schemes/programmes.

2.18 The Committee further find from the data of allocation of outlay that whatever may be the case of placing projections for different schemes of the Department, it is certain that adequate priority has been accorded by the Government while finalising the outlay for 10th Plan. It is very rare when any Ministry/Department has been allocated resources more than the projections. The Committee also observe that the focused and balanced development of wastelands is imperative keeping in view the decline in the availability of land per person over the years. Further, the facts revealed by the Parthasarthy Committee establish that there is concentration of poverty in the dry lands of the country. From the position as indicated above, the Committee find that more attention needs to be given for the development of wastelands in the country. The wastelands when developed can be a major source for fulfilling the need for food and water security. Not only that it can be a major source for providing employment to the poorest of poor in the country. The detailed scheme-wise position of outlay, expenditure

and physical achievement has been analysed in the succeeding chapter of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend for adequate outlay for different schemes of wastelands in the country. Besides recommending for higher outlay, there is an urgent need for successful implementation of the schemes/programmes which has been reviewed by the Committee in detail in the succeeding chapter of the report.

2.19 The Committee observe that Parthasarthy Committee has analysed the watershed programmes in detail and given detailed valuable recommendations. The recommendations of the said Committee should be carefully examined while holding wide-ranging consultations with all concerned and the Department should take the desired action to implement the accepted recommendations of the Committee. The Standing Committee should also be kept apprised of the status of the implementation of the major recommendations of the Parthasarthy Committee.

2.20 The Committee further find from the information provided by the Department that Rs. 1,000 crore was earmarked for new initiatives during 10th Plan. Even when the 10th Plan is coming to an end, no new initiative could be finalised. The new programme 'Bio-fuel' proposed by the Department is still at a nascent stage. The Committee in their earlier reports on Demands for Grants had repeatedly been expressing concern over the way new schemes are proposed. The Committee express strong concern over the way the scarce resources are being blocked for the new schemes, which are not implemented. The blocking of resources in this way clearly means depriving the other schemes/programmes of their due share. The Committee hold the strong view that the new schemes should be properly planned and the allocation should be earmarked only when the spadework has been done and all the paraphernalia to implement the scheme is ready.

2.21 The Committee note that the Planning Commission has constituted two working groups on Land Relations and Rainfed Areas for Eleventh Five Year Plan to finalise the strategy for the development of wastelands. The expected role of private sector in the task of development of wastelands is also being discussed while chalking out the strategy for Eleventh Plan. The Committee note that the major apprehension in involving private sector is that the interests of the local people may not be harmed. They feel that the Government should carefully consider the issue of involvement of private sector in consultation with the State Governments and local bodies. The Committee further recommend that strategy for the Eleventh Plan should be finalised expeditiously.

2.22 The comparative position of outlay proposed, earmarked and expenditure met during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07.

	(Rs. in crore) (both for the plan and non-plan)
2004-05	
Proposed outlay	1361.00
Agreed to/BE	1264.48
RE	1053.43
Actual expenditure	1013.61
2005-06	
Proposed outlay	1488.00
Agreed to/BE	1399.44
Actual expenditure	1399.21
2006-07	
Proposed outlay	2110.00
Agreed to/BE	1421.70

2.23 The following status with regard to the unspent balances as on 31 December, 2005 under different schemes of the Department has been indicated in the Budget document.

Sl.No.	Name of the Scheme	Unspent Balance (Rs. in crore)
1.	DPAP	447.52
2.	IWDP	405.28
3.	DDP	314.22
4.	CLR	132.40
5.	SRA&ULR	105.78
	Total	1405.20

2.24 Justifying the position of unspent balances, the Department has informed as under:

“The next instalment of the project is due after utilisation of 50 per cent of the previous instalment. Data under unspent balances furnishes information about the fund available under

watershed projects at DRDA level as on the date of reporting. The total project cost is Rs. 4,708 crore under IWDP for 1,382 projects under implementation for treatment of an area of 84.56 lakh hectares. Similarly, the total project cost is Rs. 6,469.20 crore and Rs. 3,817.68 crore under DPAP and DDP respectively for 24,363 and 13,476 projects under implementation for treatment of an area of 121.82 lakh ha. and 67.38 lakh ha. Under DPAP and DDP respectively. As such unspent balance usually does not exceed 10 per cent of the project cost at any point of time. This much balance is necessitated to maintain availability of funds at the implementation level to avoid eventuality of non-payment of wages as these are labour intensive projects.”

2.25 During the course of evidence on the issue of the mechanism available to persuade the slow performing States to complete different schemes in time, the Secretary, Land Resources stated as under:

“xxx they (State Governments) will come back asking for further money and we will release further money on the basis of mid-term evaluation etc. We have given seven instalments over a five year period. This mechanism is adopted for knowing the amount of money unspent. The wasteland projects being implemented by DRDAs/ZPs are to be completed in a period of five years. Only after a minimum of 50 per cent expenditure of the previous instalment released, again they may claim for the next instalment. But there is a continuing dialogue. Whatever expenditure is lying unspent it is reviewed at District level Watershed Committee and State level Watershed Committee.”

2.26 The Committee note from the trends of allocation of outlay during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 that the agreed allocation is lesser than the proposed allocation. During the year 2006-07, the agreed allocation is Rs. 689 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. The Committee find it interesting that whereas the overall allocation for 10th Plan is more than the projections, the allocations under Annual Plans are lesser than the projection. It is difficult to understand the way the budgeting exercise is being undertaken where there seems to be no planning. The Committee would like to be apprised of the basis of making projections under each of the Annual Plan.

2.27 Whereas the releases from the Centre have been stated to be almost cent per cent of the allocated outlay, the unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 1,405 crore with the implementing agencies is

really a matter of concern to the Committee. They are not convinced with the plea given by the Department whereby the Department has tried to justify the unspent amount by stating that the unspent balance do not exceed 10 per cent of the project cost at any point of time. The Department holds the view that the balance is necessitated to maintain availability of funds at the implementation level to avoid eventualities of non-payment of wages as wastelands development projects are labour intensive projects. However, the Committee wish to point out that Rs. 1,405 crore is almost equal to the overall allocation of the Department during the year 2006-07. The Committee feel that the unspent balances should be seen with reference to the allocation made during a particular year and not with reference to the total project cost under different schemes. The projects may continue even after five to seven years. Roll-on money to the tune of 10 to 20 per cent of the allocation under a scheme during a year can be justified on the grounds stated by the Department. The justification of unspent balance corresponding to the total project cost can not be understood. The Committee find that instead of taking stringent measures for keeping the unspent balances to the minimum, the Department has tried to justify it which the Committee really disapprove. The Department should take all the corrective measures and inform the Committee accordingly.

CHAPTER III

MAJOR ISSUES RELATED TO WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRY

Brief regarding the schemes of the Department related to wastelands development.

(a) Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme is an on-going scheme under which major projects are undertaken on micro watershed basis. The projects are being funded on sharing basis in the ratio of 11:1 between the Centre and the States *w.e.f.* 1 April, 2000. Prior to this the projects were being funded on 100 per cent basis by the Central Government. The projects under this Programme are generally sanctioned in non-DPAP/non-DDP Blocks.

(b) Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)

3.2 Drought Prone Areas Programme is an area development programme designed to tackle the problem of drought with a long term perspective based on strategy of optimum utilisation of land, water and human resources. This is a Centrally sponsored scheme, which used to be funded on a matching basis by the Centre and States. However, with effect from 1 April, 1999 the funds are released for projects under the programme on 75 : 25 sharing basis between the Centre and State Governments. At present, the Programme is in operation in 972 blocks in 183 districts of 16 States.

(c) Desert Development Programme (DDP)

3.3 Desert Development Programme aims at controlling desertification and to conserve, develop and harness land, water and other natural resources for restoration of ecological balance in the long run and also to raise the level of production, income and employment through irrigation, afforestation, dryland farming etc. Funds are released for projects under the programme on 75 : 25 sharing basis between the Centre and the States. The Programme is in operation in 235 blocks in 40 districts of 7 States.

(d) Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET)

3.4 Under Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme 100 per cent financial assistance is given for projects which are on Government and community land. The cost of the projects on private land is shared in the ratio of 60:40 between the Centre and the Farmers/Corporate Body.

Work done on wastelands development under the different schemes of the Department of Land Resources during 9th Plan and so far during 10th Plan period

3.5 The targets and achievements under different schemes for the development of wastelands in the country viz., IWDP, DPAP and DDP during 9th and 10th Plan alongwith the investment made are as under:—

Five Year Plan	Wastelands Development	
	Target (in million hectares)	Actual
9th Plan (1997-2002)	5.00	8.02
10th Plan (2002-2007)	18.00	12.47*

*Includes 8.02 million hectares already achieved during first three years of the current plan plus 3.85 million hectares likely to be achieved during 2005-2006.

3.6 When asked for a little mismatch between the physical and financial allocation during 9th and 10th Plan, the Department has informed as under:—

“18 million hectares target is to be achieved with an investment of Rs. 4,700 crore. A target of treating 4.13 million hectares has been fixed for 2006-2007, totaling to 16.61 million hectares. The short fall is on account of the EAS liability of Rs. 1,500 crore against which Rs. 151.87 crore were spent form the Budget of Tenth Plan, thereby reducing the achievement to 16.61 million hectares.”

3.7 Targets and achievement during the year 2005-06 and 2006-07 are as under:

(In lakh hectares)		
Year	Targets	Achievement
2005-2006	38	47.62
2006-2007	41.30	The targets are most likely to be exceeded.

Need for convergence of all watershed development programmes under one umbrella

3.8 The Committee in their respective reports have been consistently recommending to bring the programmes/schemes under one umbrella. The issue could not be resolved even though it has been in principle agreed by the Government. In the Mid-Term Appraisal document of the Planning Commission the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella has been suggested. According to this formula, the Himalayan and other hilly areas may be entrusted to the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation; the arid, semi-arid and sub-humid regions may be the responsibility of Department of Land Resources and Conservation and Protection of national bio-diversity resources and implementation of Hill Area Development Programme and Western Ghat Development Programme may be transferred to the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

3.9 When asked for the comments on the aforesaid formula the Department has informed that DoLR is concerned with development of non-forest wastelands, drought prone areas and desert areas. These areas, particularly the wastelands and other problem areas, do not follow a specific agro-climatic pattern but occur in almost all districts of the country including Himalayan and other hilly areas and high rainfall regions. Therefore, dividing the responsibilities of Department of Land Resources, Department of Agriculture and Co-operation and Ministry of Environment & Forest on the basis of distinct areas proposed in the mid-term appraisal of the Planning Commission would not be feasible. Recently, during Agriculture Coordination Committee meeting chaired by the Prime Minister, Agriculture Ministry has moved a concept paper for formation of a Rainfed Areas Authority under the aegis of Ministry of Agriculture. A decision has been taken for Ministry of Agriculture to move a Cabinet note with the incorporated views of other ministries. We have written to Cabinet Secretary for formation of a National Authority in Department of Land Resources instead of Ministry of Agriculture in view of the designated responsibility assigned to the Department and as suggested by the Technical Committee.

3.10 The Department of Land Resources was represented in the meeting of the Planning Commission on 15 February, 2004 to discuss the modalities of setting up of the National Rainfed Areas Authority. In the meeting, it was agreed that the Authority would be best located under the umbrella of the PMO.

3.11 Agriculture Coordination Committee, chaired by the Prime Minister, which is handling the subject of Rainfed Areas Authority has also Minister of Rural Development as member. Secretary (RD) also attends the Committee meetings. This enables coordination of activities related to rainfed areas and watershed projects at the highest level.

3.12 The Parthasarthy Committee in its report has dealt with the issue of multiplicity of programmes for rehabilitation of degraded lands through wastelands development run by different Ministries in detail and further emphasised the need for unification of programmes and bringing the same under a single nodal authority. It has further been mentioned that the need for unification has also been expressed by many State Governments. The said Committee has endorsed the view of the Government for setting up a National Authority for sustainable development of rainfed areas and stressed that the authority needs to be set up as a quasi-independent authority to manage the entire primarily Central Government funded watershed programme.

3.13 The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the multiplicity of programmes/schemes to tackle the problem of wastelands in the country and have been emphasising on the need for convergence of the programme. While examining the Demands for Grants, it has repeatedly been brought to the notice of Government but the issue although agreed to in principle lacks unanimity among the various Ministries involved in handling the issue of wastelands development. The Technical Committee in Chapter three of the report has expressed similar concerns. It has been stated that serious differences persist among different Ministries regarding the ownership of the unified programme.

The Committee also note that in the Mid-Term Appraisal document of the Planning commission, the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella has been suggested which seems to be not agreeable to the concerned Ministries due to their reluctance to leave the area of activities related to watershed management being undertaken by them. The Committee also note that the proposal has been mooted by the Ministry of Agriculture for a nodal centralised agency i.e. Rainfed Area Authority. Again the issue of conflict is the ownership of the aforesaid authority. Further the Committee also find that finally it has been agreed that the said authority would be best located under the umbrella of the PMO. The Committee feel that sufficient time has been lost over the issue of taking decision on the issue of convergence. It is high time to resolve the issue of convergence at the earliest.

3.14 The Committee further note the claim of the Department that the extent of wastelands has come down from 63.85 million hectares to 55.27 million hectares between the period 2000 and 2005. The Committee find that even with the efforts of the Department of Land Resources the target for development of wastelands during five years of 10th Plan are 18 million hectares. Out of this target, 12.47 hectares of wastelands have already been developed. The other Ministries/Departments of the Union Government as well as State Governments involved with the task of development of wastelands may also be contributing substantially towards the development of major areas of wastelands in the country. In this scenario, the Committee find that there is some mismatch between the achievement proclaimed by the Department and the actual area developed. Although the Department seems very optimistic by finding that the wastelands area has declined as found by the updated Atlas, the achievements reflected by the updated Atlas i.e. development of only 8.58 million hectares of land during five years period is too meagre even when compared with the targets of five years i.e. 18 millions hectares only of the Department of Land Resources. If the targets fixed and proclaimed by different Ministries of Union as well as State Governments are added together, the whole wastelands area would have been developed by now. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the achievements reflected under schemes may not be true at the ground level. The Committee would like a clarification of the Department in this regard so as to enable them to understand the position in proper perspective.

Foreclosure of projects under IWDP, DDP, DPAP and TDET

3.15 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants (2005-06) (10th report and action taken report 16th report) had noted that many projects taken up under different schemes were being foreclosed. The data furnished in this regard last year was as under:

Scheme	No. of projects foreclosed
IWDP	74 (67 projects were foreclosed prior to 1995 and 7 projects since 1995)
DPAP	1764
DDP	300
TDET	22

3.16 While examining Demands for Grants (2006-07), the Department in the replies at page 28 has stated that out of 800 projects sanctioned under IWDP upto 2005-06 during 10th Plan, none of the projects have been foreclosed. At another place (at page 21), it has been stated that out of 398 projects sanctioned during 9th Plan, seven projects have been foreclosed.

3.17 The number of projects sanctioned under different schemes of wastelands development since 9th Plan and the projects completed so far is as under:

	(in numbers)
IWDP	
9th Plan	
Total number of projects sanctioned	398
Number of projects completed	75
10th Plan	
Total number of projects sanctioned	800
Number of projects completed/foreclosed	no project has so far been completed
DPAP	
9th Plan	
total number of projects sanctioned from 1995-96 to 31 March, 2006 i.e. during 9th and 10th Plan	24363
Number of ongoing projects	16882
Number of projects for which funding has been stopped	
Since 1 April, 2003	1605
Since 1 October, 2003	32
Since 1 April, 2005	127
DDP	
Number of projects sanctioned from 1995-96 to 2005-06	13476
Number of projects completed	2583
Number of ongoing projects	10593
Number of projects for which funding has been stopped	
Since 1 April, 2003	65
Since 1 March, 2004	85
Since 1 April, 2005	150

TDET

Total projects taken	161
Number of projects completed	55
Number of projects foreclosed	22
Number of projects ongoing	84

3.18 As regards the system of foreclosure of projects, the Department has informed that the Revised Guidelines of 2001 have a provision for keeping the projects on probation for a period of one year after sanctioning. The Guidelines state:—

“Under the Wasteland Development Programme a watershed project is taken up for a period of five years, which includes an initial phase of 9-12 months for establishing the necessary institutional mechanism for execution of the project. While this process by and large, has been working satisfactorily, there seems to be instances where the PIA is not in a position to ground the required village level institutions due to conflicting interest groups in the project area. It is, therefore, desirable to put a project on probation for a period of one year. During one year, if it is considered that the project cannot be implemented successfully for certain unavoidable circumstances and reasons, the ZP/DRDA shall recommend for its foreclosure to the State Government which will consider such request on merits and send its recommendations to Department of Land Resources. Before considering any such request, the State Government shall ensure that the amount already spent in the project area has been duly accounted for. The projects will be formally closed only after approval by the Department of Land Resources. In such cases, the unspent amount should be refunded to the Department of Land Resources. This review may take into account the sustainability of the project, equity and other related issues. However, such requests shall not cover the cases of financial embezzlement, defalcation and other deliberate irregularities, for which responsibility is to be fixed”.

Committed liability under EAS

3.19 During the year 1999-2000 watershed projects being undertaken under Employment Assurance Scheme were transferred to the Department of Land Resources. The committed liability in case of watershed projects at that time was Rs. 1500 crore. As per the

information furnished by the Department, EAS watershed releases from 1999-2000 to 2003-04 is as indicated below:—

EAS Watershed releases from 1999-2000 to 2003-04

Total Area (in ha)	Funds required for completion (Rs. in lakhs)	Central share (Rs. in lakhs)	Funds released (Rs. in lakhs)					Total funds released
			1999 2000	2000- 01	2001- 02	2002- 03	2003- 04*	
6356468	148526.53	111920.33	30154.75	25711.5	19015.4	14552.28	634.91	90068.88

*approved during 2002-03.

3.20 When asked whether the committed liability in case of EAS projects has been completed the Department has informed that the funds required have been met to the extent claims were made by the States for eligible projects within the stipulated period *i.e.* 2001-02 and the extended period *i.e.* 2002-03. Further when asked about the data with regard to the projects foreclosed, the Department has stated that the request for foreclosure of projects has not been received from States. It has further been mentioned that the details of physical and financial achievements since the merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP is as given in the table above.

Monitoring with regard to physical performance of various schemes related to wastelands development

3.21 The Committee while examining Demands for Grants (2005-06) (refer para 2.16 of 10th Report) had expressed concern over the lack of mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes due to long gestation period. The Committee had even suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects. It was suggested that some sort of grading indicating poor, satisfactory or very good may be indicated against the number of projects being undertaken in various States. Another mechanism suggested by the Committee was to indicate the projects at various stages like first stage, second stage and third stage etc. The said recommendation of the Committee was reiterated in paras 10 and 28 in 16th Report (14th Lok Sabha).

3.22 Similar views have been expressed by Hon'ble Prime Minister in his address to the nation on 15 August, 2005 as indicated in the report of Parthasarathy Committee. Hon'ble Prime Minister had emphasized that there has been a lack of focus on outcomes and merely

utilising outlays has been the norms under different schemes. Further, the Technical Committee has also expressed the similar views and emphasised to divide the total gestation period in three phases.

3.23 As regards the status of project *i.e.* the stage at which these projects are being closed, the Committee in action taken report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) (16th Report) had observed from the data made available that some of the projects were being foreclosed at the last stage when major portion of allocated outlay had already been sanctioned. Para 28 of the said Report has been given at *Appendix III*.

3.24 Even when pointed out by the Standing Committee and the issue emphasised by Hon'ble Prime Minister and also highlighted in Parthasarathy Committee report, the different Budget documents presented by the Department indicate the same scenario. At page 22 of the Performance Budget, while presenting the physical performance of DDP, it has been stated that the projects are deemed to have been completed as the entire Central share for these projects has been released. Further the replies furnished by the Department on the list of points for evidence expressed the similar point of view with regard to evaluating the physical performance of the projects. At page 25 of the replies, it has been mentioned that the details of physical and financial achievements seem merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP. Further at page 35 it has been stated that with the release of seven instalments under DDP projects are deemed to be completed. When the aforesaid issue was highlighted during the course of evidence, the Secretary informed the Committee as under:

"The Parthasarathy Committee has also made certain comments. They have certain suggestions regarding better monitoring. They are saying that monitors must be seen not as inspectors but as facilitators. They must ensure that the impact assessment and research is an integral part of watershed programme and at the end of the project, a physical and financial completion report will have to be submitted to the District Watershed Development Authority, and post-project evaluation and impact assessment study will be commissioned by the DWDA. These are some of the suggestions they have made. This suggestion and other suggestions which are there right now will be definitely used for further modifying out programme, but the programme itself is under modification at the moment."

3.25 The Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports had expressed serious concerns over the issue of foreclosure of projects under the schemes related to wastelands development i.e. Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET). While examining the action taken replies, the Committee had observed that some of the projects were foreclosed at the last stage when substantial allocation had been released for the project thereby wasting national resources. Detailed analysis of the issue indicate that the system of foreclosure has been given in detail in the watershed guidelines. It has been stated that at the initial phase of a project i.e. the first nine to twelve months, if it is considered that the project cannot be implemented successfully for certain unavoidable circumstances and reasons the ZP/DRDA shall recommend for its foreclosure to the State Governments which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to the Department of Land Resources. As reported in 16th Report of the Committee, most of the projects are being foreclosed even at the last stage. The Committee observe that the guidelines do not seem to have been followed while foreclosing projects under different schemes.

The Committee further find from the data furnished by the Department that for a large number of projects under DPAP and DDP funding has been stopped. The committee would like to be informed about the difference between the funding stopped and foreclosure of the projects since two different data have been indicated in the Budget documents. The Committee would also like the Department to furnish information with regard to the date of sanction, funds earmarked and date of foreclosure/when funds were stopped in each of the foreclosed project scheme-wise so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position in detail. The Committee would also like to recommend that such information about the foreclosure/funding stopped should regularly be maintained and indicated in the Budget documents.

3.26 As regards the projects transferred from erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme of the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources during the year 1999-2000, the Committee note that the initial committed liability in case of these projects was Rs. 1500 crore. As regards the total funds released to these projects, Rs. 900.68 crore have been released so far for these projects. The Committee further find that the Department has no information with regard to the status of projects and the

physical achievements for these projects. Not only that, simply releasing the outlay with regard to claims made by States is considered as completion of the project. It has further been stated that the details of physical and financial achievements for these projects seem the merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP. The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the project is being undertaken by the Department. To analyse the position with regard to EAS projects transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources, the Committee would like to be apprised about the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so as to enable the Committee to have a proper analysis.

3.27 The Committee have repeatedly been expressing the concern over lack of mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes in their respective reports. The Committee in their 10th Report had even suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects. While noting that there is a long gestation period the Committee had suggested to evaluate the project at various stages like first stage, second stage and third stage etc. and benchmarking the projects by indicating poor, satisfactory or very good. The Committee further find that Hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed similar concerns over the lack of focus on outcomes. He in his address to the nation on 15 August, 2005 has expressed the view that merely utilising outlays has been the norms under different schemes. Not only that the Technical Committee has also expressed similar views and suggested a similar mechanism as suggested by this Standing Committee to evaluate the performance of projects. Even when the Standing Committee, Hon'ble Prime Minister and the Technical Committee of the Department of Rural Development have been expressing their concerns over the sorry state of affairs of monitoring of projects, it seems from the various Budget documents that least attention is paid towards the serious concerns expressed from various quarters. From the replies at various places it appears the number of instalments released has been deemed to be the mechanism to know that the project has been completed.

The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the projects is being undertaken by the Department under the various schemes of wastelands development. The Committee would like the Department to pay serious attention to the observations of the Committee as reported above and furnish a detailed note for the information of the Committee indicating thereby the steps proposed to be initiated by the Department to address the concerns as expressed by this Committee and from various other quarters.

Total area of Wastelands and Outlay required for Treatment of Wastelands

3.28 As per the initial Atlas brought by the Department of Land Resources in the year 2000, 63.85 million hectares is the estimated wastelands area in the country. Further, as per the latest estimates indicated in revised Atlas launched in the year 2005, the total wastelands in the country stated to be 55.27 million hectares.

3.29 The Technical Committee in its Report has stated that 45.58 million hectares have been treated so far, since 8th Plan by the initiatives of the Union Government with the total investment of Rs. 17,037.42 crore made under different schemes of the Ministries of Agriculture, Forests & Environment and Department of Land Resources.

3.30 Further, it has been stated in the said Technical Committee report that excluding the nearly 46 million hectares taken as already treated, the areas remaining to be treated are 125 million hectares. The total requirement of funds would be for Rs. 1,50,000 crore. As per the existing norms, the per hectare cost of development of wastelands as provided under different schemes is Rs. 6,000. The Technical Committee in its report has suggested to increase per hectare existing cost from Rs. 6,000 to Rs. 1,2000 per hectare and the estimates of expenditure required has been calculated with the proposed per hectare cost of treatment.

3.31 The sources for generating of the huge outlay as reported in the report of the Technical Committee are as under:

- (i) doubling of current programme outlays that would yield about Rs. 5,000 crore.
- (ii) an allocation of around Rs. 5,000 crore from the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) specially earmarked for watershed programmes. This makes perfect sense since the NREGS is already primarily focused on watershed-related activities.

Perspective Plan by the State Governments on the issue of Development of Wastelands in the Country

3.32 The Committee in their Tenth Report (Para 2.42) have recommended that in view of large areas of wastelands in the country, there is an urgent need to allocate more funds to complete the development of wastelands in a stipulated time frame and

recommended that the Department of Land Resources should ask the State Governments to prepare a Five Year Perspective Plan for each district clearly indicating the wastelands covered so far under various Programmes of the Government and during next Five Year Plan. The Committee had also recommended that such plans be drawn up in consultation with local bodies in respective Districts/States (Para Nos. 13 & 19 of Sixteenth Report).

3.33 When asked whether the Department has consulted different State Governments on the issue of preparation of Perspective Plan at district level, the Department has informed that the matter has been discussed with the State representatives during the review meetings. States have committed to submit the perspective plans for a period of five years at the earliest. States of Andhra Pradesh and Orissa have submitted the abridged plans/details of watersheds/area to be taken up delineating watersheds for immediate use, as the detailed plans are under formulation. Tamil Nadu has submitted the perspective plans in respect of three districts and plan in respect of one district has been submitted by Kerala. Perspective Plans in respect of North Eastern States and Sikkim are under formulation and will be submitted during 2006-07. Similarly, plans in respect of other States are at various stages of formulation.

National Policy on Land Resources Management and Amendment of Land Acquisition Act, 1894

3.34 As per Mid-Term Appraisal to the Tenth Plan factors like soil erosion is one of the major factors for land degradation in the country. According to the said appraisal soil erosion removes roughly 14 million tonnes of major nutrients in soil such as nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium, resulting in loss of agriculture output from 11 per cent to 26 per cent. Keeping in view all these factors into account, the said appraisal has stated that during the 10th Plan period a National Policy on Land Resources Management will be formulated for optimum management of land resources.

3.35 When asked about the status of said policy, the Department has informed that the National policy on Land Resources Management has not been formulated as yet by the Department. Wasteland Atlas is available and various programmes are being undertaken on the basis of Wasteland Atlas data.

3.36 Further, during the course of evidence the Secretary submitted as under:

“This is the crux of the issue in Land Resource management, in the preparation of a perspective plan at the National level and

at the State level. We have written to the States to prepare their plans and the States are at different stages of preparing it and we have reported it to you; but the larger policy is under debate and that is exactly what is going on today. The National Rainfed Area Authority has been announced and there is a policy paper which has been prepared by the Agriculture Ministry. It was discussed the other day in the Agriculture Coordination Committee of the Prime Minister. Side by side, the Planning Commission has also done a very large scale brainstorming session; they have prepared a paper. We have also from our side done one. We are doing on some lands which are under our control and responsibility. We have got the Parthasarathy Committee Report prepared. There are three expert committee papers which are now available. The whole matter has been referred to the Committee of Secretaries; there is an attempt being made to work out a process by which a national perspective plan can be prepared."

3.37 On the question of review of outdated Land Acquisition Act, 1894 which is more than hundred years old, the Secretary stated as under:

"You have really raised a very important matter which concerns us. It has become very critical at the moment. It is regarding the policy for land use. There is a proposal for the amendment of the Land Acquisition Act which has been pending. It is under discussion. Now, there are a lot of fresh concerns which are being expressed. As you are aware, the Rehabilitation Policy of the Government of India has also been formulated and announced but that is an attempt to give some kind of a minimum rehabilitation package. That should be implemented by everybody. Land, as a subject, is a State subject. So, the question is that no matter what we do, even if we amend the main Act, the Land Acquisition Act, which is an Act of 1894, that Act will not become effective unless the State accepts it. In its own Assembly, it has actually to be adopted. Even if the Government of India passes and modifies the Land Acquisition Act, it will have to be adopted by the States. We have to have an interaction with the States. So this is an issue which, in a big way, comes up."

3.38 The Secretary, Land Resources further added that:

"The other one is the Land Revenue Act..... There has been a mention of the Land Revenue Act, its modification. Though that

is not developed too much yet the Land Acquisition Act is certainly a major concern. I am expecting that we will be getting some guidelines. We are the nodal Ministry here. A lot of interested Ministries are there which are acquiring land, which are affected by acquisition. The Tribal Welfare and the Social Justice Ministries are big players on the affected side. Those who are acquiring land on the other side are the Ministries like Power, Water Resources, Coal, Railways, Defence, Transport etc. All of them are on the other side. So, all the players have to come together.”

3.39 When asked whether the wastelands can be used for construction of Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) houses and Agriculture Universities, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that the State Governments can use the wastelands there is no such bar.

3.40 The Committee note that different data with regard to total wastelands in the country which need to be developed has been indicated in the different documents. As per the initial Atlas brought out by the Department in the year 2000, total wastelands has been indicated as 63.85 million hectares. The latest data launched in 2005 indicate the wastelands as 55.27 million hectares. Further the Technical Committee in its report has stated that 45.58 million hectares have been treated so far since 8th Plan by the initiatives of the Union Government. It has further been stated that excluding the 46 million hectares as already treated, the areas remaining to be treated are 125 million hectares. While appreciating the fact that there are various estimates with regard to wastelands development and it is difficult to find out the exact data in this regard, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have some data indicating the minimum wastelands area that needs to be developed so as to enable the Government to prepare an action plan. The answer to this issue is the perspective plans by the different State Governments.

3.41 The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to get the perspective plans finalised from various State Governments on the issue of development of wastelands. They find from the replies that none of the States is ready with the perspective plan. Only two States i.e. Tamil Nadu and Kerala have submitted the perspective plans in respect of few districts. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have a fair idea of the task in hand and the task to be handled in future with regard to wastelands

development in the country. Further as observed in the preceding paras of the report there are varying estimates with regard to the area falling under wastelands as well as the task of development of wastelands handled by the Government initiatives. The exact idea of the wastelands area, work involved can be known when the perspective plans are ready. Besides perspective plans as submitted by the State Governments can be a better input to formulate the national plan. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue further with the State Governments to finalise the perspective plans so that the same can be used while deciding the strategy for the Eleventh Five Year Plan.

3.42 The Committee further note that as indicated by Technical Committee Rs. 1,50,000 crore would be required to treat the estimated land of 125 million hectares. The Technical Committee has suggested to double the current programme outlay. Further it has also been stated that the allocation made under National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme would supplement the outlay provided by different Government schemes for the development of wastelands. The Committee find that the outlay for National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has been separately allocated by the Department of Rural Development. Rs. 11,300 crore during 2006-2007 have been earmarked for 200 districts which have been covered by the Guarantee Scheme. Till the scheme is not made applicable nationwide, it is difficult to know how far the outlay provided for NREGS could supplement the Government initiatives taken under different wastelands programmes. Besides there is an urgent need to have some sort of coordinating mechanism for the schemes being undertaken under NREGS related to watershed activities and the schemes taken under the Department of Rural Development or some other Ministries of Union Government or State Governments. The Committee feel that Gram Sabha is the best mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Department in this regard.

3.43 The Committee find that some initiatives are being taken for formulating the National Land Resource Management Policy. The Committee would like the Government to pursue the matter further so that there is proper direction in land management.

3.44 The Committee wish to point out that Land Acquisition Act 1894 is an old and outdated enactment which needs considerable amendments keeping in view the changed circumstances. The

Committee have repeatedly been stressing for bringing amendments to this Act. The Committee understand that proposal for the amendment of Land Acquisition Act is under consideration with the Department for a long time. They find from the submission made by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence that much emphasis is not being given to finalise the proposals for the amendment of the said Act. The Committee are not convinced by the statement made by the Secretary that land is a State subject and the Central Act will not become effective unless the State accepts it. The Committee note that Central Acts are the model for the State Governments on which they draft their policies and laws. State Governments are waiting for the amendments in Land Acquisition Act. The old and outdated Act has been a hinderance for implementation of various projects where acquisition of land is required. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to finalise the proposals for amendment to the aforesaid Act and bring the same before the Parliament at the earliest.

3.45 The Committee further note that some initiatives are being taken to amend the Land Revenue Act. Consultations are being held with the interested Ministries. The Committee stress that the proposals for amendment of the Land Revenue Act should be finalised at the earliest.

3.46 The Committee find that land is the basic constraint in implementation of some of the major schemes of the Department specifically Indira Awaas Yojana where it is difficult to extend the benefits to the landless persons. The possibility of using wastelands for setting up agricultural universities and for constructing houses under Government schemes for the landless persons should be discussed with the various State Governments and the Committee apprised about the feedback received in this regard.

CHAPTER IV

WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Analysis of the Major Schemes related to Wastelands Development

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

The allocations, releases and shortfall for IWDP projects during 9th Plan are as shown below:

(Rs. in crore)

Outlay proposed by Department	Allocation		Actual/Releases	Shortfall between BE and actuals
	BE	RE		
3360.00	1148.60	986.00	962.00	186.33

4.2 Year-wise and State-wise details of the projects sanctioned during the Ninth Plan has been given at *Appendix IV*.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data as indicated at *Appendix IV*:

- (i) during the first two years *i.e.*, 1997-98, 1998-99 of the 9th Plan less numbers of projects *i.e.*, 45 and 48 projects were sanctioned as compared to the projects sanctioned during the remaining three years of the 9th Plan.
- (ii) majority of the IWDP projects were sanctioned in the States of Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh etc.
- (iii) very less number of IWDP Projects were sanctioned in the States of Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Kerala, Punjab and West Bengal.

4.3 When asked reasons for lesser number of projects sanctioned during first two years of the 9th Plan particularly when the guidelines for sanctioning watershed projects were in operation way back in April 1995, the Department has informed that the new guidelines for watershed development programmes were launched in 1995. Only a few project proposals were received from the States in the initial years.

The projects satisfying the criteria for selection of watersheds were sanctioned. Even after a lapse of two years, the demand was still low due to the implementation on people's participatory approach as envisaged in the 1995 guidelines. As a result, less projects were sanctioned in the first two years of the 9th Plan.

4.4 Further analysis of the projects undertaken during Ninth Plan under IWDP is as under:

	(In numbers)	
Total Projects undertaken	—	398
Projects completed	—	75
Projects foreclosed	—	7
Ongoing Projects	—	316
Ongoing projects with time run over	—	191

Physical and Financial Performance of IWDP projects during 9th Plan

4.5 The following statement shows the achievement of plan targets both in the physical and financial terms during the 9th Plan:

Ninth Plan period	Physical (in hq.)		Financial (Rs. in crore)	
	Target	Achievement	Outlay	Release/Exp.
1997-98	1,27,000	90,000 (70.87%)	74.50	53.86 (72.30%)
1998-99	1,37,000	1,03,000 (75.18%)	82.10	62.00 (75.51%)
1999-2000	1,36,750	1,38,500 (101.28%)	82.00	83.07 (101.30%)
2000-2001	3,25,000	3,24,450	128.00	127.78 (100%)
2001-2002	4,55,000	4,10,000 (90.11%)	210.00	169.61 (80.77%)

4.6 It may be seen that during first two years i.e., 1997-98 and 1998-99 the achievement rate in physical terms is as low as 70.87 per cent and 75.18 per cent. In financial terms, it is 72.30 per cent and

75.51 per cent during the same period. Lack of community participation for projects and a time consuming process has been attributed a reason for slow performance in 1997-98. Whereas 1998-99 cut by Ministry of finance of over Rs. 20 crore has been attributed as reason for low performance.

Performance of IWDP during Tenth Plan

4.7 The year-wise physical and financial performance of IWDP during 10th Plan Period is as follows:

Tenth Plan Period	Physical (in ha.)		Financial (Rs. in crore)	
	Target	Achievement	Outlay	Release/Exp.
2002-07	68,00,000			
2002-03	5,17,000	3,35,521 (64.89%)	450.00*	413.45 (91.87%)
2003-04	11,00,000	10,06,500 (91.5%)	402.00**	368.17 (91.58%)
2004-05	10,00,000	11,17,705 (111.77%)	448.00##	414.42 (90.88%***)
2005-06	15,00,000	16,31,806 (108.79%)	565.00##	471.15 (83.39%)#
2006-07	15,00,000		565.00##	

* This includes Rs. 150.00 crore for EAS watershed programme and Rs. 63.00 crore for DFID projects in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

** It includes Rs. 66.00 crore for DFID Projects in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

*** Poor absorption of funds in the North-Eastern States.

As on 28.2.2006.

Includes Rs. 80.00 crore for DFID projects in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

4.8 The data with regard to the projects sanctioned during each year of Tenth Plan has been given at Appendix V.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data as indicated at Appendix V:

- (i) 800 projects have been sanctioned during Tenth Plan.
- (ii) only 49 projects were sanctioned during the 2002-2003, the first year of 10th Plan.

- (iii) majority of IWDP projects were sanctioned in the States of Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka.
- (iv) very less number of IWDP projects have been sanctioned in the States of Goa, Punjab and West Bengal.

Recovery of funds

4.9 Last year during the course of examination of Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources, it came out that funds for IWDP Projects are to be recovered from some States. The following are the details of States and funds outstanding against them:

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Amount (Rs. in Crore)
1.	Kerala	5.0
2.	Gujarat	2.0
3.	Tamil Nadu	1.5
4.	Jharkhand	1.5
5.	Punjab	1.6

4.10 When asked about the reasons on what account this recovery was being made/due from certain States/UTs, the recovery of dues is on account of unspent balances, non-submission of Utilization Certificate and misutilization of funds in respect of old projects sanctioned prior to 1995 as pointed out in the C&AG Report No. 2 of 2002.

4.11 The Department has further informed that all due amount has been recovered except following:

Sl.No.	State/Distt.	Amount (Rs. in Lakhs)	On account of	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Punjab (Hoshiyarpur)	0.20	Recovery of amount	Yet to be received
2.	Sikkim (South Sikkim)	4.01	Non submission of UC	-do-

1	2	3	4	5
3.	Orissa (Kalahandi-I)	33.00	Non submission of UC	UC for Rs. 23.83285 lakhs is yet to be received.
4.	Kerala (Palakkad I&II and Wayanad-I)	502.73	Non submission of UC	Yet to be received

4.12 Concerned States are consistently being reminded to either refund the amount or submit Utilisation Certificate along with other relevant documents at the earliest.

4.13 The Technical Committee on Wastelands Development in its report has proposed that the duration of the projects taken under different schemes of watershed development should be increased from five years to eight years. Reasons for proposing the enhanced time limit has been stated to be that durable village—level institutions have not been set up and the crucial participatory processes have not had sufficient time as per the existing gestation period of five years. As a result the qualitative dimensions of the programme have suffered and it has not been possible to realise the livelihoods potential of the programme.

4.14 The Committee note that IWDP is the most important programme of the Department for the development of wastelands in the country. The status of financial achievement during 9th and 10th Plan as given above indicate that there has not been major enhancement in the outlay under the Scheme. The outlay for Rs. 450 crore during the year 2002-03 has been enhanced to Rs. 565 crore during 2006-07. But the allocation earmarked has not been fully utilised during each year of 9th and 10th Plan. Under-spending is the recurring feature of this programme. As regards the physical achievement the data indicate that almost half of the projects sanctioned are still continuing. The number of projects taken up during 10th Plan are almost double the projects undertaken during 9th Plan. Further, there are problems like unspent balances, non-submission of Utilisation Certificate and misutilisation of funds as pointed out in C&AG Report for which certain recoveries were to be made. The Committee conclude that there are serious problems in implementation of IWDP programme which need to be addressed

urgently. Taking into consideration the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country the Committee strongly recommend to enhance the allocation under IWDP which is one of the major schemes of the Department. While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would also like the Department to ensure that the allocation earmarked in a year is utilised fully.

4.15 As regards the monitoring of the physical status of the projects the Committee in the preceding paras of the report have noted that the common problems with regard to the projects undertaken for wastelands under different schemes of the Department are foreclosure of projects, stopping payment to projects etc. The issue has been dealt with in detail and suggestions made in the preceding part of the report. As regards the issue of time overrun of the projects being undertaken under IWDP, the Committee find that the gestation period of projects is five years whereas almost half of the projects taken up during the Plan are still to be completed. The committee also note that the Technical Committee has suggested to increase the gestation period of projects from five years to eight years. The Committee also observe that in case the gestation period is increased the average cost of the projects may also increase. The Committee would further like the Department to examine the suggestion of the Technical Committee and furnish their comments so as to enable the Committee to review the position further.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)

4.16 Status of projects sanctioned under DPAP:

	(In numbers)	
Total Project Sanctioned in Ninth and Tenth Plan	—	19560
Projects completed	—	5717
Projects for which funding stopped:		
Since—1 April, 2003	—	1605
Since—1 October, 2003	—	32
Since—1 April, 2005	—	127
Ongoing projects	—	16882

4.17 The Standing Committee on Rural Development in their Tenth Report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) had observed that though

utilisation position of DPAP projects had been satisfactory during the 9th Plan and three years of current Plan, yet a lot more was required to be done in some States with vast drought prone areas like Rajasthan, J&K, Gujarat. The Committee had therefore, recommended suitable enhancement of funds for DPAP Programme for this purpose.

4.18 When enquired about the status of follow up of the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee, the Department has informed that the Ministry has taken efforts to increase the fund release to the States of Gujarat, Rajasthan and J&K as the details are tabulated as under:

State	Fund Releases in 9th Plan (In Rs. Lakh)	Fund Releases in 10th Plan (from 2002-03 to 2005-06 i.e. 4 years) (In Rs. Lakh)
Gujarat	4776.89	12084.55
J&K	1037.82	1127.57
Rajasthan	3154.13	6696.45

However, Department of Land Resources is continuously pursuing with Planning Commission for enhancement of funds.

Foreclosure of DPAP projects

4.19 The Committee in their aforesaid Report had also observed that like other area development programmes of IWDP and DDP in DPAP programme the major area of concern was foreclosure of projects. The Committee had observed that as many as 1,764 DPAP projects were foreclosed. The Department in the action taken replies has informed that a total of Rs. 123.36 crore were released for such foreclosed projects. The Committee in their 16th Action Taken Report had then sought details of funds recovered from State Governments for such foreclosed projects and urged proper system of monitoring for such projects.

4.20 When asked about the update on the aforesaid issue, the Department has stated that even in respect of 1,764 projects for which the Central funds have been stopped (projects belonging to years 1995-96 to 1998-99), the activities have reportedly been taken up by the district implementing agencies corresponding to the funds released and proportionate benefits accrued to the watershed community. So, the action for recovery of funds does not arise.

4.21 The allocation during Ninth and Tenth Plan:

(Rs. in crore)

Period	Allocations B.E.	Allocations R.E.	Amount Releases	Project sanctioned (in numbers)
9th Plan (1997-2002)				
1997-1998	115.00	110.75	90.95	406
1998-1999	95.00	73.00	73.00	880
1999-2000	95.00	95.00	94.99	2278
2000-2001	190.00	190.00	189.58	3371
2001-2002	210.00	210.00	208.99	2052
10th Plan (2002-2007)				
2002-2003	250.00	250.00	250.00	2478
2003-2004	295.00	295.00	295.00	2535
2004-2005	300.00	300.00	300.19#	2550
2005-06	353.00	353.00	353.18#	3000
2006-2007	360.00			

#Amount increased due to re-appropriation of funds.

Desert Development Programme (DDP)

4.22 The status of project sanctioned:

(In numbers)

Total projects sanctioned for 1995-96 to 2005-06	—	13476
Projects completed	—	2583
Projects for which further funds have been stopped:		
Since 1 April, 2003	—	65
Since 1 March, 2004	—	85
Since 1 April, 2005	—	150
Ongoing projects	—	10593

The allocation during Ninth and Tenth Plan:

(Rs. in Crore)

Period	Allocations B.E.	Allocations R.E.	Amount Releases	Project sanctioned (in numbers)
9th Plan (1997-2002)				
1997-1998	70.00	70.00	70.01	36
1998-1999	90.00	80.00	79.80	400
1999-2000	85.00	85.00	84.99	1500
2000-2001	135.00	135.00	134.99	1659
2001-2002	160.00	150.00	149.88	1359
10th Plan (2002-2007)				
2002-2003	185.00	185.00	185.00	1602
2003-2004	265.00*	215.00	215.00	1562
2004-2005	215.00	215.00	215.19#	1600
2005-2006	268.00	268.00	240.85**	2000
2006-2007	270.00			

* Include Rs. 50 crore for Maru Gochar Yojana, later on transferred to Ministry of Finance.

** As on 28.2.2006. Total allocated amount will be utilised in full by the end of current financial year.

Amount increase by re-appropriation.

4.23 DPAP programme is being implemented in 972 blocks as identified in the report submitted by Prof. Hanumantha Rao ex-Member of Planning Commission. Further the Committee while examining Demands for Grants (2005-06) had been informed that States like Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Rajasthan and Chhattisgarh have made requests for coverage of additional blocks. As regards Desert Development Programme it is being implemented in 235 DDP blocks in the country in 40 districts of seven States. States like Gujarat have requested to include some more blocks. While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, the Committee have been informed that the term and reference of a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri S. Parthasarthy include identification of blocks afresh and the

inclusion/exclusion of the blocks from the existing blocks would be considered by the Committee. The said Committee has already submitted its report to the Department of Rural Development.

4.24 The Committee find from the information furnished above that foreclosure and stopping of funds to the projects is a major problem under DDP and DPAP blocks. The issue has been dealt with in detail in the preceding paras of the report. Here the Committee may highlight that the number of projects foreclosed and for which funds have been stopped is more than in the case of IWDP schemes. As recommended in the earlier part of the report, the Committee would like the information about the year of foreclosure, funds allocated at the time of foreclosure of each project so as to enable the Committee to make proper analysis.

4.25 The Committee further find that DDP and DPAP blocks were identified more than a decade back. The situation in these blocks may have changed. Many blocks would have turned greener and need no assistance under these programmes whereas some other additional blocks may need assistance. Further, requests from some of the States are being received by the Department for coverage of additional blocks. The Committee also note that the Parthasarthy Committee was supposed to look into the issue of exclusion/inclusion of DDP and DPAP blocks. Since the said Committee has already submitted the report, the committee would like to be informed whether the said issue has been addressed in the report and if so, the details thereof.

Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET) Scheme

Objectives of the Schemes

4.26 The objective of the Scheme *inter-alia* include:

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

4.27 The Scheme is being implemented through ICAR Institutes, State Agriculture Universities (SAUs), DRDAs and Government institutions having adequate institutional framework and organization back up. Under this Scheme, 100 per cent Central Grant is admissible

to implement the projects on wastelands owned by the Government, Public Sector Undertakings including Universities, Panchayats etc. In case of the projects on wastelands of private farmers/corporate bodies, the cost of the project is required to be shared on the basis of 60 : 40 between the Department of Land Resources and the beneficiary.

4.28 The allocation and expenditure during Tenth Plan is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Outlay	Expenditure
2002-2003	17.00	13.70
2003-2004	17.00	15.08
2004-2005	15.00	14.99
2005-2006	17.00	10.18 (as on 28.2.2006)
2006-2007	20.00	
Total	86.00	

4.29 When asked about the reasons for the lower utilisation in each year of the current Plan, the Department has stated that the TDET Scheme is being implemented in a project mode on the basis of proposals received from Implementing Agencies and sanctioned by the Project Sanctioning Committee (PSC). The reasons for the lower utilization during 2002-03 and 2003-04 are due to non receipt of appropriate fresh proposals and timely progress report, utilisation certificate, beneficiaries contribution and audited statement of accounts under ongoing projects from various implementing agencies. Nevertheless, efforts had been made during 2004-05 and 2005-06 to monitor and pursue the progress of the projects and completely utilise the funds allocated to the programme.

Project Planning and Implementation

4.30 As regards project planning and implementation, it came out during the course of examination that till the end of March, 2005 as many as 161 projects were sanctioned with an outlay of Rs. 168.16 crore. In the written replies, the Department has informed that out of 161 projects only 55 projects are completed, 22 projects are foreclosed and 84 projects are ongoing.

4.31 When asked whether the number of completed projects were as per schedule, the Department has stated that most of the projects have been completed as per schedule. However, some of the projects that could not be completed as per schedule because of specific field level problems were given suitable time extension for completion.

4.32 Further clarifying on the field level problems being faced by the TDET Projects resulting in time over runs in such projects in different States, the Department has submitted the following reasons:

- (i) TDET guidelines require beneficiary contribution to the extent of 40 per cent cost of works undertaken on private lands. Fulfilling this requirement, most of the times, is time consuming.
- (ii) sometimes, there is undue delay in the release of State share.
- (iii) implementing Agencies being State Agriculture Universities/ Research Institutions, etc., there have been delay in submissions of progress reports by them due to procedural delays inherent in their internal organizational structure.
- (iv) in many cases, particularly in case of research organizations and Universities, financial control lies with a third party like the Comptroller, invariably leading to delay in timely release of funds to the implementing department.

4.33 The Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET) Scheme is an important scheme, the foremost objective of which is operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies and dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for the development of various categories of wastelands. From the data furnished by the Department with regard to financial achievement the Committee find that even the meagre outlay *i.e.* Rs. 15 crore during 2004-05 and Rs. 17 crore during 2005-06 could not be utilised fully. Various reasons like beneficiaries contribution, delay in the release of State share, delay in submission of progress reports and non-receipt of fresh proposals have been cited as the reasons for shortfall in utilisation of funds. The Committee also note that even the few number of projects undertaken are not being successfully implemented. Out of 161 projects, as many as 22 projects were foreclosed. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need for detailed interaction with the various research institutes like ICAR, State Agricultural Universities which are basically involved with the research in this field. Besides there is an urgent need to motivate these institutions to initiative more and more projects. There is an

urgent need to study the international experience with regard to wastelands development. The Committee desire some concrete action in this regard to be taken by Government.

4.34 Besides initiating research studies one of the objectives of the programme is dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies. The Committee would like to be apprised of the number of demonstration projects undertaken under the aforesaid schemes. Besides, the initiatives taken for dissemination of research findings and technologies by the Department should also be intimated to the Committee to enable them to analyse the performance of the scheme.

CHAPTER V

LAND REFORMS DIVISION

The Land Reforms Division implements following two Centrally Sponsored Schemes:

- (a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR); and
- (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records.

Brief regarding the Schemes of the Department related to Land Reforms Division

(a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

5.2 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) was started in 1988-89 with 100 per cent financial assistance as a pilot project in eight districts each in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa and Rajasthan with a view to remove the problems and inherent flows of the existing land records system and to bring transparency and easy accessibility of the land records to the land holders. Keeping in view the encouraging results, this scheme was made separate Centrally Sponsored Scheme during the Eighth Plan (1992-1997) period and by the end of Plan period 327 districts in the country were brought under CLR. During Ninth Plan (1997-2002) 259 more districts were covered. So far 582 districts, 3514 Tehsils/Taluks/Blocks/Anchals and 879 Sub-Divisions have been covered under the scheme. A sum of Rs. 416.06 crore upto 28 February, 2006 provided to States/UTs since inception, whereas the utilisation of funds as on 31 January, 2006 reported by the States/UTs was Rs. 256.71 crore, representing 65 per cent of the total funds released. Statement showing districts/Tehsils/Sub-Divisions sanctioned and work completed under CLR programmes as on 31 March, 2006 in different States/UTs is placed at *Appendix VI*.

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

5.3 With a view to assist the States/UTs in the task of updating of land records, a Centrally sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of

Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) was started in 1987. Initially, the scheme was approved for the States of Bihar and Orissa in 1987-88 and extended to other States/UTs, during 1989-90. The scheme is being implemented by the State Governments through their Revenue/Land Reforms Departments. It is financed by the Centre and the State on 50:50 funds sharing basis. However, Union Territories are provided full Central assistance. All the States/UTs have been covered under the scheme and funds to the tune of Rs. 311.77 crore were provided to the States/UTs as Central Share up to 31 January, 2006. The utilisation of funds reported by the States/UTs is Rs. 228.01 crore, representing 73 per cent of the total funds released.

Analysis of the Schemes of the Department related to Land Reforms Division

(a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

Allocation and releases so far during the Tenth Plan (2002-2007)

5.4 The year-wise Budget Estimates, revised Estimates and actual expenditure during first four years of the current plan and B.E. for the terminal year of the Plan under the scheme are as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	35.00	35.00	31.18
2003-2004	40.00	40.00	35.77
2004-2005	50.00	50.00	45.62
2005-2006	100.00	100.00	69.93 (As on 28.2.2006)
2006-2007	100.00	—	

5.5 The Department has informed that the reasons for variation between Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate *vis-a-vis* actual expenditure during the first four years of the current Plan are that the Scheme is a demand driven and the funds earmarked for the N.E States could not be released as these States have not requested for additional funds due to non-utilisation of funds release earlier.

Progress of Scheme in States other than North Eastern States

5.6 The Department has informed that States of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat have fully operationalized the system and

made online updation through computerized system. Many other States such as Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh have also taken necessary steps in this direction by effecting regular mutation/ updation of land records. Few other States have also completed the basic data entry work and started regular updation of land records.

5.7 As per the information furnished by the Ministry there is no coverage in State like Meghalaya and in some Union Territories like Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep.

Explaining the process of computerization of land records, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

“The village records consist of 10-12 various records, and they are all interconnected in various ways. In the first stage of computerisation we are talking about a very simple process, and it is not really connecting of all the records. It is a simple question of RoR, which we call Pani in our area. The RoR must be available to the villagers with their latest picture. I am saying this because it is the basic document that a person would require for taking crop loan, and for all his other transaction/needs. Therefore, the first stage was basically to make Pani available—in the form available on the hard copy—on the computer itself, so that any person can come there and ask for it. There is usually a small fee, which is levied for it and he can get it straight from the computer and use it for all his needs. This is all that the first stage of computerisation involves..... In the next stage we are planning something, which is a bigger job. We are working out a scheme for it, that is, to incorporate the mutations, the ownership and other changes in the document directly online from the place where the mutations take place.”

5.8 On the issue of decentralization of land records, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as under:

“We are certainly very keen to support the availability of the document at a lower level.....”

The Secretary further informed as under:

“I have one idea which I am wondering whether we can make operational, that is, if we can link up the Bhoomi information with the computers of the lending bankers, then the farmer does not even have to go and get a copy every time. The bankers an

access the Bhoomi record directly without any charge and check out whatever is the record directly and use that. That will reduce the transaction cost which you very rightly were mentioning that they spend three to four days at a Taluk office and all that. He would not even have to ask for the record, if we can do a linkage. Mostly, they are all assisted by cooperative banks. This is something which I am hoping that we can try to work on. If we can get the cooperative banks to actually directly access the Bhoomi record, then we should be in a position to avoid this hardship to the farmers.”

Progress in North Eastern States

5.9 The Department has informed that with the concerted efforts of the Ministry as also of the State Governments, the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh, and Tripura have already been started and expected to be completed by March, 2007. The State of Sikkim has already completed the basic data entry work and operationalized the scheme in 2 subdivisions. In the State of Meghalaya, the scheme has not yet started due to non-availability of proper land records. The State Government of Meghalaya has been requested to undertake survey settlement work with the use of modern technology so that updated land records could be computerized.

5.10 The Department has informed that one of the step which has been taken by the Department for improvement in the implementation of the CLR scheme is not give emphasis on to stop issue of manual copies of Record of Rights (RoR) and to provide legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR by amending the necessary Revenue Rules/Regulations etc.

5.11 On being asked whether the amendments have been made in the necessary Revenue Rules/Regulations to provide legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR, the Department has stated that the States of Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, U.P. and West Bengal have already amended the necessary revenue Rules/Regulations to provide legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR. Other State shave also been requested to amend necessary rules/Regulations to provide legal sanctity to RoR but these States are facing following problems:

- (i) Waiting for complete implementation and stabilization of computerized system.

- (ii) Lack of administrative and political will at State level.
- (iii) In few States namely MP, Rajasthan etc., Panchayats have been given powers to handle undisputed cases of mutation, which has resulted in manuals as well as computerized distribution of RoR.

Computer Training to Revenue Officials

5.12 On the issue of imparting of computer application training to Revenue Officers, the Department has informed that 15 States namely Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh, Delhi and Pondicherry have been provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials.

5.13 The Department has informed that the LBSNNA has conducted an evaluation study on Computerisation of Land Records in the States of Karnataka, West Bengal and Rajasthan. The evaluation study of Tamil Nadu is under progress. The Department has further stated that NIRD was also requested to undertake evaluation study in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Kerala. However, no progress report has so far been received from NIRD and they have not submitted any evaluation report of any State.

5.14 Maintenance and updating of land records is an important area which needs to be addressed urgently. Land records are the basic document of the property owned by an individual as well as by the group of people and Government at various levels. The importance of land records is immense not only for an individual but also for Government for the future planning. Once the land records are properly maintained, it will bring transparency and a mechanism to have an idea of Benami landholdings. The Committee find that a laudable scheme Computerisation of Land Records has been initiated by the Union Government with 100 per cent Central assistance since 1988-89. The outlay provided so far *i.e.* Rs. 416.06 crore could not be utilised fully by the State Governments. The utilisation upto 31 January, 2006 is Rs. 256.71 crore. The Committee feel that under-spending of around 40 per cent of the outlay is a major area of concern. Further the Committee note that the allocation during the year 2005-06 was double as compared to previous year. The Committee also find from the replies that sincere efforts have not been made to find out the reasons for huge under-spending. It has simply been stated that the scheme is demand driven. The Committee while expressing their concern over the under-utilisation

of funds would like the Department to find out specific reasons for under-spending State-wise and inform the Committee accordingly.

5.15 The Committee further note that States of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat have fully operationalised the system and made online updation through computerized system. Besides many other States such as Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh have also taken necessary steps in this direction by affecting regular mutation/updation of land records. Few other States have also completed the basic data entry work and started regular updation of land records. The worst performing State is Meghalaya and some Union Territories *viz.*, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep. The Committee appreciate the efforts made by some of the States like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat who could not only fully computerize the land records but also could make updation possible through computerized system. The Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter with other States so that the objectives of the programme can be achieved in these States.

5.16 The Committee further note that some progress has been made with regard to maintenance of land records in North Eastern States. As informed by the Department the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura have already been started. The work is likely to be completed in March 2007. The State of Sikkim has already completed the data entry work. In the case of Meghalaya, the scheme has not yet been started due to non-availability of proper land records. The Committee would like the Department to further pursue with these North Eastern States so that the work relating to computerization of land records is completed.

5.17 The Committee further note from the replies furnished by the Department that one of the important tasks for the successful implementation of programme is to stop issue of manual copies of Record of Rights and to provide legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR by amending the necessary revenue rules/regulations. Whereas the States of Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have already amended the necessary revenue rules/regulations in his regard, the action is pending in other States. Various reasons like lack of administrative and political will at State level, waiting for complete stabilization of computerized system etc. have been indicated as the reasons for not providing legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR in these States. The Committee feel

that more interaction through various seminars, conferences is required with the State Governments to persuade them to amend the revenue rules/regulations so that the computerized system of land records may be given legal sanctity. Besides the Committee feel that once the land records are computerized and the people are made aware of the system, the other issues related to giving legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR would automatically be demanded by the public at large. As such there is an urgent need to first complete the system of computerization by the initiatives of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and make maintenance as well as updation of land records a reality. The Committee hope that the Department would take the desired action in this regard.

5.18 The Committee further note the laudable idea given by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources whereby a thought is being given to link up the land record information with the computers of the lending bankers so that the farmer does not even need to procure the copy of land records every time. The bankers can access the land record directly without any charge. The Committee appreciate the idea and feel that if it is made possible, it will help the general public specifically farmers. Not only it will reduce the transaction cost, but also would be a great relief for the poor persons whose applications are rejected by the banks due to non-availability of proper copy of land records. Besides, the assistance under various Centrally Sponsored Schemes provided through banks like Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) can easily be made available.

5.19 The Committee find that 15 States have been provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds earmarked for training to these States. The Committee would also like to be informed about the module of training and the agencies involved for imparting training. They would like to suggest that similar initiatives should be taken in other States also.

5.20 The Committee further find that Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA) has conducted an evaluation study on Computerisation of Land Records in the States of Karnataka, West Bengal and Rajasthan. The evaluation study of Tamil Nadu is under progress. Further NIRD was also requested to undertake evaluation study in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Kerala. The Committee express their unhappiness that no progress report has been received from NIRD

which is a premier institution for research and is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee would like to be apprised when these studies were initiated. They would also like to be apprised about the details of the studies completed by LBSNAA.

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

5.21 The following are the details of B.E., R.E. and actual expenditure during each year of Tenth Plan:

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	20.00	20.00	20.73
2003-2004	25.00	25.00	24.46
2004-2005	20.00	20.00	19.43
2005-2006	40.00	40.00	26.93 (as on 28.2.2006)
2006-2007	49.00	—	—
Total	154.00		

One of the reasons for underspending in the SRA & ULR scheme as reported in the replies in inability to arrange matching share of 50 per cent by State Governments. The Department has informed that the matter of reviewing the funding pattern from existing 50:50 to 90:10 for North-Eastern states and 75:25 in case of other than NE states was taken up by the Department with the Planning Commission. Planning Commission has stated that the Twelfth Finance Commission Report has provided more resources. However, there is no specific mention about additional amount for the purpose of land records has been made.

5.22 When asked as to how in the absence of clear cut mention about additional funds for the purpose of land records in the Twelfth Finance Commission Report the Department plan to arrange funds for implementation of the scheme, the Department has stated that during the Conferences of Revenue Ministries/Secretaries organized by this Ministry from time-to-time, States are being requested to make provision in their State Budget so as to provide matching share for the purpose of land records.

5.23 During the course of examination the Department has informed that the system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal areas of the North-Eastern States, because cadastral survey has not been done thereby no land records exist. In some of these States, there is no legislation regarding land and land related matters. Though individual ownership of land has been developed in some areas, a good deal of land is still owned communally. Arunachal Pradesh has some land records and Manipur has land records for 5 valley districts. Therefore, these States have started data entry work under the Scheme of CLR. The State of Meghalaya has no proper land records. The State Government has been requested to carry out survey and settlement with the use of Modern survey equipments so that proper land records could be established. State Governments of Mizoram and Nagaland have already started survey and settlement with the financial support from Govt. of India under the scheme of SRA & ULR.

5.24 When asked about the difficulties being faced in conducting the aforesaid cadastral survey of North-Eastern States and whether local tribal laws/customs are coming in the way for undertaking such surveys in these States, the Department has stated that in the areas, proper survey have not been carried out. States have to create the land records first in the hilly areas then they can go for cadastral surveys and further they stated that this Department has no information because land and its management is exclusively under the jurisdiction of the State Government as provided in Entry No. 18 of List II (State List) to the Seventh schedule to the Constitution of India. However, this Ministry has been playing an advisory and coordinating role in the field of land reforms. Therefore, State Governments have to take action for undertaking survey in these areas.

5.25 The Committee find from the data with regard to allocation under the scheme Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) that out of Rs. 311.77 crore provided to the States/UTs as Central share upto 31 January, 2006, the utilisation position is Rs. 228.01 crore. Thus around 27 per cent of the funds could not be utilised. The Committee also note that the inability of State Governments to provide 50 per cent matching share is the basic concern for implementation of the programme. The Committee also note that the matter of reviewing the financial pattern from existing 50:50 to 90:10 for North-Eastern states and 75:25 in case of other than NE states was taken up by the Department with the Planning Commission who have stated that the 12th Finance Commission Report has provided more resources. The said issue

was addressed in detail by the Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports. The Committee had also observed that there is no specific mention about additional amount for the purpose of land records in the 12th Finance Commission Report. In view of this, the Committee would like the Government to take up the matter again with the Planning Commission in the light of the observations made by the Committee and impress upon them to change the funding pattern.

5.26 The Committee further note that two schemes SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records are inter-related. The land records can be computerized only when the land records are properly available. Thus availability of land records is the basic issue. In view of this, the Committee would like to be apprised by the Department how the coordination between these two schemes is being maintained.

5.27 The Committee find that the system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal areas of North Eastern States. In most of the areas even the cadastral survey has not been done and so no land records exist. With regard to the programme 'Computerisation of Land Records', the Committee have been informed that the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura has already started. The Committee observe that Computerization of Land Records is not possible when the basic data of land records is not available in an area. In this situation the Committee wonder how the programme of Computerisation of Land Records is progressing when even the cadastral survey in these States has not been done and no land records exist. The clarification in this regard may be furnished to enable the Committee to review the position of Computerization of Land Records and SRA & ULR schemes in North Eastern States.

NEW DELHI;
17 May, 2006

27 Vaisakha, 1928 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT SHOWING BUDGET ESTIMATES, REVISED ESTIMATES AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE
DURING 9TH PLAN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	9th Plan Outlay and Expenditure																				
		9th Plan		1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001			2001-2002			9th Plan (1997-2002)			
		As propo- sed	Agreed/ Actual	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22			
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	700.00	705.00	115.00	100.75	100.75	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.99	190.00	190.00	190.00	210.00	210.00	209.62	705.00	668.75	668.26	
2.	Desert Development Programme	1430.00	540.00	70.00	70.00	70.00	90.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	85.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	160.00	150.00	150.00	540.00	520.00	519.80	
3.	I.W.D.P.	3360.00	1148.60	74.50	50.00	53.95	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	82.00	83.07	480.00	387.00	386.90	430.00	405.00	376.35	1148.50	986.10	962.27	
4.	Computerisation of Land Records	332.46	178.00	20.00	20.00	20.19	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	32.69	50.00	48.00	47.85	45.00	45.00	44.36	178.00	171.00	169.84	
5.	SRA & ULR	326.00	92.60	18.80	18.80	18.97	8.80	8.80	9.05	10.00	10.00	10.25	25.00	25.00	24.99	30.00	25.00	23.94	92.60	87.60	87.20	
6.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	106.00	51.00	8.00	7.50	5.60	8.00	8.00	8.05	8.00	8.00	8.70	12.00	10.87	10.98	15.00	12.00	9.93	51.00	46.37	43.26	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
7.	Consolidation of Land Holdings													1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00
8.	Support to NGOs/VAs Scheme			4.00	4.00	2.60	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	8.40	7.02	
9.	Wasteland Development Task Force			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.98	
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	291.00	52.10	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.23	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.20	0.12	5.60	3.10	0.49	
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation			1.00	0.30	0.04	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.26	0.20	5.00	0.20	0.05	9.00	2.01	1.44	
12.	Communication			4.00	1.50	1.42	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.00	2.92	0.86	0.50	0.50	0.26	12.50	6.67	5.90	
13.	Board Secretariat			1.50	1.50	1.27	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.71	2.50	2.45	2.38	3.00	2.10	1.68	11.00	10.05	8.46	
Total Plan		6545.46	2767.30	318.80	275.55	275.79	324.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	323.60	900.00	800.00	799.66	900.00	850.00	816.21	2767.30	2513.05	2476.92	
Non-Plan																						
Secretariat Economic Services				0.20	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.84	2.60	2.54	2.19	
Total Plan & Non-Plan				319.00	275.74	275.93	324.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	323.77	900.90	800.89	800.50	900.99	850.97	817.05	2769.90	2515.59	2479.11	

APPENDIX II
DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES
STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE DURING
TENTH PLAN (FROM 2002-03 TO 2005-06)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	10th Plan				2002-2003			2003-2004			2004-05			2005-06			2006-07			
		As Propo- sed	As agreed by Planning Commi- ssion	Exp. as on 31.3. 2006	As Propo- sed	Agreed to BE	RE	Actual Exp.	As Propo- sed	Agreed to BE	RE	Actual Exp.	As Propo- sed	Agreed to B.E.	RE	Actual Exp.	As Propo- sed	Agreed to BE	Actual Expen- diture	As Propo- sed	Agreed to BE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	1600	1500	1198.37	270.00	250.00	250.00	250.00	310.00	295.00	295.00	295.00	330.00	300.00	300.00	300.19	375.00	353.00	353.18	400.00	380.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	1200	1100	883.36	210.00	185.00	185.00	185.00	230.00	265.00	195.00	215.00	240.00	215.00	215.00	215.19	285.00	268.00	268.17	300.00	270.00
3.	IWDP	1900	1800	1488.51	440.00	387.00	380.00	354.45	350.00	335.00	329.00	312.90	380.00	368.00	368.00	334.42	415.00	485.00	486.74	550.00	485.00
	Total Watershed Programme	4700.00	4400.00	3570.24	920.00	822.00	815.00	789.45	890.00	895.00	819.00	822.90	950.00	883.00	883.00	849.00	1075.00	1106.50	1108.89	1250.00	1115.00
4.	Computerisation of Land Records	500	400.00	212.31	100.00	55.00	35.00	31.18	55.00	40.00	40.00	35.77	65.00	50.00	50.00	45.62	125.00	100.00	99.74	175.00	100.00
5.	SRA&ULR	200	200.00	104.84	40.00	35.00	20.00	20.73	35.00	25.00	25.00	24.46	35.00	20.00	20.00	19.66	65.00	40.00	39.99	95.00	49.00
6.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)			0.00																280.00	1.00
7.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	365	365.00	275.27	63.00	63.00	60.00	59.00	66.00	66.00	51.00	55.28	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.99	85.00	80.00
8.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	100	90.00	60.77	20.00	17.00	16.00	13.70	20.00	17.00	14.00	15.08	15.00	15.00	15.00	14.99	20.00	17.00	17.00	20.00	20.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
9.	Investment Promotional Scheme			5.81		1.00	0.10	3.13	10.00	0.10	0.10	0.96	6.00	0.10	0.10	0.54	3.00	0.10	1.18	5.00	3.00
10.	Appraisal Monitoring and Evaluation	100	71.00	0.00	20.00	5.95	2.95			4.85	0.54			1.20	0.50			1.20			
11.	Communication			0.00		1.05	0.95			1.05	0.36			1.70	1.20			1.70			
	New Initiatives		1000	0.00					100.00	1.00	0.00	0.00									
12.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Sanvardhan Yojana			0.00									200.00	200.00	0.00	0.00		0.00			
13.	Bio Fuel			49.00									10.00	10.00	0.20	0.00	120.00	50.00	49.00	200.00	50.00
	Total Plan	5965.00	6526.00	4278.24	1163.00	1000.00	950.00	917.19	1176.00	1050.00	950.00	954.45	1361.00	1261.00	1050.00	1010.61	1488.00	1396.00	1395.99	2110.00	1418.00
	Non Plan			0.00																	
	Secretariat Economic Services			11.73		3.81	3.62	2.83		3.66		2.83		3.48	3.43	3.00		3.44*	3.22		3.70
	Total Plan & Non Plan	5965.00	6526.00	4289.97	1163.00	1003.81	953.62	919.87	1176.00	1053.86	950.00	957.28	1361.00	1264.48	1053.43	1013.61	1488.00	1399.44	1399.21	2110.00	1421.70

*BE of Rs. 3.44 Crore was reduced to Rs. 3.29 Crore at RE stage.

APPENDIX III

RECOMMENDATION PARA NO. 28 (16TH REPORT, 14TH LOK SABHA)

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, aforestation, pasture development, creation of livelihood opportunities, training of stake holders etc.

The Committee deplore the way their recommendation on such a serious issue like foreclosure 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.

APPENDIX IV

**STATEMENT SHOWING STATE-WISE AND YEAR-WISE IWDP
PROJECTS SANCTIONED DURING 9TH PLAN**

(in numbers)

Sl.No.	State	Year					Total
		1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5	6	4	7	10	32
2.	Bihar	0	0	0	0	1	1
3.	Chhattisgarh	0	0	0	4	6	10
4.	Gujarat	1	6	6	7	6	26
5.	Haryana	2	0	0	1	3	5
6.	Himachal Pradesh	2	2	5	8	7	24
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	1	2	0	0	4	7
8.	Jharkhand	0	0	1	2	1	4
9.	Karnataka	4	5	5	0	8	22
10.	Kerala	0	0	0	2	0	2
11.	Maharashtra	1	3	5	7	4	20
12.	Madhya Pradesh	5	2	11	9	10	37
13.	Orissa	6	6	1	6	9	28
14.	Punjab	0	0	0	0	3	3
15.	Rajasthan	2	1	8	9	7	27
16.	Tamil Nadu	1	1	8	9	4	23
17.	Uttar Pradesh	7	7	9	3	7	33
18.	Uttaranchal	1	0	0	4	6	11
19.	West Bengal	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Total	38	41	63	78	97	317
	North Eastern States	7	7	10	29	28	61
	Grand Total	45	48	73	107	125	398

APPENDIX V

**STATEMENT SHOWING STATE-WISE AND YEAR-WISE IWDP
PROJECTS SANCTIONED DURING TENTH PLAN**

Sl.No.	State	2002-03 No. of projects sanctioned	2003-04 No. of projects sanctioned	2004-05 No. of projects sanctioned	2005-06 No. of projects sanctioned	Total No. of projects sanctioned
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	10	10	16	38
2.	Bihar	0	9	9	17	35
3.	Chhattisgarh	0	8	9	15	32
4.	Goa	0	2	0	2	4
5.	Gujarat	0	11	9	15	35
6.	Haryana	0	4	6	5	13
7.	Himachal Pradesh	0	8	2	13	23
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	0	1	4	10	15
9.	Jharkhand	0	6	4	6	16
10.	Karnataka	1	9	10	17	37
11.	Kerala	0	3	0	12	15
12.	Maharashtra	0	9	10	13	32
13.	Madhya Pradesh	1	16	14	19	50
14.	Orissa	0	7	9	15	31
15.	Punjab	0	0	4	5	9
16.	Rajasthan	0	9	9	15	33
17.	Tamil Nadu	0	11	10	19	40
18.	Uttar Pradesh	0	13	13	16	42
19.	Uttaranchal	4	3	6	12	25
20.	West Bengal	0	2	4	7	13
	Total	8	141	140	249	538

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	North Eastern States					
21.	Arunachal Pradesh	8	10	11	22	51
22.	Assam	15	14	35	23	87
23.	Manipur	6	5	7	8	26
24.	Meghalaya	0	7	7	7	21
25.	Mizoram	5	5	5	17	32
26.	Nagaland	7	5	5	5	22
27.	Sikkim	0	3	4	4	11
28.	Tripura	0	0	7	5	12
	Total of NE	41	49	81	91	262
	Total of IWDP	49	190	221	340	800

APPENDIX VI

DISTRICT/TEHSILS/SUB-DIVISION SANCTIONED AND WORK COMPLETED UNDER CLR PROGRAMME AS ON 31.3.2006

Sl. No.	Name of the State/ UTs.	Total No. of Districts	Districts covered	District Data Centre	Monitoring Cell at State Head Quarters	Total number of Sub-division	Number of sub-division covered	Total number of Tehsils/Talukas Blocks	Number of Tehsils/Talukas Blocks sanctioned	Number of Tehsils/Talukas/Blocks where computer centre set up	Tehsil/district centre fully operational (in terms of on demand distribution RoR & mutation updation)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Andhra Pradesh	23	23	23	1	79	79	308 Tehsils	308	308	308
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	14	14					149 Circles			
3.	Assam	23	23		1		12	155 Circles	83		
4.	Bihar	37	37			101		515 Anchals			
5.	Gujarat	25	25	25	1	54	35	226 Taluks	226	226	226
6.	Goa	1	1					11 Taluks	11	11	11
7.	Haryana	19	19	20	1	47	47	112 Tehsils	115	67	7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12	12	12	1	51	51	110 Tehsils	110	104	50
9.	Jammu & kashmir	14	14					59 Tehsils	59	59	
10.	Jharkhand	22	22					210 Anchals	210	210	
11.	Karnataka	27	27	27	1	52	52	177 Taluks	177	177	177

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
12.	Kerala	14	14					63 Taluks	63	63	1
13.	Madhya Pradesh	45	45	45	1	185	182	273 Tehsils	273	257	257
14.	Maharashtra	35	35	35	1	109	109	358 Taluks	358	312	312
15.	Manipur	9	8					5 38 Sub-division	5		
16.	Meghalaya	7						32 Blocks			
17.	Mizoram	9	9					23 Sub-division	23	23	
18.	Nagaland	8	8					93 Circles			
19.	Orissa	30	30	30	1	58	58	171 Tehsils	171	151	151
20.	Punjab	17	17				72	72 Tehsils			
21.	Rajasthan	32	32		1	188	188	246 Tehsils	246	241	241
22.	Sikkim	4	4					9 Sub-division	9	4	2
23.	Tamil Nadu	29	29	29	1	73	73	206 Taluks	206	206	206
24.	Tripura	4	4				15	38 C.D. Blocks	37		
25.	Uttar Pradesh	70	70	70	1			305 Tehsils	300	305	305

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
26.	Uttaranchal	13	13	13	1	84	84	Tehsils	84	55	55
27.	West Bengal	18	18	18	1	65	65	341 Blocks	341	341	341
28.	Chhattisgarh	16	16	16	1	63	63	98 Tehsils	98	98	98
29.	D&N Haveli	1	1					1 Taluk			
30.	Delhi	9	9					27 Tehsils		5	5
31.	Pondicherry	1	1	2	1			8 Taluks	5	2	2
32.	Chandigarh	1	1					1 Tehsil			
33.	A&N Islands	1						7 Tehsils			
34.	Daman & Diu	2	1					2 Taluks	1		
35.	Lakshadweep	1						4 Sub-division			
	Total	593	582	365	16	1212	1019	4532	3519	3225	2755

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH
SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY,
THE 21 MARCH, 2006

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

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mohan Jena
3. Shri Dawa Narbula
4. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
5. Shri Prabodh Panda
6. Shri Mohan Singh
7. Shri Sita Ram Singh

Rajya Sabha

8. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
9. Shri Penumalli Madhu
10. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

**

**

**

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

1. Dr. Renuka Viswanathan, Secretary (LR)
2. Shri L. Rynjah, Additional Secretary
3. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, Additional Secretary & Financial Adviser
4. Shri Rakesh Behari, Joint Secretary
5. Shri D.P. Roy, Joint Secretary

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened for briefing by the representatives of (i) Department of Rural Development and (ii) Department of Land Resources on Demands for Grants (2006-2007). He informed the Committee that the sittings of the Committee for the purpose of examination of Demands for Grants (2006-2007) (as intimated to the members of the Committee vide Lok Sabha Secretariat Notice dated 23 March, 2006) had to be rescheduled due to rescheduling of Seventh Session of Lok Sabha. The detailed revised programme for oral evidence and consideration and adoption of the Reports was then circulated to the members of the Committee. Chairman solicited cooperation of the members of the Committee to finalise the reports on Demands for Grants (2006-2007).

**

**

**

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Departments of Rural Development and Land Resources and drew their attention to the provisions of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker. He in his welcome address raised the main issues which included underspending of outlay, huge opening balances with various State Governments, underachievement of targets, mismatch of physical and financial achievement as indicated in the various Budget documents of the respective Departments.

4. **

**

**

[The representatives of the Department of Rural Development then withdrew at 1625 hrs. Since the Secretary, Department of Rural Development is also looking after the Department of Land Resources, she along with the common officers of both the Departments (Department of Rural Development and Department of Land Resources) stayed back and officers dealing with the Department of Land Resources joined them.]

**Not related to the Report.

5. The Secretary briefed the Committee about the various activities and the highlights of the Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources. The main issues that came up during the course of briefing were lack of effective mechanism for evaluating the physical and financial performance of the projects under different schemes/programmes, need for people's participation especially that of women in implementation of projects, lack of coordination between different Ministries/Organisations in watershed development projects etc. The members raised various queries and the witnesses responded to the queries of the members.

6. A verbatim record of the proceeding was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned to meet again on
22 March, 2006 at 1500 hrs.*

APPENDIX VIII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

MINUTES OF THE SIXTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 12 APRIL, 2006

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in Committee Room
G-074, Parliament Library Building (PLB), New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mohan Jena
3. Shri Subhash Maharia
4. Shri Hannan Mollah
5. Shri Dawa Narbula
6. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
7. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
8. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
9. Shri Mohan Singh
10. Shri Sita Ram Singh
11. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
12. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
13. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

14. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
15. Shri Penumalli Madhu
16. Dr. Chandan Mitra
17. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

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

1. Dr. Renuka Viswanathan, Secretary (LR)
2. Shri L. Rynjah, Additional Secretary
3. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, AS & FA
4. Shri Rakesh Bihari, Joint Secretary
5. Shri D.P. Roy, Joint Secretary
6. Shrimati Smita Chugh, Joint Secretary

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) and drew their attention to the provisions of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker. He thereafter made certain crucial remarks on the implementation of major schemes of the Department. The major area of concern in the schemes related to wastelands development such as Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), the lack of mechanism to evaluate the physical achievement of the projects, foreclosure of many projects thereby wasting the national resources, huge under-spending under different schemes. He also referred to landmark achievements made by some of the States under the schemes related to land records i.e., Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) and Computerization of Land Records (CLR) which needed to be replicated by the other States. He also referred to the poor position of land records in North-Eastern States which needed more attention under the schemes of the Department.

3. The Secretary of the Department responded to the major issues raised by Hon'ble Chairman. Thereafter members of the Committee raised several queries supplementing the issues raised by the Hon'ble Chairman. The Committee observed that wastelands if reclaimed, could be a major source of employment to the unemployed in the country. The role of private sector in the field of wastelands development was

also deliberated during the discussion. A suggestion was also made to find out if the wastelands could be used for construction of houses under Indira Awaas Yojana. The representatives of the Department responded to the various queries of the members of the Committee.

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IX

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-2006)

MINUTES OF THE TWENTIETH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 8TH MAY, 2006

The Committee sat from 1430 hrs. to 1530 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hannan Mollah — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
3. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
4. Shri Prabodh Panda
5. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
6. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
7. Shri Sita Ram Singh
8. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
9. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

10. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
11. Shri Penumalli Madhu
12. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Hannan Mollah, M.P. to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) and adopted the draft Report with slight modifications.

4. The Committee then authorized the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid draft Report 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 to meet again on
9 May, 2006 at 1100 hrs.*

APPENDIX X

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl.No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.5	<p>The Committee note that the primary objective of inserting direction 73A in the Directions by the Speaker was to make the Government more accountable for implementation of the various recommendations of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that even after elapse of around six months when the statement on Tenth Report has fallen due and about three months when the Ministry was requested for making the revised statement in respect of Second Report, the statements are yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister. The Committee find that the Department is taking the desired action to make the statements in the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements are made at the earliest during the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee further strongly recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements on each of the reports are made within the specified period <i>i.e.</i>, six months after the presentation of the Report to Parliament as per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, in future.</p>
2.	2.17	<p>The Committee find from the data indicated for 9th and 10th Plan that there is huge mismatch between the proposed allocation and agreed to allocation. Whereas during 9th Plan, the allocation as agreed to is around 40 per cent of the proposed outlay, the agreed to allocation during 10th Plan is Rs. 561 crore</p>

more than the proposed outlay. The department has submitted new guidelines as a reason for slow utilisation and getting lesser allocation during 9th Plan. The reasons put forth by the Department for getting around 40 per cent of the proposed allocation during 9th Plan are not convincing. The plea accorded by the Department for getting more than the proposed allocation during Tenth Plan is that Rs. 1,000 crore was provided for 'New Initiatives' and thus the outlay agreed for Tenth Plan would come up to Rs. 5,526 crore which is Rs. 439 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. Even if it is accepted, the projected outlay during 10th Plan was Rs. 580.46 crore lesser than proposed outlay during 9th Plan.

The Committee are surprised to find that the proposed allocation during 9th Plan was higher when the guidelines were new but during 10th Plan, the projections were reduced, even when the field agencies had adapted themselves to the new guidelines. The Committee conclude that the projections are not properly presented to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for different plans. Even the Secretary during the course of the oral evidence has admitted that somewhere the mistake is there. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should take utmost care while making projections for 11th Plan. The perspective plans for wastelands development should be prepared by the various State Governments after due consultations with the Implementing Agencies. Not only that district level plans should be prepared after taking into consideration the total work to be undertaken keeping in view the area of wastelands in that area, the capacity of the implementing agencies etc., while holding key consultation at the grass-root level and at the Panchayat level. With

regard to other schemes for land records also the projections should be made keeping in view the work completed and the pending work. The projections should be realistic to the extent possible. Besides, the outlay, strategy and priorities during 11th Plan should be chalked out well before the start of the 11th Plan *i.e.* the year 2007-2008, so as to ensure meaningful utilisation of outlay. The early finalisation of outlay for the 11th Plan would further enable the State Governments/implementing agencies to make timely allocations under different schemes/programmes.

3. 2.18 The Committee further find from the data of allocation of outlay that whatever may be the case of placing projections for different schemes of the Department, it is certain that adequate priority has been accorded by the Government while finalising the outlay for 10th Plan. It is very rare when any Ministry/Department has been allocated resources more than the projections. The Committee also observe that the focused and balanced development of wastelands is imperative keeping in view the decline in the availability of land per person over the years. Further, the facts revealed by the Parthasarthy Committee establish that there is concentration of poverty in the dry lands of the country. From the position as indicated above, the Committee find that more attention needs to be given for the development of wastelands in the country. The wastelands when developed can be a major source for fulfilling the need for food and water security. Not only that it can be a major source for providing employment to the poorest of poor in the country. The detailed scheme-wise position of outlay, expenditure and physical achievement has been analysed in the succeeding chapter of the report. Here the

1	2	3
		<p>Committee would like to recommend for adequate outlay for different schemes of wastelands in the country. Besides recommending for higher outlay, there is an urgent need for successful implementation of the schemes/programmes which has been reviewed by the Committee in detail in the succeeding chapter of the report.</p>
4.	2.19	<p>The Committee observe that Parthasarthy Committee has analysed the watershed programmes in detail and given detailed valuable recommendations. The recommendations of the said Committee should be carefully examined while holding wide-ranging consultations with all concerned and the Department should take the desired action to implement the accepted recommendations of the Committee. The Sanding Committee should also be kept apprised of the status of the implementation of the major recommendations of the Parthasarthy Committee.</p>
5.	2.20	<p>The Committee further find from the information provided by the Department that Rs. 1,000 crore was earmarked for new initiatives during 10th Plan. Even when the 10th Plan is coming to an end, no new initiative could be finalised. The new programme 'Bio-fuel' proposed by the Department is still at a nescient stage. The Committee in their earlier reports on Demands for Grants had repeatedly been expressing concern over the way new schemes are proposed. The Committee express strong concern over the way the scarce resources are being blocked for the new schemes, which are not implemented. The blocking of resources in this way clearly means depriving the other schemes/programmes of their due share. The Committee hold the strong view that the new schemes should be properly</p>

1	2	3
		planned and the allocation should be earmarked only when the spadework has been done and all the paraphernalia to implement the scheme is ready.
6.	2.21	The Committee note that the Planning Commission has constituted two working groups on Land Relations and Rainfed Areas for Eleventh Five Year Plan to finalise the strategy for the development of wastelands. The expected role of private sector in the task of development of wastelands is also being discussed while chalking out the strategy for Eleventh Plan. The Committee note that the major apprehension in involving private sector is that the interests of the local people may not be harmed. They feel that the Government should carefully consider the issue of involvement of private sector in consultation with the State Governments and local bodies. The Committee further recommend that strategy for the Eleventh Plan should be finalised expeditiously.
7.	2.26	The Committee note from the trends of allocation of outlay during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 that the agreed allocation is lesser than the proposed allocation. During the year 2006-07, the agreed allocation is Rs. 689 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. The Committee find it interesting that whereas the overall allocation for 10th Plan is more than the projections, the allocations under Annual Plans are lesser than the projection. It is difficult to understand the way the budgeting exercise is being undertaken where there seems to be no planning. The Committee would like to be apprised of the basis of making projections under each of the Annual Plan.
8.	2.27	Whereas the releases form the Centre have been stated to be almost cent per cent of the

allocated outlay, the unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 1,405 crore with the implementing agencies is really a matter of concern to the Committee. They are not convinced with the plea given by the Department whereby the Department has tried to justify the unspent amount by stating that the unspent balance do not exceed 10 per cent of the project cost at any point of time. The Department holds the view that the balance is necessitated to maintain availability of funds at the implementation level to avoid eventualities of non-payment of wages as wastelands development projects are labour intensive projects. However, the Committee wish to point out that Rs. 1,405 crore is almost equal to the overall allocation of the Department during the year 2006-07. The Committee feel that the unspent balances should be seen with reference to the allocation made during a particular year and not with reference to the total project cost under different schemes. The projects may continue even after five to seven years. Roll-on money to the tune of 10 to 20 per cent of the allocation under a scheme during a year can be justified on the grounds stated by the Department. The justification of unspent balance corresponding to the total project cost can not be understood. The Committee find that instead of taking stringent measures for keeping the unspent balances to the minimum, the Department has tried to justify it which the Committee really disapprove. The Department should take all the corrective measures and inform the Committee accordingly.

9. 3.13 The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the multiplicity of programmes/schemes to tackle the problem of wastelands in the country and have been emphasising on the need for

convergence of the programme. While examining the Demands for Grants, it has repeatedly been brought to the notice of Government but the issue although agreed to in principle lacks unanimity among the various Ministries involved in handling the issue of wastelands development. The Technical Committee in Chapter three of the report has expressed similar concerns. It has been stated that serious differences persist among different Ministries regarding the ownership of the unified programme.

The Committee also note that in the Mid-Term Appraisal document of the Planning Commission, the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella has been suggested which seems to be not agreeable to the concerned Ministries due to their reluctance to lease the area of activities related to watershed management being undertaken by them. The Committee also note that the proposal has been mooted by the Ministry of Agriculture for a nodal centralised agency *i.e.* Rainfed Area Authority. Again the issue of conflict is the ownership of the aforesaid authority. Further the Committee also find that finally it has been agreed that the said authority would be best located under the umbrella of the PMO. The Committee feel that sufficient time has been lost over the issue of taking decision on the issue of convergence. It is high time to resolve the issue of convergence at the earliest.

10. 3.14 The Committee further note the claim of the Department that the extent of wastelands has come down from 63.85 million hectares to 55.27 million hectares between the period 2000 and 2005. The Committee find that even with the efforts of the Department of Land Resources

the target for development of wastelands during five years of 10th Plan are 18 million hectares. Out of this target, 12.47 hectares of wastelands have already been developed. The other Ministries/Departments of the Union Government as well as State Governments involved with the task of development of wastelands may also be contributing substantially towards the development of major areas of wastelands in the country. In this scenario, the Committee find that there is some mismatch between the achievement proclaimed by the Department and the actual area developed. Although the Department seems very optimistic by finding that the wastelands area has declined as found by the updated Atlas, the achievements reflected by the updated Atlas *i.e.* development of only 8.58 million hectares of land during five years period is too meagre even when compared with the targets of five years *i.e.* 18 millions hectares only of the Department of Land Resources. If the targets fixed and proclaimed by different Ministries of Union as well as State Governments are added together, the whole wastelands area would have been developed by now. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the achievements reflected under schemes may not be true at the ground level. The Committee would like a clarification of the Department in this regard so as to enable them to understand the position in proper perspective.

11. 3.25 The Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports had expressed serious concerns over the issue of foreclosure of projects under the schemes related to wastelands development *i.e.* Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP)
-

and Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET). While examining the action taken replies, the Committee had observed that some of the projects were foreclosed at the last stage when substantial allocation had been released for the project thereby wasting national resources. Detailed analysis of the issue indicate that the system of foreclosure has been given in detail in the watershed guidelines. It has been stated that at the initial phase of a project *i.e.* the first nine to twelve months, if it is considered that the project cannot be implemented successfully for certain unavoidable circumstances and reasons the ZPO/DRDA shall recommend for its foreclosure to the State Governments which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to the Department of Land Resources. As reported in 16th Report of the Committee, most of the projects are being foreclosed even at the last stage. The Committee observe that the guidelines do not seem to have been followed while foreclosing projects under different schemes.

The Committee further find from the data furnished by the department that for a large number of projects under DPAP and DDP funding has been stopped. The Committee would like to be informed about the difference between the funding stopped and foreclosure of the projects since two different data have been indicated in the Budget documents. The Committee would also like the Department to furnish information with regard to the date of sanction, funds earmarked and date of foreclosure/when funds were stopped in each of the foreclosed project scheme-wise so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position in detail. The Committee would also like to recommend that such information about the

1	2	3
		foreclosure/funding stopped should regularly be maintained and indicated in the Budget documents.
12.	3.26	As regards the projects transferred from erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme of the Department of Rural development to the Department of Land Resources during the year 1999-2000, the Committee note that the initial committed liability in case of these projects was Rs. 1500 crore. As regards the total funds released to these projects, Rs. 900.68 crore have been released so far for these projects. The Committee further find that the Department has no information with regard to the status of projects and the physical achievements for these projects. Not only that, simply releasing the outlay with regard to claims made by States is considered as completion of the project. It has further been stated that the details of physical and financial achievements for these projects seem the merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP. The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the project is being undertaken by the Department. To analyse the position with regard to EAS projects transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources, the Committee would like to be apprised about the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so as to enable the Committee to have a proper analysis.
13.	3.27	The Committee have repeatedly been expressing the concern over lack of mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes in their respective reports. The Committee in their 10th Repot had even suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects. While noting

that there is a long gestation period the Committee had suggested to evaluate the projects at various stages like first stage, second stage and third stage etc. and benchmarking the projects by indicating poor, satisfactory or very good. The Committee further find that Hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed similar concerns over the lack of focus on outcomes. He in his address to the nation on 15 August, 2005 has expressed the view that merely utilising outlays has been the norms under different schemes. Not only that the Technical Committee has also expressed similar views and suggested a similar mechanism as suggested by this Standing Committee to evaluate the performance of projects. Even when the Standing Committee, Hon'ble Prime Minister and the Technical Committee of the Department of Rural Development have been expressing their concerns over the sorry state of affairs of monitoring of projects, it seems from the various Budget documents that least attention is paid towards the serious concerns expressed from various quarters. From the replies at various places it appears the number of installments released has been deemed to be the mechanism to now that the project has been completed.

The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the projects is being undertaken by the Department under the various schemes of wastelands development. The Committee would like the Department to pay serious attention to the observations of the Committee as reported above and furnish a detailed note for the information of the Committee indicating thereby the steps proposed to be initiated by the Department to address the concerns as expressed by this Committee and from various other quarters.

1	2	3
14.	3.40	<p>The Committee note that different data with regard to total wastelands in the country which need to be developed has been indicated in the different documents. As per the initial Atlas brought out by the Department in the year 2000, total wastelands has been indicated as 63.85 million hectares. The latest data launched in 2005 indicate the wastelands as 55.27 million hectares. Further the Technical Committee in its report has stated that 45.58 million hectares have been treated so far since 8th Plan by the initiatives of the Union Government. It has further been stated that excluding the 46 million hectares as already treated, the areas remaining to be treated are 125 million hectares. While appreciating the fact that there are various estimates with regard to wastelands development and it is difficult to find out the exact data in this regard, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have some data indicating the minimum wastelands area that needs to be developed so as to enable the Government to prepare an action plan. The answer to this issue is the perspective plans by the different State Governments.</p>
15.	3.41	<p>The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to get the perspective plans finalised from various State Governments on the issue of development of wastelands. They find from the replies that none of the States is ready with the perspective plan. Only two States <i>i.e.</i> Tamil Nadu and Kerala have submitted the perspective plans in respect of few districts. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have a fair idea of the task in hand and the task to be handled in future with regard to wastelands development in the country. Further as observed in the preceding paras of the report there are varying estimates with regard to the area falling under</p>

wastelands as well as the task of development of wastelands handled by the Government initiatives. The exact idea of the wastelands area, work involved can be known when the perspective plans are ready. Besides perspective plans as submitted by the State Governments can be a better input to formulate the national plan. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue further with the State Governments to finalise the perspective plans so that the same can be used while deciding the strategy for the Eleventh Five Year Plan.

16. 3.42

The Committee further note that as indicated by Technical Committee Rs. 1,50,000 crore would be required to treat the estimated land of 125 million hectares. The Technical Committee has suggested to double the current programme outlay. Further it has also been stated that the allocation made under National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme would supplement the outlay provided by different Government schemes for the development of wastelands. The Committee find that the outlay for National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has been separately allocated by the Department of Rural Development. Rs. 11,300 crore during 2006-2007 have been earmarked for 200 districts which have been covered by the Guarantee Scheme. Till the scheme is not made applicable nationwide, it is difficult to know how far the outlay provided for NREGS could supplement the Government initiatives taken under different wastelands programmes. Besides there is an urgent need to have some sort of coordinating mechanism for the schemes being undertaken under NREGS related to watershed activities and the schemes taken under the Department of Rural Development or some other Ministries of Union Government or State Governments. The Committee feel that

1	2	3
		Gram Sabha is the best mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Department in this regard.
17.	3.43	The Committee find that some initiatives are being taken for formulating the National Land Resource Management Policy. The Committee would like the Government to pursue the matter further so that there is proper direction in land management.
18.	3.44	The Committee wish to point out that Land Acquisition Act 1894 is an old and outdated enactment which needs considerable amendments keeping in view the changed circumstances. The Committee have repeatedly been stressing for bringing amendments to this Act. The Committee understand that proposal for the amendment of Land Acquisition Act is under consideration with the Department for a long time. They find from the submission made by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence that much emphasis is not being given to finalise the proposals for the amendment of the said Act. The Committee are not convinced by the statement made by the Secretary that land is a State subject and the Central Act will not become effective unless the State accepts it. The Committee note that Central Acts are the model for the State Governments on which they draft their policies and laws. State Governments are waiting for the amendments in Land Acquisition Act. The old and outdated Act has been a hinderance for implementation of various projects where acquisition of land is required. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to finalise the proposals for amendment to the aforesaid Act and bring the same before the Parliament at the earliest.

1	2	3
19.	3.45	The Committee further note that some initiatives are being taken to amend the Land Revenue Act. Consultations are being held with the interested Ministries. The Committee stress that the proposals for amendment of the Land Revenue Act should be finalised at the earliest.
20.	3.46	The Committee find that land is the basic constraint in implementation of some of the major schemes of the Department specifically Indira Awaas Yojana where it is difficult to extend the benefits to the landless persons. The possibility of using wastelands for setting up agricultural universities and for constructing houses under Government schemes for the landless persons should be discussed with the various State Governments and the Committee apprised about the feedback received in this regard.
21.	4.14	The Committee note that IWDP is the most important programme of the Department for the development of wastelands in the country. The status of financial achievement during 9th and 10th Plan as given above indicate that there has not been major enhancement in the outlay under the Scheme. The outlay for Rs. 450 crore during the year 2002-03 has been enhanced to Rs. 565 crore during 2006-07. But the allocation earmarked has not been fully utilised during each year of 9th and 10th Plan. Under-spending is the recurring feature of this programme. As regards the physical achievement the data indicate that almost half of the projects sanctioned are still continuing. The number of projects taken up during 10th Plan are almost double the projects undertaken during 9th Plan. Further, there are problems like unspent balances, non-submission of Utilisation Certificate and misutilisation of funds as pointed out in C&AG Report for

which certain recoveries were to be made. The Committee conclude that there are serious problems in implementation of IWDP programme which need to be addressed urgently. Taking into consideration the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country, the Committee strongly recommend to enhance the allocation under IWDP which is one of the major schemes of the Department. While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would also like the Department to ensure that the allocation earmarked in a year is utilised fully.

22.

4.15

As regards the monitoring of the physical status of the projects the Committee in the preceding paras of the report have noted that the common problems with regard to the projects undertaken for wastelands under different schemes of the Department are foreclosure of projects, stopping payment to projects etc. The issue has been dealt with in detail and suggestions made in the preceding part of the report. As regards the issue of time overrun of the projects being undertaken under IWDP, the Committee find that the gestation period of projects is five years whereas almost half of the projects taken up during the Plan are still to be completed. The committee also note that the Technical Committee has suggested to increase the gestation period of projects from five years to eight years. The Committee also observe that in case the gestation period is increased the average cost of the projects may also increase. The Committee would further like the Department to examine the suggestion of the Technical Committee and furnish their comments so as to enable the Committee to review the position further.

1	2	3
23.	4.24	<p>The Committee find from the information furnished above that foreclosure and stopping of funds to the projects is a major problem under DDP and DPAP blocks. The issue has been dealt with in detail in the preceding paras of the report. Here the Committee may highlight that the number of projects foreclosed and for which funds have been stopped is more than in the case of IWDP schemes. As recommended in the earlier part of the report, the Committee would like the information about the year of foreclosure, funds allocated at the time of foreclosure of each project so as to enable the Committee to make proper analysis.</p>
24.	4.25	<p>The Committee further find that DDP and DPAP blocks were identified more than a decade back. The situation in these blocks may have changed. Many blocks would have turned greener and need no assistance under these programmes whereas some other additional blocks may need assistance. Further, requests from some of the States are being received by the Department for coverage of additional blocks. The Committee also note that the Parthasarthy Committee was supposed to look into the issue of exclusion/inclusion of DDP and DPAP blocks. Since the said Committee has already submitted the report, the committee would like to be informed whether the said issue has been addressed in the report and if so, the details thereof.</p>
25.	4.33	<p>The Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET) Scheme is an important scheme, the foremost objective of which is operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies and dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for the development of various categories of</p>

1	2	3
		<p>wastelands. From the data furnished by the Department with regard to financial achievement the Committee find that even the meagre outlay <i>i.e.</i> Rs. 15 crore during 2004-05 and Rs. 17 crore during 2005-06 could not be utilised fully. Various reasons like beneficiaries contribution, delay in the release of State share, delay in submission of progress reports and non-receipt of fresh proposals have been cited as the reasons for shortfall in utilisation of funds. The Committee also note that even the few number of projects undertaken are not being successfully implemented. Out of 161 projects, as many as 22 projects ere foreclosed. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need for detailed interaction with the various research institutes like ICAR, State Agricultural Universities which are basically involved with the research in this field. Besides there is an urgent need to motivate these institutions to initiate more and more projects. There is an urgent need to study the international experience with regard to wastelands development. The Committee desire some concrete action in this regard to be taken by Government.</p>
26.	4.34	<p>Besides initiating research studies one of the objectives of the programme is dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies. The Committee would like to be apprised of the number of demonstration projects undertaken under the aforesaid schemes. Besides, the initiatives taken for dissemination of research findings and technologies by the Department should also be intimated to the Committee to enable them to analyse the performance of the scheme.</p>
27.	5.14	<p>Maintenance and updating of land records is an important area which needs to be addressed</p>

urgently. Land records are the basic document of the property owned by an individual as well as by the group of people and Government at various levels. The importance of land records is immense not only for an individual but also for Government for the future planning. Once the land records are properly maintained, it will bring transparency and a mechanism to have an idea of Benami landholdings. The Committee find that a laudable scheme Computerisation of Land Records has been initiated by the Union Government with 100 per cent Central assistance since 1988-89. The outlay provided so far *i.e.* Rs. 416.06 crore could not be utilised fully by the State Governments. The utilisation upto 31 January, 2006 is Rs. 256.71 crore. The Committee feel that under-spending of around 40 per cent of the outlay is a major area of concern. Further the Committee note that the allocation during the year 2005-06 was double as compared to previous year. The Committee also find from the replies that sincere efforts have not been made to find out the reasons for huge under-spending. It has simply been stated that the scheme is demand driven. The Committee while expressing their concern over the under-utilisation of funds would like the Department to find out specific reasons for under-spending State-wise and inform the Committee accordingly.

28. 5.15 The Committee further note that States of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat have fully operationalised the system and made online updation through computerized system. Besides many other States such as Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Chhattisgarh have also taken necessary steps in this direction by affecting regular mutation/updation of land records. Few other States have also completed

1	2	3
		<p>the basic data entry work and started regular updation of land records. The worst performing State is Meghalaya and some Union Territories viz., Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep. The Committee appreciate the efforts made by some of the States like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat who could not only fully computerize the land records but also could make updation possible through computerized system. The Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter with other States so that the objectives of the programme can be achieved in these States.</p>
29.	5.16	<p>The Committee further note that some progress has been made with regard to maintenance of land records in North Eastern states. As informed by the Department the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura have already been started. The work is likely to be completed in March 2007. The State of Sikkim has already completed the data entry work. In the case of Meghalaya, the scheme has not yet been started due to non-availability of proper land records. The committee would like the Department to further pursue with these North eastern States so that the work relating to computerization of land records is completed.</p>
30.	5.17	<p>The Committee further note from the replies furnished by the Department that one of the important tasks for the successful implementation of programme is to stop issue of manual copies of Record of Rights and to provide legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR by amending the necessary revenue rules/regulations. Whereas the States of Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have already amended the</p>

necessary revenue rules/regulations in this regard, the action is pending in other States. Various reasons like lack of administrative and political will at State level, waiting for complete stabilization of computerized system etc. have been indicated as the reasons for not providing legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR in these States. The Committee feel that more interaction through various seminars, conferences is required with the State Governments to persuade them to amend the revenue rules/regulations so that the computerized system of land records may be given legal sanctity. Besides the Committee feel that once the land records are computerized and the people are made aware of the system, the other issues related to giving legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR would automatically be demanded by the public at large. As such there is an urgent need to first complete the system of computerization by the initiatives of the Centrally sponsored schemes and make maintenance as well as updation of land records a reality. The Committee hope that the Department would take the desired action in this regard.

31.

5.18

The Committee further note the laudable idea given by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources whereby a thought is being given to link up the land record information with the computers of the lending bankers so that the farmer does not even need to procure the copy of land records every time. The bankers can access the land record directly without any charge. The Committee appreciate the idea and feel that if it is made possible, it will help the general public specifically farmers. Not only it will reduce the transaction cost, but also would be a great relief for the poor persons whose applications are rejected by the banks due to

1	2	3
		non-availability of proper copy of land records. Besides, the assistance under various Centrally sponsored schemes provided through banks like Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) can easily be made available.
32.	5.19	The Committee find that 15 States have been provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds earmarked for training to these States. The Committee would also like to be informed about the module of training and the agencies involved for imparting training. They would like to suggest that similar initiatives should be taken in other States also.
33.	5.20	The Committed further find that Lal Bhadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA) has conducted an evaluation study on Computerisation of Land Records in the States of Karnataka, West Bengal and Rajasthan. The evaluation study of Tamil Nadu is under progress. Further NIRD was also requested to undertake evaluation study in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Kerala. The Committee express their unhappiness that no progress report has been received from NIRD which is a premier institution for research and is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee would like to be apprised when these studies were initiated. They would also like to be apprised about the details of the studies completed by LBSNAA.
34.	5.25	The Committee find from the data with regard to allocation under the scheme Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) that out of Rs. 311.77 crore provided to the States/UTs as

Central share upto 31 January, 2006, the utilisation position is Rs. 228.01 crore. Thus around 27 per cent of the funds could not be utilised. The Committee also note that the inability of State Governments to provide 50 per cent matching share is the basic concern for implementation of the programme. The Committee also note that the matter of reviewing the financial pattern from existing 50:50 to 90:10 for North-Eastern states and 75:25 in case of other then NE states was taken up by the Department with the Planning Commission who have stated that the 12th finance Commission Report has provided more resources. The said issue was addressed in detail by the Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports. The Committee had also observed that there is no specific mention about additional amount for the purpose of land records in the 12th Finance Commission Report. In view of this, the Committee would like the Government to take up the matter again with the Planning Commission in the light of the observations made by the Committee and impress upon them to change the funding pattern.

35. 5.26 The Committee further note that two schemes SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records are inter-related. The land records can be computerized only when the land records are properly available. Thus availability of land records is the basic issue. In view of this, the Committee would like to be apprised by the Department how the coordination between these two schemes is being maintained.
36. 5.27 The Committee find that the system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal areas of North Eastern States. In most of the areas even the cadastral survey

has not been done and so no land records exist. With regard to the programme 'Computerisation of Land Records', the Committee have been informed that the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura has already started. The Committee observe that Computerization of Land Records is not possible when the basic data of land records is not available in an area. In this situation, the Committee wonder how the programme of Computerisation of Land Records is progressing when even the cadastral survey in these States has not been done and no land records exist. The clarification in this regard may be furnished to enable the Committee to review the position of Computerization of Land Records and SRA & ULR schemes in North Eastern States.
