

27

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2006-2007)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2007-2008)**

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2006-2007)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2007-2008)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 14.05.2007

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 14.05.2007



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

May, 2007/Vaisakha, 1929 (Saka)

C.R.D. No. 033

Price : Rs. 131.00

© 2007 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 Status of implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in Nineteenth Report under direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha.	4
CHAPTER III Major issues related to Land Reforms	5
CHAPTER IV Issues related to the Centrally Sponsored Schemes of Watershed Management with specific reference to the Demands for Grants (2007-2008)	18
CHAPTER V The issues related to implementation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes for Computerisation of Land Records and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records	51
CHAPTER VI Bio-fuel	63
APPENDICES	
I. The critical analysis of the Statement on the Tenth Report (14th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	65
II. Details of Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land (September, 2006)	66
III. Details of Distribution of Government Wastelands (September, 2006)	67
	(i)

	PAGE
IV. Details of Number of Tenants Conferred Ownership Rights (or Rights Protected) and area accrued to them (September, 2006)	68
V. Details of State-Wise Information on Alienation and Restoration of Tribal Lands (September, 2006)	70
VI. State-wise data of total wastelands and areas covered under IWDP Since 1995	71
VII. Statement showing proposed allocation, BE, RE, Actual Expenditure of Tenth Plan and proposed outlay for Eleventh Plan and agreed to B.E. for the year 2007-08	73
VIII. Programme and State-wise balance of funds as on 31 December, 2006	81
IX. Outstanding Utilisation Certificates for 2006-07 in respect of Grants/Loan released upto 31 March, 2005 (as on 31.12.2006)	83
X. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 29.3.2007	86
XI. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 12.4.2007	89
XII. Statement of Recommendations/Observations	94

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shrimati Susmita Bauri
3. Shri Mani Charenamei
4. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
5. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
6. Shri George Fernandes
7. Shri Zora Singh Mann
8. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
9. Shri Hannan Mollah
10. Shri D. Narbula
11. Shri A. F. G. Osmani
12. Shri T. Madhusudan Reddy
13. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
14. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
15. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
16. Shri Sita Ram Singh
- *17. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
18. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
19. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
20. Shri Beni Prasad Verma
21. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shri D.C. Srikantappa, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Urban Development to Committee on Rural Development *vice* the vacancy caused due to change of nomination of Shri Shrichand Kriplani MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Rural Development to Standing Committee on Chemical and Fertilizers *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II, para no. 2847 dated August 31, 2006.

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Balihari
23. Shri Jayantilal Barot
24. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
25. Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal
- #26. Dr. Ram Prakash
27. Dr. Chandan Mitra
28. Shri P.R. Rajan
29. Shri Bhagwati Singh
30. Ms. Sushila Tiriya
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

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

#Nominated *w.e.f.* 27.4.2007.

ABBREVIATIONS

BE	—	Budget Estimates
BPL	—	Below Poverty Line
CAZRI	—	Central Arid Zone Research Institute
CLR	—	Computerisation of Land Records
CRIDA	—	Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture
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
EAPs	—	Externally Aided Projects
EFC	—	Expenditure Finance Committee
EIA	—	Environmental Impact Assessment
IAY	—	Indira Awaas Yojana
ICAR	—	Indian Council for Agricultural Research
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
IWMP	—	Integrated Watershed Management 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
NLCB	—	National Land Use and Conservation Board

NLWC	—	National Land Use and Wasteland Development
NPCLRM	—	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management
NRAA	—	Nation Rainfed Area Authority
NREGS	—	National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
NWDB	—	National Wastelands Development Board
PIA	—	Project Implementation Agency
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
RoR	—	Record of Rights
SAUs	—	State Agriculture Universities
SEZs	—	Special Economic Zones
SGRY	—	Swarnajayanti Grameen Rozgar Yojana
SGSY	—	Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SHGs	—	Self-Help Groups
SIA	—	Social Impact Assessment
SLUBs	—	State Land Use Boards
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 (2006-2007) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty seventh Report on Demands for Grants (2007-2008) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 29 March, 2007.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 12 April, 2007.

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. The Committee 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;
9 May, 2007

19 Vaisakha, 1929 (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 Union Department of Land Resources was set up in April, 1999 to act as the Nodal Agency in the field of Land Resource Management. The Department of Land Resources comprises two Divisions namely the Wastelands Development Division and Land Reform Division.

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

- (i) Land reforms, land tenures, land records, consolidation of holding and other related matters.
- (ii) Administration of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894) and matters relating to acquisition of land for purposes of the Union.
- (iii) 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.
- (iv) 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;
- (v) Land revenue, including the assessment and collection of revenue, survey of revenue purposes, alienation of revenues;
- (vi) Duties in respect of succession to agricultural land;
- (vii) National Wastelands Development Board;
- (viii) National Land Use and Wasteland Development Council;
- (ix) Promotion of Rural Employment through Wastelands Development;

- (x) Promotion of production of fuel-wood, fodder and timber on non-forest lands, including private wastelands;
- (xi) Research and development of appropriate low cost technologies for increasing productivity of wastelands in sustainable ways;
- (xii) Inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary coordination in programme planning and implementation of the Wastelands Development Programme including training;
- (xiii) Promotion of people's participation and public cooperation and coordination of efforts of Panchayats and voluntary and non-Government agencies for Wastelands Development;
- (xiv) Drought Prone Area Programmes;
- (xv) Desert Development Programmes;
- (xvi) The Registration Act (16 of 1908);
- (xvii) (a) National Mission on Bio-diesel;
- (b) Bio-fuel plant production, propagation and commercial plantation of bio-fuel plants under various schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Panchayati Raj; and
- (c) Identification of non-forest land wastelands in consultation with, the State Governments, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Panchayati Raj for bio-fuel plant production.

1.4 To carry out the assigned functions, the Department of Land Resources at present implements the following Schemes:

- (i) Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP);
- (ii) Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP);
- (iii) Desert Development Programme (DDP);
- (iv) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR);
- (v) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR); and
- (vi) Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET).

1.5 From the year 2007-2008 the schemes meant for the development of wastelands/degraded land through watershed approach *viz.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been merged into Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). Besides the schemes related to maintenance, updation and Computerisation of Land Records *viz.* Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) have been merged into National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resource Management (NPCLRM). Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET) has further been reformed and restructured as 'Professional Support'. The aforesaid restructured programmes will be implemented from the year 2007-2008.

1.6 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for the year 2007-2008 are Rs. 1,503.78 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 16 March, 2007.

1.9 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the over—all analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demands for Grants (2007-2008).

CHAPTER II

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE IN NINETEENTH REPORT UNDER DIRECTION 73A OF THE DIRECTIONS BY THE SPEAKER, LOK SABHA

As per direction 73A of the 'Directions by 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 Committee of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry.

2.2. Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources was presented to Lok Sabha on 20 April, 2005. The statement with regard to this Report had fallen due on 19 October, 2005. However, the statement on the said Report was made by Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development in Lok Sabha on 12 May 2006. The critical analysis of the Statement is at **Appendix-I**.

2.3. Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2006-07) was presented to Parliament on 18 May, 2006. Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development has made a statement in the House in pursuance of direction 73A on 9 March, 2007. Critical analysis of the Statement is in progress.

CHAPTER III

MAJOR ISSUES RELATED TO LAND REFORMS

Amendments to Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and amendments to National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation, 2003.

The Standing Committee have consistently been pursuing with the Department since Tenth Lok Sabha to bring amendments to the old and outdated Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and bring amendments to National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation, 2003 to address to various issues with the fast changing scenario of industrialization, urbanization and New Economy Policy.

3.2 In this regard, the Hon'ble President in the Address to joint session of Parliament, 2007 has stated as below:

“Acquisition of agricultural land for industrial development and related purposes and the terms of compensation have become issues of major public concern in our country. On the one hand there are genuine concerns of farmers regarding acquisition of agricultural land and on the other hand, there is a need to use land to generate employment through industry and related activities. Therefore, issues of humane rehabilitation and the need for fair pricing of agricultural land need to be addressed both in policy and in law. My Government is committed to bringing in a new rehabilitation policy, which will be backed by amendments in the Land Acquisition Act wherever necessary.”

3.3 When asked about the status in this regard, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence informed as under:

“The present status of the initiatives of the Department of Land Resources is on three fronts. One is that a comprehensive Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy at the Central level has been drafted and it is currently awaiting the final approval of the Cabinet. But more importantly, the difference between the earlier policies and the present policy is that this will be given a statutory back up. Therefore, an Act to give shape to the policy in statutory term is being drafted and this is currently with the Law Ministry for finalisation.”

3.4 As regards the amendments to the Land Acquisition Act, the Department has informed that the Law Ministry has been requested to draft the amendments to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 on the lines of the new rehabilitation policy which has been placed in the public domain at the websites of the Department of Land Resources and Ministry of Rural Development.

3.5 The following are the salient feature of the proposed policy:

- a. Applicability enlarged to include all cases of involuntary displacement and not merely those affected by projects involving displacement above a certain number.
- b. Social Impact Assessment (SIA) mandatory for all projects involving physical displacement beyond the defined threshold (400 families *en masse* in plain areas or 200 families *en masse* in tribal, hilly areas, etc.).
- c. SIA process to run simultaneously with Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where applicable.
- d. Social science and rehabilitation experts to be on the Committee to examine the SIA study report.
- e. Public hearing in affected zone mandatory for SIA study.
- f. Consultation with Gram Sabhas (or public hearings in areas not having Gram Sabhas) mandatory for finalizing R&R plan.
- g. Land-for-land subject to availability of government land.
- h. Housing benefits as per the prescribed scale.
- i. At least one person per family to get preference in jobs in projects, subject to availability of vacancies and suitability of the affected persons.
- j. Training to affected persons for taking up suitable jobs as well as for self employment.
- k. Preference to affected persons in allotment of contracts.
- l. Preference to affected persons in wage employment in construction phase of project.
- m. Adequate resettlement and full payment of compensation to take place ahead of displacement.

Special consideration for SCs and STs –

- i. Reservation benefits for SCs and STs to continue in resettlement zones.

- ii. Tribal Development Plan in projects displacing 200 or more tribal families.
- iii ST occupiers of forest lands prior to the commencement of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 also covered.
- n. Fishing rights of affected persons protected, including those of tribals and SCs.
- o. R&R Committees to have representatives of women, SCs, STs, NGOs, PRIs/ULBs, local MPs/MLAs, etc.
- p. Wide publicity to be given to the R&R Plan by all necessary means.
- q. Fast-track exercise for updating of land records to take place concurrently with the acquisition proceedings, and titles to alienated tribal lands to be restored.
- r. National Monitoring Committee, headed by Secretary (RD), to be supported by National Monitoring Cell.

3.6 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence while emphasising on the need to protect the interest of the persons where land is acquired stated that the concern of the following three categories of persons, the Department is trying to address:

- (a) People whose land is being acquired directly;
- (b) People who are utilizing the land they may not have title; and
- (c) Labourers who desire livelihood from land, though they may not have interest directly in the land, either as owner or as encroachers.

3.7 As regards the deadline for bringing the aforesaid legislation to Parliament, the Secretary stated that currently it would be difficult to give a precise date but they would like to do it as early as possible.

3.8 On the issue of land for land as the compensation for land acquisition the Secretary stated as under:

“A mention was made about land for land. It is an area which we are addressing to the extent, it should be done. Otherwise, there can be a chain reaction. You can acquire land because the man has to be provided land; then you acquired further land. One possibility particularly in the irrigation projects is this—those areas which are going to get irrigation in some clusters or patches

where some smaller amount of land can be given. The other projects, some of them have followed by providing money, allowing the people to have freedom to go and buy land wherever they like. There has been some experience in that area. That is an ideal situation”.

The policy of the Department on the issue of acquiring land for Special Economic Zones (SEZs)

3.9 When asked about the data with regard to agricultural land/wastelands acquired so far under Special Economic Zones (SEZs) for setting up industries and related activities, the Department has informed that the data in this regard has been called from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry which is the nodal Ministry in the Government of India.

3.10 As regards the stand of the Department of Land Resources for acquiring land for SEZs, the following has been stated by the Department:

“The Department is of the view that industries, SEZs etc. should be established preferably on wastelands. Degraded forest land could also be considered but with higher than the usual norms for compensatory afforestation or reforestation. To the extent agricultural land is used for industries etc. there should be compensatory development of wastelands for the sake of food security of the country.”

Separate legislation for acquisition and rehabilitation

3.11 On the observation of the Committee during the course of evidence that the issue of acquisition and rehabilitation are inter-related and as such these issues should be addressed by a single legislation, the Secretary while explaining the Government’s stand in this regard stated as under:

“In the Land Acquisition Act, the immediate issue on which there is quite large discussion relates to the term ‘public purpose’. Rehabilitation even earlier was not part of the Land Acquisition Act as such. There are a number of issues beyond land acquisition, including for example area development, the periphery development, providing livelihood support, training skill development and various other things. A part of land may be acquired land and a part of land may also be Government land which is allocated. Even then, it will apply. So, it is a slightly

broader perspective and we want to make it much more comprehensive so that there is focused kind of approach on the resettlement and rehabilitation rather than limited only to the acquired land because it is more related to the project, though I agree that primary motivation or trigger may come from acquisition.”

3.12 The Secretary during the course of evidence further submitted that the Department in the comment from the Commerce and Industry Ministry has stated that land which is required absolutely for the functional needs of a particular industry or a project only that much should be acquired and not anything beyond that because then the question of builders come.

3.13 The representative of the Department further added as under:

“The Law Ministry and the Attorney General strongly advised that we run the risk, if we want to make an amendment and bring the entire resettlement and rehabilitation, which may not be in tune with the basic tenets of the Land Acquisition Act, and that it is more advisable to have a separate Act where we will have a monitoring and grievance redressal mechanism. It may also apply to various kinds of rehabilitation requirements which may be even beyond land acquisition, which may not be man-made but may be in some other forms; disaster management also requires a lot of rehabilitation exercise. So, the rehabilitation policy is going beyond land acquisition. Therefore, the legal advice was that it will not fit into a single Act.”

The need to bring the Land Use Policy

3.14 When asked whether the Department propose to have a comprehensive land use policy for rural areas the Department has stated as under:

“Land is a State subject. The role of the Central Government in this field is advisory and coordinating. However, legislative provisions restricting conversion of agricultural land for non agricultural purposes exist in most of the States.

Ministry of Rural Development is of the view that industries, SEZs etc. should be established preferably on wastelands. Degraded forest land could also be considered but with higher than the usual norms for compensatory afforestation or reforestation. To the extent agricultural land is used for industries

etc., there should be compensatory development of wastelands for the sake of food security of the country. The Ministry is administering Watershed Development Programmes like Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme for development of degraded/wastelands.

At National level for management of land resources and policy direction, a National Land Use & Wasteland Development Council (NLWC) headed by Prime Minister under which three Boards namely (i) National Wasteland Development Board headed by Minister of Rural Development; (ii) National Land Use and Conservation Board headed by Minister of Agriculture; and (iii) National Afforestation and Eco-Development Board headed by Minister of Environment and Forests, exist.

At State Level, State Land Use Boards (SLUBs) have been created in States/Union Territories under the chairmanship of Chief Minister/Chief Secretaries to address land-use issues of the State and coordinate with Centre on Land issues.

Ministry of Agriculture has been requested for convening the meeting of the National Land Use and Conservation Board (NLCB) so that the issues related to the acquisition of agricultural land for non agricultural purposes could be discussed.”

3.15 Land is one of the biggest resources for any country. With the enormous expansion of the State’s role in promoting public welfare and economic development since Independence, acquisition of land for public purposes has become far more important than ever before. Further, with the changing scenario of industrialization, liberalization, urbanization and new economic policy there is an immense pressure on land. Now-a-days, land is being acquired for setting up Special Economic Zones (SEZs) so as to generate employment through industries and related activities. With the increased activity of land acquisition for public purposes as well as for setting up industries, the issues related to land acquisition and rehabilitation of the affected persons whose land is being acquired have been the matter of debate recently.

The Committee note that land and its management falls under the State List. However, the Union Government has played a crucial role in the advisory capacity as well as a facilitator since Independence. In this scenario, the responsibility of the Department of Land Resources, being the nodal Union Department, to deal with

the issues related to land is immense. On the one hand, there is a need to bring amendments to the old and outdated laws related to land acquisition to protect the interests of the persons whose land is being acquired, on the other hand, there is a need to ensure that there is no reduction in total agricultural land which may further aggravate the demand and supply mis-match of agricultural products. On both the accounts, the Department of Land Resources has the key responsibility. On the issue of bringing amendments to the old and outdated Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and rehabilitation policy, the Committee have persistently been recommending in the respective reports to expedite the same.

As regards the status of the amendments to Land Acquisition Act and rehabilitation policy, the Committee have been informed that the new rehabilitation policy has been drafted and is in the public domain at the websites of the Department of Land Resources and Ministry of Rural Development. The Ministry of Law and Justice has been requested to draft the amendments to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 on the lines of the new rehabilitation policy. The Committee also find that it is proposed to give the rehabilitation policy a statutory backing. As such, two separate legislations on the Land Acquisition and rehabilitation are proposed to be drafted and placed before the Parliament. As regards the major changes proposed in the revised Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation Legislations, the Secretary has informed that in the revised legislations, attempt is being made to protect the interests of the following three categories of persons:—

- (a) people whose land is being acquired directly;
- (b) people who are utilizing the land, they may not have title; and
- (c) labourers who derive livelihood from land though they may not have interest directly in the land either as owners or encroachers.

Further, the Secretary has also informed that the issue of giving land for land is being addressed in the aforesaid proposed legislations. As regards the deadline for bringing the aforesaid legislations, the Secretary has informed that the Department would like to do it as early as possible. While noting the aforesaid contents of the proposed legislations on Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to expedite finalisation of the aforesaid legislations and if possible, bring the

same before Parliament during the second part of the current Session of Parliament.

3.16 The Committee would also emphasize that there is an urgent need to balance the larger interests of the community for which the land is being acquired and the right of the individual whose land is being acquired thereby depriving him/her of means of livelihood. Besides, there is an urgent need to address the issue of acquisition of land for private enterprises. The acquisition of land for private enterprises cannot be at the same footing as the land acquired for various projects of public welfare. The Committee also note the stand of the Department according to which land should be acquired absolutely for the functional needs of a particular industry or a project and should not exceed the particular purpose so as to include quotas of builders etc. The Committee find that there are various issues in this regard which need to be addressed strongly in the legislations, the foremost of which is the policy of giving land for land. The Committee note that land besides being the source of livelihood for a person is also a symbol of social status in the society where a person lives. Besides, with the land various emotional issues are also attached. In this scenario, it is of utmost importance to address all these concerns and compensate the persons whose land is acquired not only with land but with the land of the same quality.

Besides, another issue which needs to be addressed is that the projects for which land is being acquired should be constructed within a specified time period and not extended unduly to get more profits with the rising prices of land. There is a need to ensure that only the specific project for which land is acquired is constructed on the land and not used for other commercial purposes. The Committee would like the Department to address to the aforesaid concerns of the Committee in the proposed legislations on Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation.

3.17 On the issue of bringing two legislations, one for the purpose of land acquisition and the other for rehabilitation, the Department has informed that the Law Ministry and Attorney General have strongly advised to have two separate legislations in this regard because the rehabilitation policy is going beyond land acquisition. The Committee feel that the issues of land acquisition and rehabilitation are inter-linked and as such need to be addressed in a single legislation. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the details of the interactions and deliberations held with the Law Ministry and Attorney General in this regard so as to

understand the matter in detail and recommend further in this respect.

3.18 The erstwhile Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development during Tenth Lok Sabha had examined various provisions made under Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and presented Eighth Report on 'Land Acquisition Act, 1894' to Lok Sabha on 15 December, 1994. Thereafter, the Standing Committee on Rural Development pursued various issues related to land acquisition and rehabilitation of the persons whose land is being acquired, in their various Reports presented to Parliament. The Committee would like that their various observations/recommendations made in the respective reports should be taken into consideration while making amendments to Land Acquisition Act and bringing in a new law related to the issue of rehabilitation.

3.19 As stated earlier, there is an urgent need to ensure that there is no reduction in total agricultural land in the country. In this regard, the Committee note the stand of the Department according to which industries, Special Economic Zones should be established preferably on wastelands. Degraded forest land could also be considered but with higher than the usual norms for compensatory afforestation or reforestation. To the extent agricultural land is used for industries etc., there should be compensatory development of wastelands for the sake of food security of the country. The Committee also note that the data with regard to the land acquired for Special Economic Zones so far is being collected by the Department from the concerned Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The Committee also note that legislative provisions restricting use of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes exist in most of the States. In this regard, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to study the laws in various States. Further the Committee note that land is a non-renewable resource and is finite. It cannot be further extended. In view of this, there is an urgent need to ensure a balanced use of land for different purposes *viz* agriculture, industries, forestation, housing etc. While noting the stand of the Department that industries, SEZs should preferably be set up on wastelands/degraded forest land, the Committee recommend that the Government should permit acquisition of land cautiously keeping in view the limited land resources of the country. In this scenario, perhaps there is an urgent need to have a National Land use Policy which can guide the various State Governments in having laws with regard to the use of land for different purposes with the objective of balanced and harmonious use of land for different purposes. In

this regard, the Committee also note that the Department has requested the Ministry of Agriculture to convene the meeting of the National Land Use and Conversion Board to discuss the issues related to acquisition of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes. The aforesaid concerns of the Committee should specifically be brought before all concerned. Besides, the concern of Committee to have a National Land use Policy should also be brought to the knowledge of the concerned Ministries/Departments. The Committee should also be kept apprised about the follow up of the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee.

Distribution of surplus land to landless labourers

3.20 When asked about the overall policy of the Government with regard to distribution of surplus land to landless labourers in the country, the Department has stated that Land Ceiling has been considered as one of the effective instruments for reducing disparities in ownership of land by prescribing a maximum ceiling area and acquiring the surplus land for distribution amongst the eligible rural poor. The States, therefore, enacted ceiling legislations to reduce the land holdings and distribution of the surplus land to the landless poor. The Department has further stated that the State Governments have been requested from time to time to conduct special drives for distribution of remaining ceiling surplus land to the eligible rural poor.

3.21 The information with regard to the details of distribution of ceiling surplus land, Government wastelands, number of tenants conferred ownership rights (or rights protected) and alienated tribal land restored to tribals based on the feedback received from States/ UTs are given in **Appendix- II, III, IV & V** respectively.

3.22 The analysis of the data reveal the following details of distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land:

	(Area in acres)
Area declared surplus	68,72,824
Area taken possession	60,27,180
Area distribution to individual beneficiaries	48,99,893
Total number of beneficiaries	54,01,232

3.23 The Department has informed that 39 percent of the total beneficiaries belong to SC/ST.

3.24 The State/UTs-wise information indicates that the maximum number of beneficiaries are 28,47,821 in West Bengal. The number of beneficiaries ranges between one lakh and five lakh in case of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. In other States/UTs the number of beneficiaries is less than one lakh.

Details of distribution of Government wastelands

3.25 Total wastelands distributed — 148.55 lakh acre

The State specific analysis of the data reveals that Haryana distributed nil wastelands. The maximum number of distribution is in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar (including Jharkhand), Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh (including Uttaranchal).

Details of number of tenants conferred ownership rights and area accrued to tenants

3.26	Total number of tenants	—	125.85
	Area accrued	—	167.157

3.27 Eleven States/UTs of Bihar, Goa, Jharkhand, Manipur, Nagaland, Punjab, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Delhi and Daman & Diu have not reported the data. Tenancy laws are not prevailing in Haryana and Madhya Pradesh. In Chhattisgarh, Meghalaya, Mizoram Andaman & Nicobar Island, Chandigarh, the number of tenants who have been accrued land is nil.

3.28 Details of State-wise information as alienation and restoration of tribal lands

		(Area in acres)
Cases decided in favour of tribals	—	2,02,901
Area	—	5,61,485
cases in which land was restored to tribals	—	1,80,703
Area	—	3,76,482

(The information has been provided for ten States : Bihar (including Jharkhand) and Madhya Pradesh (including Chhattisgarh).

3.29 The Committee note that the Department monitors the data with regard to distribution of surplus land to landless labourers. Besides, the Department persuades the State Governments from time to time to conduct special drives for distribution of surplus land over and above the ceiling to the eligible rural poor. The Department has furnished various data indicating the progress in regard to— (a) distribution of surplus land, (b) distribution of Government wastelands (c) number of tenants conferred ownership rights, (d) information of alienation and restoration of tribal land. The analysis of the data indicates that out of area of 68,72,824 acres declared surplus 60,27,180 acres could be taken possession of and out of that 48,99,893 acres could be distributed to 54,01,232 beneficiaries, out of which 39 per cent of the beneficiaries are Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. As regards distribution of Government wastelands so far, 148.55 lakh acres could be distributed in various States. As regards number of tenants conferred ownership rights, 125.85 lakh could be given 167.157 lakh acres of land. As regards alienation and restoration of tribal land, out of 2,02,901 cases decided in favour of tribals, in 1,80,703 cases, the land was restored to tribals. The analysis of the data indicates that there is much difference between the area taken possession of and area distributed to individual beneficiaries and between the cases decided in favour of tribals and cases in which land was restored to tribals. The Committee would like the Department to further pursue the matter with the various State Governments so that maximum number of beneficiaries could be helped in this regard.

As regards the distribution of Government's wastelands to individual beneficiaries, the Committee feel that besides distributing land to individuals, there is an urgent need to provide the facilities and technical know-how to the beneficiaries so that the wastelands can be developed and can become the means of livelihood for the individual beneficiaries.

3.30 The Committee would like to point out an interesting situation. Whereby on the one hand land is being acquired for setting up industries, Special Economic Zones and urbanization, on the other hand, the emphasis is being given to distribute the land to landless persons. The Committee also feel that the agenda of distribution of land to the landless persons would have got a backseat due to the current priorities of acquisition of land for setting up industries etc. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the data with regard to distribution of land/wastelands year-wise so as to understand the aforesaid change of priorities and comment further in this regard.

3.31 The Committee note from the statement given with regard to number of tenants conferred ownership rights and area accrued to them in various States that in Arunachal Pradesh tenancy laws are not enacted. The Committee note that in the rural areas at present there may not be trend of renting the property but with the changing scenario of economic development there may be pressure on renting property for housing and other things. There is an urgent need to foresee the changing realities and bring tenancy reforms in rural areas too. The Committee would like to have the detailed information about the tenancy laws in various States so as to enable them to analyze the position.

3.32 The Committee further note that in various States, there is a peculiar problem of people occupying land and using it for several years but not having the proper title. As dealt in detail in the preceding part of the report, the Secretary has assured that the proposed amendments to the Land Acquisition Act and the proposed Rehabilitation Legislation would address to the issue of providing due compensation to these categories of land holders. The Committee note that land acquisition is not the only area where these people are at a disadvantageous position, but otherwise also they are debarred from various facilities like availing of loan under different Central/State Schemes or for housing etc. There is an urgent need to address to this issue by bringing various reforms in land laws of various State Governments. The Union Government can play a role of facilitator by guiding these States through various guidelines to bring such reforms. The Committee recommend to the Department to take action in view of the aforesaid observation of the Committee.

CHAPTER IV

ISSUES RELATED TO THE CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEMES OF WATERSHED MANAGEMENT WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2007-2008)

Convergence of all watershed programmes being run by different Ministries and setting up a National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA)

4.1 The erstwhile Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development first took up the issue of convergence of watershed programme being run by various Ministries/Departments and bring under one umbrella in 2nd Report on Demands for Grants (1998-99) (12th Lok Sabha). The aforesaid recommendation was pursued year after year (refer 22nd Report (12th Lok Sabha), 12th Report (13th Lok Sabha), 22nd Report, (13th Lok Sabha), 33rd Report (13th Lok Sabha), 47th Report (13th Lok Sabha), 2nd Report (14th Lok Sabha), 10th Report (14th Lok Sabha), 19th Report (14th Lok Sabha). Pursuant to the consistently pursuing of the matter, the programme based on watershed guidelines *viz.* DPAP and DDP and watershed component in erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) being run by the Department of Rural Development were transferred to the Department of Land Resources *w.e.f.* 9 April,1999. The Standing Committee continued pursuing the matter further and finally the Government has agreed to some sort of convergence and the Finance Minister in his speech on Budget 2007-2008 has informed that the National Rainfed Area Authority was established to coordinate all schemes related to watershed development and other aspects of land use. In President's address to Joint Session of Parliament 2007 also, it was mentioned that for coordinate and focused attention on the issues of dry land and rainfed farmers, the National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) has been set up to guide policy in this regard. Rs. 100 crore has been allocated for the Rainfed Area Development Programme during the year 2007-2008 under Ministry of Agriculture.

4.2 The Department in the written note while elaborating the objectives for setting up the aforesaid authority stated as under:

“Rainfed areas present a grim picture of water scarcity, fragile eco-system, large-scale land degradation, low rainwater use efficiency, low investments, poor infrastructure, high population pressure and inappropriate input and policy support.

Though several schemes envisaging the development of rainfed areas are under implementation by various Central Ministries, the outcome is not reflected in the national production, productivity, income and equity indicators. There is, therefore, a need for a higher level of coherence, synergy and coordination among these programmes. An appropriate strategy is urgently required for the holistic and integrated development of rainfed regions.

It is with this objective that the Authority has been set up and it is expected that the National Rainfed Area Authority would provide the much needed knowledge support for the up-gradation and management of the country's dryland and rainfed agriculture."

4.3 Further, Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as under:

"A Rainfed Area Authority has been envisaged, its primary role will be at the level of providing a strong technical support and to take into account all the research and other developments which are taking place, pool them and help the country to move forward in improving the utilisation of the rainfed areas through various programmes and to do coordination and collaboration among the various programmes being done by the various Ministries"

4.4 The National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) has been set up under Union Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, New Delhi.

The composition of the Rainfed Area Authority

4.5 The National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) is a two-tier structure consisting of a Governing Board and an Executive Committee with the following composition:—

I. Governing Board

1. Minister of Agriculture	Chairman
2. Minister of Rural Development	Co-chairman
3. Minister of Water Resources	Member
4. Minister of Environment & Forests	Member

5. Member, Agriculture, Planning Commission	Member
6. Secretary, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation	Member
7. Secretary, Department of Agriculture Research & Education	Member
8. Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development	Member
9. Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources	Member
10. Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Forests	Member
11. Secretary, Ministry of Panchayati Raj	Member
12. Chairman, NABARD (National Bank for Agriculture & Rural Development)	Member
13. One Farmer Representative/ Organization (To be nominated by Ministry of Agriculture)	Member
14. Chief Executive Officer (National Rainfed Area Authority)	Member Secretary

4.6 II. Executive Committee

1. Chief Executive Officer, National Rainfed Area Authority
2. Five Eminent Experts in the field of:—
 - (i) Water Management
 - (ii) Agriculture/Horticulture
 - (iii) Animal Husbandry & Fisheries
 - (iv) Forestry
 - (v) Watershed Development
3. One representative each from Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Panchayati Raj
4. Advisor, Agriculture, Planning Commission
5. Director, Central Arid Zone Research Institute (CAZRI), Jodhpur
6. Director, Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture (CRIDA), Hyderabad
7. Subject Matter Specialists

Main areas of jurisdiction of the aforesaid Authority

4.7 The main areas of jurisdiction of the National Rainfed Area Authority are:

- (i) To prepare a perspective plan, outlining the national strategy and road map for holistic and sustainable development of rainfed farming areas.
- (ii) To evolve common guidelines for all schemes of different Ministries including Externally Aided Projects (EAPs) for development of Rainfed/Dry land Farming Systems.
- (iii) To coordinate and bring convergence within and among agricultural and wasteland development programmes being implemented in rainfed areas of the country.
- (iv) To identify rainfed areas in different States which need priority attention and prepare watershed development programmes for integrated natural resource management, in consultation with States, focusing on multi dimensional crop, livestock, horticulture, agri-pasture integrated systems and programmes for landless farming communities.
- (v) To identify gaps in input supply, credit availability, dissemination of appropriate technology and other requirements relevant for development of rainfed areas.
- (vi) To guide the implementing agencies on priority setting and monitor the specific interventions required.
- (vii) To develop plans/programmes for capacity building of Centre/State Government functionaries in rainfed areas.
- (viii) To suggest modalities to strengthen National and State Level Institutions concerned with Rainfed/Dryland areas, and establish institutional linkages with prioritized watersheds.
- (ix) To monitor disbursement of rural credit/insurance cover/safety net programmes developed for rainfed areas.
- (x) To set the research agenda including a critical appraisal of on-going programmes and promote diffusion of required knowledge for integrated farming in rainfed areas to district and lower level authorities.
- (xi) To evaluate the effectiveness of completed watersheds and concurrent evaluation of on-going programmes.

Share of different Ministries in the task of watershed development

4.8 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence informed the Committee that Department of Land Resources and the Department of Rural Development basically under NREGA and to some extent under SGRY are actually doing bulk of the work under watershed development programmes. He also added that perhaps the Ministry of Rural Development is the largest implementing agency of the programme.

Coordination of watershed activities at the State level as well as ground level

4.9 The Standing Committee have persistently been recommending convergence of watershed activities at the State level as well as at the ground level. In this regard the Committee (refer Para 16 of 24th Report) had observed as under:

“The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to also take into consideration the initiatives taken by the State Governments with regard to the development of wastelands by their own schemes. Perhaps the best way to know about the status of wastelands in the country would be updating the information with regard to wastelands based on the district-wise status in the areas which have large wastelands in the country. Unless the core data in this regard is obtained indicating the ground position, no study would give the actual position in this regard. While reiterating the concerns expressed earlier, the Committee would like to recommend for a permanent mechanism to periodically update the information in this regard. The Department should take the desired initiatives in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.”

4.10 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence acknowledged that at the operational level, there has to be coordination and there has to be a convergence of schemes particularly at the State and district level.

4.11 Elaborating further, the Secretary stated as under:

“At present, there is no delegation. Today all 500 hectare proposals are coming to the Ministry at the national level. Today, we have about 45,000 cases. Under IWDP, we have 1877 cases; under DPAP, we have 27,439 cases, and under DDP we have 15,746 cases. Total 45,000 live files are there. These are all 500 hectare proposals.

At the national level in the Ministry, it is not possible to handle such projects. So, what we propose is that once we have the State level organization, we will delegate the power to it so that they will develop a small programme for a block or what we call mini watershed kind of programme and bring it to the State level, where our representatives can go and attend that, where the sanctioning can be done. As we are doing under PMGSY, we can release the funds to the State level agency and they can do the day to day management with district level interaction. We will only look at broader pictures whether the larger watershed area at three tier level is being done professionally or not and we will make some evaluations and studies from time to time and provide technical support from the national level. This is a fundamental change in the programme management which we would like to bring."

4.12 The Standing Committee have persistently been recommending in their respective reports since the year 1998-1999 to bring all the activities related to wastelands being undertaken by different Ministries of Union Government under one umbrella. Pursuant to the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee, the Ministry of Rural Development initially transferred DDP, DPAP and watershed component of erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources to bring convergence of the activities related to watershed schemes in their own Ministry. The Committee continued pursuing the issue of bringing the watershed activities of the different Ministries under one umbrella and the Government have now finally agreed to the recommendation of the Committee and the National Rainfed Area Authority has been constituted under the Ministry of Agriculture with the initial allocation of Rs. 100 crore for the year 2007-08. With regard to the composition of the aforesaid authority, the Committee note that the authority has a two-tier structure consisting of a Governing Board and an Executive Committee. The Minister of Agriculture is the Chairman of Governing Board and Ministers of Rural Development, Water Resources and Environment & Forests are Members of the Board. Further the Secretaries of various Ministries are also members of the aforesaid Board. As regards the Executive Committee, on the top is Chief Executive Officer, National Rainfed Area Authority. Besides, five eminent experts in the field of Water Management, Agriculture/Horticulture, Animal Husbandry & Fisheries, Forestry and Watershed Development are also in the Executive Committee. One representative each from various concerned Ministries are also in the Executive

Committee. Besides, Advisor, Agriculture, Planning Commission, Director (CAZRI), Director (CRIDA) and Subject matter Specialists are also in the Executive Committee. The Committee also note from the information furnished by the Department of Land Resources that with the implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme under which bulk of the works under watershed development would be undertaken, the Ministry of Rural Development is the largest implementing agency of the watershed programme. The Committee appreciate the convergence of activities related to watershed development under one Central Authority *i.e.* National Rainfed Area Authority and hope that tangible results would be seen in the coming years. The Committee feel that the said Authority should best have been located under the Ministry of Rural Development being the largest implementing agency of the watershed activities. The Committee would like to know from the Department of Land Resources the initiatives taken in this regard so as to analyze the position and comment further.

4.13 Besides the convergence of the activities related to watershed development at the Union Government level, the Committee have been recommending convergence of watershed activities at the State level as well as at the ground level. The Secretary during the course of evidence has acknowledged the need for some Centralized agency at the State level. The Secretary has further emphasized on the need for Centralized agency at the State level by giving a typical example of the number of cases which have to be dealt with at the National level. He has stated that at present 500 hectare proposals are coming to the Ministry at the National level and as such 45,000 live files are there with the Department of Land Resources. Once the State level organization is established, the power to look into the various projects can be delegated. The Central level agency will develop a small programme for a block or a mini watershed kind of programme and bring it at the State level where the representatives of the Department of Land Resources can go and the projects can be sanctioned. On the PMGSY model the funds can be released to State level agency and State level agency can do the day-to-day management with district level interaction. The Committee feel that the aforesaid mechanism is on the lines suggested by the Committee in their respective reports and therefore, emphasize for an early decision in this regard. The Committee feel that with the Centralized agency in every State the national level authority can concentrate more on the policy issues as well as evaluating the different programmes which may eventually bring noticeable impact on the implementation of various schemes of watershed management. The

Committee while endorsing the decision of the Department in this regard recommend for early constitution of State level agencies and some district level mechanism to coordinate the ground level activities.

Data with regard to the extent of wastelands in the country

4.14 The data indicated in the various documents of the Department with regard to an estimated wastelands in the country is 55.27 million hectares. However, it has been stated in the Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan that 80 million hectares is the degraded land. When asked about the aforesaid confusion in the data, the Department has stated that the Department is not aware of the basis on which the Planning Commission has taken 80 million hectares as degraded land. When further clarification was taken as to whether the Department was not consulted while finalizing Approach Paper the Department has submitted that the draft was sent to Department for comments and the Department had clarified that these may be an estimated 125 million hectares of degraded land in rainfed areas including 80 million hectares of land under dryland farming which may actually need to be developed.

4.15 Further, the conflicting data of untreatable land has been indicated in the various documents. At one place, the Department has stated that 12.65 million hectares of wastelands is untreatable at another place thus data has been shown as 12.12 million hectares. When further clarification was sought, the Department in the supplementary replies has stated that the extent of untreatable wastelands as per Wastelands Atlas of India is 12.12 million hectares. The data given earlier by the Department of the order of 12.65 million hectares of untreatable land has been substantiated by the data given in the Wasteland Atlas – 2005 as under:

		(in hectares)
Waterlogged and marshy permanent	—	5,34,115
Barren rocky/stony waste area	—	57,74,711
Steep Sloping area	—	9,09,738
Snow covered and or glacial area	—	54,32,816
Total	—	1,26,5,380

4.16 Further, clarifying the position of data with regard to total wastelands in the country, the representative from the Department has elaborated as under:

“Now the first Wastelands Atlas was prepared in the year 2000. At that time, the Wastelands Atlas told us that about 63.87 million hectares was then the estimated quantity of wastelands. This question keeps cropping up that over a period of time are we reducing the extent of waste lands or it is going up. So again at the initiative of the Department we commissioned a fresh Wastelands Atlas whose results were made available in 2005. We were happy to note that according to the results of this Wastelands Atlas, the total wastelands comes to 55.27 million hectares. So, over a period of five years, there was an over all reduction of 8.6 million hectares which all said and done is a fair achievement. We also would just like to inform the Committee for its own information that out of this balance that remains about 55.27 approximately 12.12 million hectares is not treatable because these are barren rocks or stony wastelands areas or very steep slopes or snow covered area, glacier areas and that leaves us with a balance of 43.15 million hectares. So, this is what the Wastelands Atlas in terms of the satellite imagery is telling us. So, what I would say is that this is what we should take. Aside all this, of course, we have identified areas of DPAP and DDP. If we total this figures up, we get about 132 to 134 million. The Parthasarthy Committee’s estimate is 125 million hectares. There is slight over lap between our DDP areas and DPAP areas with the satellite imagery. So our 134 approximates roughly to 125 which estimate Parthasarthy Committee has now formalized in its report of January, 2006. So, the Department’s view is that we should take Parthasarthy Committee’s recommendations as currently the most correct one based on the data available. That is why, we had said that about 60 per cent of this total area which is about 75 million, is what our Department should try to tackle over three plan periods covering 5 million each year. That was the target we wanted to achieve.”

State-wise position of Wasteland Atlas

4.17 State-wise position of wastelands and area covered under IWDP since 1995 is given in **Appendix-VI**. It could be seen therefrom that since 1995 under IWDP 10.56 million hectares could be covered under IWDP. Very good achievement i.e. 50 percent or more development of area in term of total area and the coverage is in Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Mizoram and Nagaland.

4.18 The targets fixed during different plan period by the Department of Land Resource are as under (refer para 2.34 of 10th Report).

	Target (in million hectares)
Ninth Plan (1997-2002)	5
Tenth Plan (2002-2007)	15
Eleventh Plan (2007-2012)	20

4.19 As per the revised targets for Eleventh Plan, 25 million hectares area is projected to be developed.

4.20 As regards the achievement of targets, the Department has informed as under:

“As per the revised data indicated in the Atlas (2000) and Atlas (2005), 8.6 million hectare was the reduction in the wastelands. The Department usually achieves the targets as mentioned in the various Budget Documents. For instance during 2005-06, the Department has informed that the targets fixed under the three area development programmes were fully achieved in that year as under IWDP against the target of 340 new projects to cover an area of 16.31 lakh hectares, 497 new projects were sanctioned to treat an area of 22.62 lakh hectares exceeding the target. Under DPAP and DDP, the targets of 3000 new projects cover to an area of 15 lakh hectares and 2000 new projects with an area of 10 lakh hectares respectively, have also been fully achieved.”

4.21 The Committee find that even when the Atlas (2000) and updated Atlas (2005), is available with the Government which contains the Scientific data of wastelands in the country mapped in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), different data of wastelands/untreatable land are indicated in various documents of the Government. Untreatable land as per the Atlas is 12.65 million hectares, whereas the Department has indicated it as 12.12 million hectares at one place. The Committee fail to understand how the untreatable land can further increase or decrease. The Department may explain the position in this regard.

4.22 As regards the projections for treating the wastelands, it is imperative to have the exact information about the task ahead so as to have proper planning. In this regard different data of wastelands are given in different documents. Whereas, the Approach Paper to

Eleventh Plan has estimated requirement of Rs. 80,000 crore for treatment of 80 million hectares of wastelands, as per the Parthasarthy Committee Report the projections have been made based on the data of 125 million hectares of wastelands. Further, the updated Atlas indicates the area of wastelands as 55.27 million hectares. Further clarifying the position the Secretary informed the Committee that estimates of 125 million hectares include area of DDP and DPAP land. As regards the estimates of Approach Paper, the Department at one place has indicated that they are not aware of this data whereas at another place it has been stated that when the draft of Approach Paper came to the Department for comments, it was clarified that there may be an estimated 125 million hectare of degraded land in rainfed area including 80 million hectares of land under dryland farming. The Committee conclude from what has been stated above that perhaps there is no clarity of the exact area which is rainfed area under DDP and DPAP blocks as well as dryland farming in the country. As regards wastelands since the district-wise data is available as per the scientifically obtained data in updated Atlas, perhaps the data can be relied upon. However, there is too much confusion when the data of wastelands is combined with data of other degraded /rainfed land which need treatment. In this scenario the Committee would like the Department to clarify whether the separate district based data of rainfed/degraded land other than the wastelands data of Atlas is available with the Government and whether the outlays required for degraded/rainfed area are different from those for the wastelands.

4.23 The Committee further note that whereas wastelands is spread all over the country, DDP/DPAP blocks are area specific and identified in various States. DDP blocks have been identified in seven States/UTs and DPAP blocks have been identified in sixteen States/UTs whereas wastelands are there in almost every State. However, the extent of wastelands may vary from State to State. Besides, the DDP, DPAP blocks may vary with the passage of time. Such frequent change may not be there in wastelands. In this scenario perhaps, there is a need to set targets separately for wastelands/ other degraded areas. Otherwise there will be utter confusion. The Committee would like the clarification from the Department on the aforesaid observation so as to analyse the position further.

4.24 As regards the claim of the Department that 8.6 million hectares of wastelands was covered as reported in the updated Atlas, the Committee would like to be informed of the States where the extent of wastelands has considerably come down. Besides, as per

the data indicated by the Department in Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Mizoram, Nagaland, considerable part of the wastelands have been covered. The Committee would also like to be informed whether the achievements reflected in these States match with the position of wastelands coming down in the updated Atlas which contain district-wise data obtained through Satellite imagery so as to draw the meaningful conclusion about the progress of work with regard to development of wastelands in the country and to chalk out further strategy in this regard.

4.25 The Committee further note that as per the planning made by the Department 5 million hectares was proposed to be covered during Ninth Plan, 15 million hectares during Tenth Plan and 20 million hectares during Eleventh Plan. Now the targets for Eleventh Plan have been revised to 25 million hectares. The Committee may like to be clarified whether the aforesaid targets include the targets fixed for rainfed/degraded land other than wastelands areas. The Committee further observe that the Department is drawing the conclusion/making strategy with regard to the achievement/development of the wastelands keeping in view the efforts being made by the Department of Land Resources. However, besides the Department of Land Resources, the other Departments viz. the Department of Rural Development under NREGA and SGRY, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Forest and Environment and the various State Governments are making substantial allocation and doing considerable work for the treatment of wastelands. With the setting up of the National Rainfed Area Authority, there is an urgent need to study the impact of the schemes at the ground level. Perhaps, there is an urgent need to have district based planning. The achievements need to be reflected district wise while noting the actual work done in each State. Such district-wise data should be merged to know the State plans which should ultimately lead to the National Plan. Such district based monitoring of the data should be an annual exercise so as to have the exact idea of the ground position. The Committee would like the Department to convey the concerns of the Committee in this regard to the National Rainfed Area Authority and do the national planning on the lines suggested by the Committee.

Per hectare cost of wastelands

4.26 Rs. 6,000 per hectare is the existing cost of development of wastelands under different schemes as per the watershed guidelines. As regards the projections for Eleventh Plan, the Department has

estimated the required outlay on the basis of Rs. 12,000 per hectare as proposed in Parthasarthy Committee Report. In the Approach Paper, the projections for Eleventh Plan have been made on the basis of Rs. 10,000 per hectare.

4.27 The following observations of Parthasarthy Committee have been indicated by the Department justifying the projected cost of Rs. 12,000 per hectare:

“In the course of our tour of watershed programmes across the country, we received repeated representations from various state governments urging an upward revision of the cost norm. We are now proposing that the programme be of an 8-year period and the norm be raised to Rs. 12000 per hectare. The per-year per-ha norm becomes Rs. 1500. This rise of 25% over the figure for the year 2000 is certainly warranted by the annual rate of inflation (4%) in this period. To put it another way, if we take into account the rate of inflation between 2000 and 2006, the figure of Rs. 6000 per hectare comes to Rs. 7500 per hectare. This is for 5 years. For 8 years this figure comes to over Rs. 12,000 per hectare. Also we must note that since the norm will be frozen for 8 years, we are already discounting for inflation in this 8 year period. Finally, we must also remember that Rs. 12,000 is a maximal figure. The projects will be funded as per the actual cost of the action plan. The tendency of PIAs to simply multiply the area of the watershed with the per hectare norm is to be very strongly discouraged. The norm only sets a ceiling and is no way indicative of the actual budget, which must be determined on the basis of ground realities – the need and possibilities inherent in each watershed.”

4.28 It could be seen from the aforesaid observation of Parthasarthy Committee that Rs. 12,000 per hectare has been estimated to be the maximal figure. The actual cost of treatment per hectare of wastelands may as such be between Rs. 6,000 and Rs. 12,000 per hectare. When asked how the projections for Eleventh Plan would be justified when Rs. 12,000 is the maximum limit as projected by Parthasarthy Committee, the Department has tried to justify the position by the following reasoning:

- (a) “It is true that the Parthasarthy Committee has suggested that the cost norm of Rs. 12,000 per hectare. Is a maximal figure. The Committee has also indicated that the projects will be funded as per the actual cost indicated in the Action

Plan. The Department acknowledges that the cost norms would be fixed in line with the detailed project report and after taking into consideration all the relevant factors. As such, it is quite possible that the cost norms in some cases may be less than Rs. 12,000 per hectare.

- (b) The Department will carefully assess the actual costing that is desirable for each project and treat the matter on a case by case basis.
- (c) For the purposes of the proposed outlay for the Eleventh Plan, the figure of Rs. 12,000 per hectares was used in order to prepare a credible projection. The purpose is not to indicate that every single project will have a cost norm of Rs. 12,000 per hectare only. The projections for the Eleventh Plan may be seen in this light."

4.29 As regards the final decision with regard to the projected per hectare cost of development of wastelands amounting to Rs. 12,000, the Department has stated that after careful consideration and comprehensive review the matter will be taken up to the Expenditure Finance Committee of the Ministry of Finance and thereafter to the Cabinet for final decision.

4.30 The Committee note that the cost of development of wastelands at the rate of Rs. 6,000 per hectare was fixed way back during the year 2001. With the increase in costs, there is an urgent need to hike the existing cost of development and make projections accordingly. In this regard, the Committee find that the Department has made projections for Eleventh Plan at the rate of Rs. 12,000 per hectare. However, the Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan has indicated the estimated requirement of outlay on the basis of Rs. 10,000 per hectare. Besides, another noticeable fact is that the projections, of the Department are based on the Parthasarthy Committee Report. While noting the contents of the Parthasarthy Committee Report, the Committee find that Rs. 12,000 per hectare cost is a maximal figure. The Department has further clarified that the figure of Rs. 12,000 per hectare has been used in order to prepare a credible projection. As far as, the question of actual costing is concerned, it will be done on project to project basis.

In this regard the Committee would like to be informed about the existing practice indicating clearly whether the allocation is being made on project to project basis or at the existing rate *i.e.* Rs. 6,000 per hectare. Besides, the Committee may also be informed whether

there is any noticeable cost difference between the development of wastelands and the rainfed area. The Committee feel that the major portion of the cost of wastelands/rainfed area goes towards the wages of labourers, since, these are labour intensive work. As such another fact which needs to be considered while fixing the cost of treatment of wastelands is the hike in the wages of labourers in different States.

The Committee would like all the aforesaid observations to be taken into consideration while arriving at the decision on revised per hectare cost norms.

The comparative position of financial and physical achievements and review of various schemes of watershed development i.e. DDP, DPAP and IWDP during Tenth Plan and projections for Eleventh Plan for Total Watershed Programmes.

4.31 The proposed outlay, agreed B.E., R.E. and actual expenditure during each year of the Tenth Plan for total watershed programme:

Year	Proposed	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure
2002-03	920	822	815	789.45
2003-04	890	895	819	822.90
2004-05	950	883	883	849.80
2005-06	1075	1106	1106	1108.09
2006-07	1250	1115	1115	1061.52
Total Tenth Plan	4985	4821	4738	4631.73

4.32 Statements and the overall position with regard to Tenth Plan and proposed outlay for Eleventh Plan and agreed to B.E. for the year 2007-08 are indicated in **Appendix-VII**:

Proposed Allocation for Task	47,00
Agreed by Planning Commission	44,00
B.E.	4821
R.E.	4738
Expenditure	4631.76

4.33 Comparative position of outlay during 2007-08 *i.e.* the first year of Eleventh Plan for Watershed Programmes:

Year	Proposed Outlay	B.E.	R.E.
2006-2007	1250	1115	1115
2007-2008	2000	1114.54	

4.34 Projections made for Eleventh Plan by the Department Rs. 11,700 crore.

Projections as per the Approach Paper to — Rs. 80,000 crore
Eleventh Plan

Projections made in the Parthasarthy — 1,50,000 crore
Committee Report

4.35 The Parthasarthy Committee Report has also indicated that at the current level of outlay, it would take around 75 years for treatment to be completed. For the work to be completed by the year 2020, the Government needs to allocate around Rs. 10,000 crore per annum every year for the next 15 years to meet the target. The doubling of current outlay has been suggested. Another Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS.

4.36 The following observations can be made after the detailed analysis of the aforesaid data:

- (a) there is marginal difference between the proposed and agreed B.E. during each year of Tenth Plan *i.e.* the period between 2002-2003 to 2006-2007. However, for the first year of Eleventh Plan, the Planning Commission has agreed to around 55 percent of the projected outlay;
- (b) there was some cut of outlay at R.E. stage during the year 2002-03 and 2003-04. However, no cut has been imposed at R.E. stage during the subsequent years *i.e.* 2004-05 to 2006-07;
- (c) there was some hike in outlay of each year of Tenth Plan as compared to the previous year. However the outlay of the year 2007-08 has been pegged at the outlay provided during the year 2006-07;
- (d) the expenditure reported is more than 100 percent during the year 2003-04 and 2005-06. During the year 2002-2003

and 2004-2005, the underspending was to the tune of Rs. 25.55 crore and 33.20 crore respectively. During 2006-07 upto 15 March, 2007, the expenditure reported is 1061.52 crore as compared to B.E. and R.E. of Rs. 1115 crore.

Physical Achievement

IWDP

4.37 During Tenth Plan no year-wise targets were fixed. However, against the overall targets of development of 68 lakh hectares, the achievement was 68,26,557 hectares which is more than the targets.

DPAP

4.38 Under DPAP during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 the position of targets and achievement is as follows:

Year	Targets (No. of the projects)	Achievement (No. of the projects)
2004-05	2800	2550
2005-06	2800	3000
2006-07	3000	3076

DDP

4.39 The details of the targets and achievement is as under :

Year	Targets (No. of the projects)	Achievement (No. of the projects)
2004-05	1800	1600
2005-06	1800	2000
2006-07	2230	2270 (upto 31.1.2007)

4.40 The aforesaid data of physical achievement indicates that the overall targets were almost accomplished under the three major schemes of Watershed Development *viz.* IWDP, DDP and DPAP.

4.41 The Committee find that during each year of Tenth Plan, the Department has achieved almost 100 per cent physical as well as financial achievements as compared to the allocation made and the targets fixed under different schemes of wastelands development.

Further during each year of the Tenth Plan, the Department has been allocated nearly the same amount as proposed to Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance. However, during the first year of Eleventh Plan, the Department has been provided a little over 50 per cent of the proposed outlay. Not only that, during each year of Tenth Plan, there has been some enhancement in outlay as compared to previous year, however, the outlay provided during first year of Eleventh Plan has been pegged at the outlay provided during the terminal year of Tenth Plan *i.e.* 2006-07. The Committee strongly recommend the Government to enhance the allocation during the year 2007-08 specifically when the Department has achieved 100 percent physical and financial targets and the year 2007-08 is the first year of Eleventh Plan which will reflect the priorities of the Government during the Plan.

4.42 As regards the strategy of the Department during Eleventh Plan, Rs. 11,700 crore has been proposed for Eleventh Plan. The proposed allocation during Eleventh Plan is more than double the projections made during Tenth Plan. Further the Parthasarthy Committee has projected the requirement of outlay of Rs. 1,50,000 crore to complete the target of wastelands development by the year 2020. The Parthasarthy Committee has projected the annual allocation of Rs. 10,000 crore. To meet this Rs. 10,000 crore, it has been proposed that the current outlay should be doubled and another Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS. Against the proposed allocation of Rs. 1,50,000 crore, Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan has estimated the requirement of Rs. 80,000 crore. Perhaps the difference between the projections made in the Approach Paper and Parthasarthy Committee report is due to the difference in per hectare cost of wastelands development. While Approach paper has estimated Rs. 10,000 as the projected per hectare cost of development, the Parthasarthy Committee has projected Rs. 12,000 as the per hectare cost of development. Besides, the projections made in regard to the total work ahead in the Approach Paper and Parthasarthy Committee report also differ. The aforesaid issues have been dealt in detail in the preceding part of the report where the Committee has emphasised the need to resolve the aforesaid issues. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the development of wastelands/degraded land is the top most priority area of the Government as indicated in the President's Address to Parliament and as indicated in the Approach Paper. However, from the allocation made during 2007-08, it seems that adequate priority has not been given to this sector. The Committee also note that in the present scenario of mismatch between the demand and availability of foodgrains, it is extremely necessary

to increase the area of agriculture in the country. Besides, with the pressure on land for industries etc., there is pressure on the Government to develop the area of wastelands. The aforesaid issues have been adequately addressed in the third chapter of the report. Here the Committee strongly recommend the Government to provide adequate outlay under the different schemes after the detailed planning to be made at the national level by the Centralized agency viz. National Rainfed Area Authority.

The issue of unspent balances and the monitoring of programmes related to Watershed Development .

4.43 The scenario of physical and financial achievement during Tenth Plan reflects a very favourable scenario of implementation of various watershed schemes of the Department of Land Resources. However, certain areas viz. unspent balances, foreclosure of project, pendency of utilisation certificates raise serious concerns over the system of analysing physical and financial achievements. The relevant issues are dealt with in the succeeding paras of the report.

Unspent Balances

4.44 The Statement indicating the details of unspent balances under different schemes of the Department has been given at **Appendix-VIII**.

4.45 The analysis of the data indicates the position of unspent balances under DPAP, DDP and IWDP as under:

			(Rs. in crore)
DPAP	—		321.21
DDP	—		306.08
IWDP	—		341.86
Total			969.15

4.46 Another noticeable fact noted from the statement is that nothing has been mentioned in various columns in respect of the following number of States:

- (i) **DPAP** The information has been furnished for 14 States, whereas DPAP is applicable in 16 States. No information has been furnished for Jharkhand and Orissa.

- (ii) **DDP** The information has been furnished for all 7 States where DDP is being implemented.
- (iii) **IWDP** In Manipur, Kerala, although the allocations are being made, nothing has been indicated about the unspent balances.

Foreclosure of projects

4.47 The number of projects foreclosed under DPAP, DDP, & IWDP are as under:-

DPAP	—	1764
DDP	—	300
IWDP	—	7

4.48 The Committee have persistently been recommending to indicate the data of foreclosure of projects under various watershed scheme in the various Budget Documents. Even then the Department has not bothered to furnish the information in the Budget documents of 2007-08. In this regard during the course of examination of Demands for Grants (2007-08), the Department has assured the compliance of the recommendation of the Committee.

Pendency of Utilisation Certificates

4.49 As per the information furnished in the Budget documents, 221 total utilisation certificates amounting to Rs 201.51 crore were outstanding as on 31 December, 2006.

4.50 When asked the reasons for pendency of Utilisation Certificate, the Department has stated as under:

“Area Development Programmes – IWDP, DPAP and DDP are need based. The sanctioned projects under these programmes are funded in installments towards contributions of Central Share and second and onward installments are released when 50 per cent Utilisation Certificate of the earlier installments is received. Thus, there remains some funds unutilised in case of ongoing projects. However, these funds remain under the process of utilisation and provide continuity to the implementation of the projects. In essence unspent balance is a continuous concept rolling over the project life and hence any utilization can not be pin pointed against the existing unspent balance.”

4.51 The basic reasons for non-submission of utilization certificates by various States/Union Territories mainly comprise of following:-

1. "Utilisation certificate is submitted project-wise at the time of release of second and onward installments. Sometimes there is a time lag in the implementation of the projects which result into non-submission of Utilisation Certificates of the earlier installments taken.
2. The Utilisation Certificate is submitted in respect of installments already released at the time of making the proposals for fresh installment in each project. Therefore, the Utilisation Certificate of new installments always are reflected as unsubmitted."

4.52 The Department has informed that Bihar, Assam, Manipur and Arunachal Pradesh are the main defaulter States. State-wise information is furnished as per **Appendix-IX**.

Area Officers Scheme

4.53 Area Officers scheme in the Ministry of Rural Development is an important mechanism for monitoring the implementation of major programmes of the Ministry with special reference to quality, adherence to implementation schedule, flow of funds, proper utilization of funds and achievement of physical and financial targets etc. through field visits. Senior officers of the level of Deputy Secretary and above are assigned specific States for periodic visit and monitoring. After the visits tour reports containing the observations and facts are submitted. Shortcoming in the implementation of visited projects as observed in the said report are taken up with the concerned implementing agency at the different level of review/monitoring meetings. Major findings in such visits are project specific depending upon the objective of the project and are addressed to while releasing the funds and adopting the system of monitoring.

4.54 During the year 2006, the schemes of Department of Land Resources were monitored in the following manner:-

- (i) Under online monitoring system most of the districts in the States/ Union Territories have started feeding the data online.
- (ii) Monthly review meeting of nodal officers representing the various States/ Union Territories were conducted regularly.
- (iii) Evaluation studies for major projects by independent agencies were conducted in the State of Nagaland.

- (iv) The performance of 17 States was reviewed in a special and focused manner for giving the impetus to the implementation of the programmes.

4.55 Following improvements in the monitoring mechanism of the Ministry (DoLR) were envisaged during the year 2006-07:

- (i) Development of website and online monitoring – during the year 2006-07 the system of online monitoring by the States in the website developed by the Department has been introduced. The work has commenced, however, many State functionaries are under the process of getting familiarization of the system through training.
- (ii) Every month a meeting for reviewing the progress made and funds utilized by the States is conducted which is attended by the nodal officers of the States amongst others.
- (iii) Evaluation studies of ongoing projects have been entrusted to independent evaluators for assessing the performance of ongoing projects.
- (iv) A special review meeting of the States meeting impetus for implementation is conducted in the department where the pace of performance is examined.

4.56 The Committee while examining Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources had noted that the Budget Documents of the Department indicate that the releases for the State Governments/ Implementing Agencies are considered as spending and as such a favourable performance of the Department indicating 100 per cent physical and financial achievement is indicated. The data of unspent balances, foreclosure of projects, pendency of utilisation certificates present the other side of the picture. The Committee while observing that there was no system to analyse the performance of different projects had recommended for periodic evaluation of projects at different stages and grading of the projects as poor, satisfactory, very good. In this regard para 2.15 and 2.16 of Tenth Report of the Committee are reproduced below:

“The Committee conclude from what has been stated above that the data indicate quite a favourable performance of the Department as compared to the other counterpart Departments of the Ministry of Rural Development *viz* the Department of Rural Development and Drinking Water Supply where the actual allocation is far less than the proposed outlay of those Departments. The better

allocation position is also due to very good expenditure position shown by the Department under several schemes. The allocation and the efforts made by the Department need to be continued in a bigger way keeping in view the gigantic task of huge areas falling under wastelands in the country.”

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

4.57 The Committee further pursued the issue of evaluation of projects in 19th Report (14th Lok Sabha).

4.58 The Department in Chapter III of the Outcome Budget has stated that it has revamped the monitoring mechanism which has the following feature:

- (i) Mandatory mid term evaluation of the projects by an independent evaluator after release of 45% of the project cost;
- (ii) For effective monitoring, grading of projects has been done from the basis of performance as:
 - a. Preparatory Stage;
 - b. Implementing/execution stage; and
 - c. Completion stage.
- (iii) State Rural Development Departments have been involved at the three stages to monitor the projects through a State level Committee.

- (iv) Benchmarking of projects as poor, satisfactory, good, very good and excellent on the basis of performance was discussed with State Secretaries and it has been suggested that minimum measurable criteria for activities in three stages may be fixed by the Government of India and the suggestion is under consideration of the Ministry.

4.59 The Committee have reviewed the physical and financial achievement during each year of the Tenth Plan in the preceding chapter of the report whereby it has been noted that Department has achieved almost 100 per cent physical and financial targets. While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous years, the Committee have noted that the position is not so favourable if the ground situation in this regard is analyzed. The various Budget documents of the Department indicate that the releases to the State Governments/implementing agencies are considered as spending. Besides, the area covered by different projects is considered to be developed without analyzing the ground situation. There is no mechanism to analyze the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes due to long gestation period. The data indicated with regard to unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 969.15 crore under the three major schemes Desert Development Programme (DDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) further substantiates the aforesaid observation of the Committee. As many as 1764 projects under DPAP, 300 projects under DDP and 7 projects under IWDP have been foreclosed by now. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to indicate the position of unspent balances as well as foreclosure of projects in the various Budget documents so as to know the position with regard to real achievement at the ground level. The Committee express strong exception at the information is not being furnished in the Outcome Budget of the Department inspite of the insistence by the Committee in the respective Reports.

The Standing Committee on Rural Development while examining the Demands for Grants 2005-06 of the Department [refer Para 2.16 of Tenth Report (14th Lok Sabha)] had suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects under the aforesaid three major schemes at various stages of implementation. The recommendation of the Committee in this regard is reproduced below.

"The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to evolve some sort of mechanism for evaluating the performance of

different projects. Some sort of grading indicating poor, satisfactory or very good may be indicated against the number of projects being undertaken in various States. Besides, another mechanism can be to have some system indicating the projects at First stage, Second stage, Third stage etc. Such type of analysis would enable a critical evaluation of the projects. The Committee would like the Department to consider the said aspect and apprise the Committee accordingly."

The Committee note with satisfaction from the written replies that the Department has agreed to adopt the monitoring system suggested by the Committee. To conclude, the Committee again emphasize the strict monitoring of the projects being undertaken under the major schemes related to wastelands through various systems of monitoring *viz.* monitoring of projects at various stages, grading of projects, monitoring through area officers schemes. Besides, another mechanism to evaluate the performance of the project is through Vigilance Committees. The Committee strongly recommend to strengthen the monitoring mechanism as suggested above. Besides, the Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation to indicate the data with regard to unspent balances and foreclosure of projects in the various Budget documents. The aforesaid data may also be made available on the website of Department to bring transparency as well as to put pressure on the implementing agencies to perform better in this regard. Besides, the data and outcome of the meetings of Vigilance Committees as well as the area officers' schemes should also be given in the Budget documents. Besides the Department should categorically inform the Committee the reasons for huge under-spending under the three major schemes DDP, DPAP and IWDP and take corrective action to ensure that the allocation made under different programmes is meaningfully utilized. The Committee may also be kept apprised about this.

Review of IWDP in the context of the task of wastelands development in North-Eastern Region

4.60 The following is the position of total wastelands and percentage of wastelands to the geographical area in North Eastern States including Sikkim.

Geographical Area	— 262179 Square Kilometres
Wastelands	— 62106.64 Square Kilometres
Percentage of wastelands to geographical area	— 23.69 per cent

4.61 North Eastern States have no DDP and DPAP blocks and as such only IWDP is being implemented in these States. So far 558 projects covering 27,56,860 hectares of wastelands were undertaken during 8th, 9th, and 10th Plan under IWDP. The Department has further indicated the data of the area actually treated according to which out of 27,56,860 hectares covered so far only 1,19,324 hectares *i.e.* around 4 per cent could actually be treated. Out of 558 projects undertaken under IWDP two projects have been foreclosed and Rs. 20.85 crore is lying unspent with the various North-Eastern States as indicate in **Appendix-VIII** of the written replies.

4.62 As regards the strategy of the Department during Eleventh Plan with specific reference to wastelands development in North Eastern States, the Department has informed that out of 6.21 million hectares of total wastelands in North-Eastern States around 2.76 million hectares have already been covered under IWDP. Thus around 3.45 million hectares still remains to be covered. During the Eleventh Plan at National level an area of 250 lakh hectares is proposed to be covered under Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). Since 10 per cent of the allocations are earmarked for North-Eastern States, about 2.5 million hectares of wastelands will be covered under IWMP.

4.63 **The Committee find that out of total geographical area of 2,62,179 sq. Kms. of North-Eastern States including Sikkim, 62,106.64 sq. kms. *i.e.* 23.69 per cent of the total area is wastelands. In the North-Eastern States, out of the three schemes DDP, DPAP and IWDP related to watershed development, only one scheme *i.e.* IWDP is being implemented since these States have no DPAP and DDP blocks. As regards the achievement made with regard to the various projects being implemented in these areas, so far 558 projects were taken up during Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Plan under IWDP covering 2.76 million hectares of land. Out of this 2.76 million hectares only 1,19,324 hectares *i.e.* around 4 per cent of the total land could actually be treated as per the information provided by the Department. Another noticeable fact is that the strategy for Eleventh Plan is being chalked out based on the data of coverage *i.e.* 2.76 million hectares and as such the Department is very optimistic to cover the remaining 2.50 million hectares during the Eleventh Plan thus leaving only 0.95 million hectares in North-Eastern States. Further Rs. 20.85 crore is lying unspent with various North-Eastern States. The Committee have dealt with in detail the issue of releases being considered as spending as well as coverage being treated as really developed by the Department in the preceding chapter of the report. Similar trends are noticeable in the case of North Eastern States. The Committee disapprove the way the projections are being made without noting**

the ground situation. There is an urgent need to understand the ground situation with regard to the implementations of various projects so as to know the real impact of these programmes. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to review the policy of monitoring as given in detail in earlier part of the report and give adequate emphasis on the development of wastelands in North-Eastern States which have a sizeable area of wastelands.

- (i) Slipped back areas falling from the developed category to again wastelands.
- (ii) The post project maintenance.
- (iii) Status of ownership of the wastelands.

Slipped back area falling from the developed category to again wastelands

4.64 When asked whether the Department has made any study to know about the slipping back of area from the developed category again to degraded land, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that some studies by the Satellite technology have been done in this regard. However, as on today no detailed study has been done. The Department will make it as a part of on going programme so as to monitor the position of the real recovered area as well as the position of lapsing back areas.

Watershed Development Fund and the Post Project Maintenance

4.65 The extracts of the guidelines are reproduced below:

“One of the mandatory conditions for selection of villages in Watershed Development Programmes is people’s contribution towards Watershed Development Fund (WDF). The contribution to WDF shall be a minimum 10 per cent of the cost of works executed on individual lands. However, in case of SC/ST and persons identified below the poverty line, the minimum contribution to the Fund in respect of community property may come from all the beneficiaries, which shall be a minimum of 5 per cent of the development cost incurred. It should be ensured that the contribution comes from the beneficiary farmers and is not deducted from the wages paid to the labourers who are engaged to treat the private lands. These contributions would be acceptable either in cash/voluntary labour or material. A sum equivalent to the monetary value of the voluntary labour and materials would be taken from the watershed project account

and deposited in this fund. The Gram Panchayat shall maintain the Watershed Development Fund separately. The Chairman and Secretary, Gram Panchayat will operate the WDF account jointly. Individuals as well as charitable institutions should be encouraged to contribute generously to this Fund. The proceeds of this Fund shall be utilised in maintenance of assets created on community land or for common use after completion of project period. Works taken up for individual benefit shall not be eligible for repair/maintenance out of this fund."

4.66 On the issue of capacity building in terms of PRIs and individuals the Secretary of the Department stated as under:

"Capacity building at all levels will be something very important and capacity building particularly in terms of interacting with the common people, the farmers and other landless people who are going to work on wasteland or the common property. The role of PRIs is also very critical. This is how we are trying to have a new approach and would really like to take it upon a mission mode, what the Parthasarthy Committee has also suggested."

Status of ownership of wastelands

4.67 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted before the Committee that the Department do not have information from different areas as to who own which land.

Merger of IWDP, DDP and DPAP under Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWDP)

4.68 The Department has informed that the existing three area development programmes *viz.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP from 2007-08 onwards have been merged into a scheme 'Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWDP)' with a view to consolidate and coverage these programmes for the purpose of integrated planning and optimum use of resources. The Department has further stated that the programme will however, retain its operational identify besides State Wasteland Resource Centre will be formed by training experts from different areas for project planning, monitoring, training and MIS/GIS data base.

4.69 It has further been informed that the Department has undertaken the task of preparing the guidelines on priority and propose to submit the common guidelines on IWMP to the National Rainfed Area Authority for approval by the end of June, 2007.

4.70 The Department has informed that IWMP would be implemented by adopting three tier approach one for upper reaches like hills and forest areas, second for intermediate slopes and the third for plains and flat areas.

4.71 While submitted the detail of three tier approach the Department has stated as under:

“In order to bring about broad based conceptualization and integration of all the area development programmes, it is proposed to integrate the related schemes within the Ministry of Rural Development for strong synergy and convergence among the programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP. For integrated planning, sustainable outcomes, clear conceptualization of rural livelihoods of the communities, the revised concept of the Integrated Watershed Management Programme has been proposed.

In the revised watershed programme, a holistic view is proposed to be taken so that the treatment effected, covers all the three major components of a watershed project. The purpose is to ensure that coverage and treatment are taken up right from the upper, forested areas which are the beginning of the water source, down to the plain areas where most of the labour intensive works are taken up.

Hence, a three-tier approach would be adopted towards the implementation of the Integrated Watershed Management Programme. In the upper reaches, which are mostly hilly and forested, the onus of implementation would lie with the Forest Departments and the Joint Forest Management Committees (JFMC). In the intermediate slopes, the Integrated Watershed Management Programme would address all the necessary issues. The Project Implementing Agency under the programme would be responsible for good quality implementation and progress of all works and other related items. As to the third level of the plains and flat areas, where there would be a large concentration of labour intensive works, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) will operate so that there is a strong convergence between the IWMP and NREGS. While this is the broad approach, the actual allocation of work at different reaches will depend on sources of funds and detailed coordination at the district level”

Recommendation of the Parthasarthy Committee on integrating the livestock management, involvement of PRIs and Self Help Groups (SHGs).

4.72 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that Parthasarthy Committee has recommended to integrate the livestock management as a key part of the programme and the Department is in agreement with it. Parthasarthy Committee has also recommended for the involvement of PRIs and Self Help Groups (SHGs) and User Groups who are to be involved in the programme.

The fate of ongoing projects under IWDP, DPAP and DDP which have been merged under IWMP

4.73 IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been merged with a new programme Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) from 2007-08.

4.74 The Department has informed that since these programmes are proposed to be merged, new modalities have to be evolved for which approval of the Cabinet and Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) is to be sought.

4.75 As regards the issue of committed liability that would need to be handled in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP the following data with regard to the ongoing projects has been given by the Department.

Year	Name of the Scheme	Ongoing Project
2006-07	IWDP	1314
2006-07	DPAP	16789
2006-07	DDP	10411
	Total	28514

4.76 The Committee note that the existing area development programmes *viz.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been converged into a comprehensive scheme Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) *w.e.f.* 2007-08. The Committee hope that the revised scheme would look into the various aspects with regard to monitoring of programme at the ground level and the issue of convergence as raised by the Committee from time to time in the earlier reports and re-emphasised in the preceding chapters of the report.

4.77 The Committee note that under the ambitious programme 'National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme', most of the permissible activities relate to land development. As indicated in the earlier part of the report, Parthasarthy Committee while projecting the annual allocation of the Department has suggested that out of the annual requirement of Rs. 10,000 crore, Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS. In this context, the Committee find that perhaps there is an urgent need to consider allowing development of wastelands as an activity under NREGS. This would further ensure sufficient works under the Guarantee Legislation to provide minimum 100 days of employment to each family who demand work as per the provisions made under the Act. The Department of Land Resources in this regard should discuss this matter with the sister Department of Rural Development and the outcome arrived at should be indicated to the Committee.

4.78 The Committee note that although the new programme IWMP has been proposed to be implemented from the year 2007-08, the modalities of revised programme has so far not been finalized. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Ministry of Rural Development to have the detailed homework done before launching a new scheme or restructuring a programme. It is difficult to understand how the subsumed programme would be implemented in the absence of the detailed guidelines and pending the finalisation of the detailed modalities. The year 2007-08 has already commenced *w.e.f.* 1st April 2007 and the Committee fail to understand how the revised programme would be implemented in this year in the absence of the detailed modalities. In view of the aforesaid scenario the Committee strongly recommend expeditious finalization of the guidelines and the detailed modalities.

4.79 The Committee note that DDP and DPAP are being implemented in the specified identified DDP and DPAP blocks in various States of the country. Although the Department has informed that the operational identity of different programmes would be maintained in the revised programme, the Committee would strongly recommend to provide adequate priority to the DDP and DPAP blocks in the revised programme.

4.80 The Committee further find that as many as 28,500 projects under IWDP, DDP and DPAP are continuing at present. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to ensure that the issue of committed liabilities for these ongoing projects is handled carefully while switching on from the earlier programmes

to the new programmes so as to have meaningful utilization of the outlays spent on these projects.

Professional Support

4.81 The Department has stated that for successful implementation of the area development programme, it has been decided to strengthen the professional support by taking up measures in large scale in following areas:

- (i) Capacity Building;
- (ii) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&P);
- (iii) Information, Education and Communication (IEC); and
- (iv) Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET).

4.82 For this, TDET Scheme has been merged with the scheme 'Professional Support' with an outlay of Rs. 89.10 crore during 2007-2008. The old scheme of TDET is being implemented by ICAR Institutes, Agricultural Universities etc. The Secretary during the course of oral evidence has stated as under:

"In a dedicated institutional support, today, although we have a reasonable size support at the national level, but the professional components are not adequate. I think, there is a need for having people from disciplines like soil science and people with background in forestry, in agriculture, in horticulture and other fields so that they can give us technical support. In addition, there has to be a strong support in terms of people who understand GIS, spatial data, land records and can then integrate them because that is how a total plan for a small area can be prepared.

We also wanted to have a professional team at the State level. Only Andhra Pradesh and Orissa have started with this. Otherwise, today even with a large programme, there is not a dedicated team. We are going to support this programme at the end, at the district level. In some of the livelihood programmes, in the watershed programme, some of the programmes which are supported by World Bank and IFED and other agencies, we have started doing it in a few States. Western Orissa Livelihood Project is one such project. Then there are some watershed programmes in a few States. At the district level also, some professional support is there. We would like to replicate it in all the districts where the size of the programme is reasonable."

4.83 The Committee note that a laudable initiative has been taken by the Department to strengthen the professional support for the successful implementation of various area development programmes. The Secretary has informed the Committee about the dedicated team of professionals so as to provide the technical support for these programmes. In some of the States like Andhra Pradesh, Orissa there is a dedicated team of professionals at the State level. Besides, at the district level also some professional support is there. The Secretary has assured that the experience of having dedicated team at State and district levels would be replicated in all the districts where the size of the programme is reasonable. While appreciating the idea given by the Secretary in this regard, the Committee would like that it should be implemented expeditiously so as to ensure the successful implementation of various programmes.

CHAPTER V

THE ISSUES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEMES FOR COMPUTERISATION OF LAND RECORDS AND STRENGTHENING OF REVENUE ADMINISTRATION AND UPDATING OF LAND RECORDS

Review of the performance of :—

- (i) Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records and
- (ii) Computerisation of Land Records.

5.2 The features of newly launched scheme of National Programme for Comprehensive Land Records Management (NPCLRM) after merging the aforesaid two programmes.

Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

5.3 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) was started in 1988-89 on pilot basis in eight States. The scheme was approved as a separate Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records during the 8th Plan. The scheme envisages computerization of ownership and plot-wise details for ensuring that landowners get computerized copies of Records of Rights (RoRs) on demand. By the end of the 8th Plan, 323 districts in the country were brought under the scheme with an expenditure of Rs. 64.44 crore. During the first year of the Ninth Five Year Plan *i.e.* 1997-98, it was decided that funds should be provided for operationalisation of the scheme at Tehsil/Taluka level also. During the Ninth Five Year Plan, Rs. 169.14 crore was released to various States under the scheme by covering 259 more districts. At present, the scheme is being implemented in 582 districts covering the entire country, except the State of Meghalaya and Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Island, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep.

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

5.4 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. The Scheme of SRA & ULR is being implemented in the entire country.

5.5 The position of total funds released and the expenditure under both the programmes since inception is as below:

(Rs. in Crore)

Name of the Programme	Outlay Released (Upto Dec. 2006)	Expenditure	Percentage of Expenditure
Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)	461.79	292.52	63%
Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records	330.67	253.81	77%

(a) Financial Performance during 10th Plan

5.6 The total Tenth Plan B.E., R.E., Expenditure and shortfall in utilization under CLR and SRA & ULR are as under:

Scheme	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure (Upto Jan., 07)	Shortfall
CLR	325	325	262.95	62.05
SRA & ULR	179	154	112.60	66.40

(b) Financial performance during 2006-2007

(i) Computerization of Land Records

5.7 In respect of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) during 2006-2007 (upto December 2006) against the outlay of Rs. 100 crore, only 16.41 crore have been released and following reasons have been attributed for less release:

- (i) Delay in release of funds by States to implementing Agencies;
- (ii) Non-availability of data entry agencies in some States; and
- (iii) Lack of trained staff to manage computer centers.

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

5.8 Similarly for Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR), during 2006-2007, as against the outlay of Rs. 49 crore, the total releases were only Rs. 5.78 crore (upto December, 2006) and the reasons furnished are delay in State Governments providing matching share and time consuming survey settlement operations.

5.9 During the course of evidence , the Secretary of the Department detailing out the progress made with regard to updation of data on Land Records in different States has stated as under:

“ Goa, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal are the States which have completed RoR data entry. There are a couple of other States which have also done very well but we have not included them like Orissa and Andhra Pradesh. The States which have stopped manual issue of record of rights are Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Guajarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. A few States have also placed data on the website. These are Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand and Orissa. Now different States are in different stages”.

5.10 Giving the overall review of the aforesaid two programmes the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as under:

“This programme has been going on for some time. One is the computerization of land records and the other is the modernization and strengthening of revenue administration. In the second programme, what we have found in the last few years is that more or less it has been reduced into a building programme that is strengthening of land revenue administration. It is because perhaps that is the easiest thing to do. The States do not have the resources and the Ministry had also been sanctioning them. But we feel that is not the genuine priority. At our level, we should start something more concrete which is going to be beneficial. On the computerization of land records, almost 15 to 20 years have gone. Initially, there were a lot of technology issues like computing in Indian languages. Then the productivity, then the capacity in the private sector to do the data entry and other things come. That phase is more or less

over. Today, we have a much better understanding of the technology and also the productivity has increased in the sense that we can tackle large volumes of data over reasonably short period.”

5.11 The Secretary also informed that there are unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 219 crore under Computerisation of Land Records and 94 crore under Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR).

Progress in North Eastern States

5.12 The Department in the written replies has informed that the subject of modernization of the land revenue administration system has been taken up with the North-Eastern States in the Conferences of Revenue Ministers/Revenue Secretaries of the States from time to time as well as in video conferences organized specially for the purpose. Of late, the North Eastern States have shown significant interest in taking up the work in right earnest. The tempo is being maintained by working closely with the concerned officials of these State Governments. The Department is also insisting on proper utilization certificates for the same, while offering to release further funds. Similar approach will continue in the coming years as well.

5.13 Further, the issue of these States facing difficulty in providing 50 percent State share for the scheme of SRA & ULR will not exist any longer, because the components covered by that scheme will be funded @ 100 percent by the Central Government under the National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resource Management (NPCLRM) from the year 2007-08.

5.14 While reviewing the position of land records in North Eastern States the Committee had observed (refer para 5.27 of 19th Report) as under:

“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 observed that computerisation of Land Records is not possible when the basic data of land records is not available in an area.”

National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)

5.15 The Department has stated that with a view to provide computerized Record of Rights (RoRs) with maps to scales, other data based certificates etc. to citizens for securing agricultural and non-agricultural credit based on land assets, the new programme of National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM) has been started from 2007-2008 by merging the two schemes of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). The Department has stated that Rs. 3,104 crore have been proposed during Eleventh Plan and Rs. 145 crore for 2007-2008. In Outcome Budget 2007-2008 it has been stated that it seeks to pilot the programme in 60 districts including a mix of developed, developing and backward districts. However, the on going works under the existing schemes of CLR and SRA & ULR, for which funds have already been provided or are being provided up to the end of 2006-07 will continue; the same will be dovetailed with the activities under the NPCLRM as the districts will move to the next level.

5.16 The Programme will cover all the districts in the country over a period of time, beginning with pilot projects in a selected number of districts. The pilot districts will be selected from across the country, and the selection will be made in consultation with the respective State Governments and UT Administrations and will take into consideration the levels of preparedness of the different States.

5.17 The Secretary highlighted the various activities to be undertaken under the restructured programme (NPCLRM) as given under:

“Now, we have tried to integrate all these programmes. I would just again briefly outline what are the activities which we want to take up and how we are going to integrate these things. We are trying to put a very clear focus on deliverables because we would like to start from what we want to achieve and then try to work out a road map towards that. The first thing will be that we will have a citizen focus in this programme. We would see ultimately how the citizen is going to be benefited. That means if people come across a window, can they get a copy of their records and a copy of the map. It is because map is the other component which practically has remained unaddressed in the programme of computerisation of land records. There are

some technical problems. Basically, there are two issues—one is that old maps are there and some of them are not in good shape. So, there has been a constant debate whether we should really computerize them or whether we should wait for doing a completely new survey using the latest technology like global positioning system and modern survey instruments. Our approach will be that whatever is there, with that land record management work is going on. So the first of all that should be available and the re-survey and other things which are going to take a longer time, that can be started. But we should not wait for that and keep these things pending because records of rights actually consist of two parts. One is the *Khatian* or what contains the name of the land holder and the plot number etc. and other is the map. So, we will complete this. The technical problem is that this is available in what is known as analogue data, so, we just take a photograph of that. Then you convert that into what is known as vectorisation that means you can extract the area from the computer with reference to a particular point and position of all other points are known. It is the vectorisation activity. We want to take it up in a time bound programme whatever map is available we will try to complete that and hopefully in three years' period we would complete it. That is a mission mode programme which would be one of the key components of this so that the citizens can get a benefit of it."

5.18 As regards the updation of the land records, the Secretary informed that the Department would support case management system so that once the land records are computerized these are updated on a continuous basis.

5.19 When asked about the fate of some of the States particularly North Eastern States where no land records exist the Secretary clarified as under:

"at present there is no proposal for taking up any survey. Preparation of land records is basically the task of the State Governments. The original work has to be done by the States."

5.20 The Secretary further explained that under the restructured programme it is proposed to have much more professional input at the State as well as national level that is missing under the existing programme. GIS experts and people familiar with land records and people having good idea about survey would be involved. On some of technical issue, like the Indian language Interface, efforts would be

made to associate IT industry to find a standards Digitization maps. Since the volume of work is too large, it cannot be taken as a departmental activity, it has to be decided how to outsource the various activities.

5.21 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of 2006-07 had observed that the necessary revenue rules/regulations have to be amended by the various State Governments to provide legal sanctity to computerized copies of Record of Rights. In this regard the observance of the Committee (refer para 5.17 of 19th Report) is reproduced below:

“The Committee note 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 computerised 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 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 computerisation by the initiatives of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme and make maintenance as well as updation of land records a reality.”

Linking land records with the computer of the lending bankers

5.22 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants (2006-2007) had been informed that thinking was being given for linking the land records with the computers of the lending bankers so as to facilitate easy accountability of loan to poor persons.

5.23 The observation of the Committee (refer para 5.18 of 19th report) has been reproduced under:

“The Committee 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 records 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.”

5.24 The Committee observe that the existing Centrally Sponsored Schemes relating to Land records viz. (i) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) and (ii) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) have been integrated into a comprehensive programme ‘National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)’ w.e.f. 2007-08. The new feature of the restructured programme consists of emphasis on computerisation of whatever land records are available with professional input at State as well as Central level and the time bound approach to complete the task on a mission mode within three years. The Committee appreciate the firm resolve of the Department to computerize the existing maps and land records within a time bound period of three years and hope that the various shortcomings of the existing programmes which include the matching share to be provided by the State Governments, training etc. would be properly addressed in the restructured programme. The Committee would like that the observations/recommendations made by the Committee in various reports, year after year should be considered while finalizing the modalities of the programme. Besides, the Committee would like to emphasise that the modalities of the programme which include the outsourcing of certain activities should be finalised expeditiously. The guidelines of the programme should be framed at the earliest. The Committee may be kept apprised of the same.

5.25 As regards the transition from the existing programme to the restructured programme, the Committee strongly recommend that the various issues related to the existing projects including committed liability and unspent balances should be taken care of very carefully by the Department and the Committee may be kept apprised of the modalities finalised in this regard.

5.26 The Committee further observe that at present two schemes are being undertaken for land records viz. SRA & ULR to supplement the efforts made by the State Governments to monitor/update land records and the other for Computerisation of Land Records. Maintenance and updation of land records are inter-related issues and no purpose can be served by computerisation unless the land records are properly maintained. Thus the core data is the essential input for the success of the computerisation programme. The Committee also agree that it is of utmost importance to save in whatever way the information of maps/land records as available with the Revenue Departments so as to ensure that these maps do not decay further. The restructured programme would be addressing the aforesaid system. The Committee while supporting the Department in this regard strongly recommend to the Government to provide adequate outlay so as to enable the Department to complete the task in the country within the envisaged time frame of three years.

5.27 The Committee while supporting the Department on the issue of restructuring the programme find that another area of concern is having correct land records. The proposed restructured scheme of computerisation of land records on the basis of the existing records would only serve the purpose of saving the decaying maps/land records but the real purpose of land records can be achieved only when the land records are correct and reflect the true ground position in this regard. In this regard, the State Governments' efforts were being supplemented by the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records. The Secretary has informed that under the restructured programme, there is no proposal for taking up any survey. He has also stated that preparation of land records is basically the task of State Governments and the original work has to be done by the States. The Secretary has also observed that SRA & ULR has been reduced into a building programme *i.e.* strengthening of land revenue administration which is not the genuine priority of the programme. The Committee differ here from the observation of the Secretary and note that very good work has been done under the programme by some of the States as admitted by the Department in the various

documents. Goa, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have been stated to be the States which have completed RoR data entry work with the assistance provided under the programme. It has also been mentioned that Orissa and Andhra Pradesh have also done good work. In this scenario, the Committee express strong concern over discontinuing the programme meant for maintenance and updating of land records *i.e.* SRA & ULR. While agreeing that there may be some problems in the implementation of the programme in some of the States, the Committee feel that the same can be addressed through bringing reforms in the various modalities of the programme. Since some States could do very good work, other States can also be motivated to emulate the good performing States. Besides, the Committee observe that with the proposed restructured programme only the States who could do something to have very good land records can be benefited. Again the worst performing States would be at a disadvantageous situation since these States have land records in a form which will serve no purpose after computerization.

The Committee further observe that in North Eastern States, the position of land records is further worse. In this regard, it is pertinent to highlight the observation of the Committee while examining the Demands for Grants 2006-07 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 States even the cadastral survey has not been done and so no land records exist. The Committee had been informed at that stage that under the existing schemes some of the North Eastern States have done some work like Arunachal Pradesh has some land records and Manipur has land records for five valley districts and these States have started data entry work. The State Government of Meghalaya has no proper land records and has been requested to carry out survey and settlement. State Governments of Mizoram and Nagaland have already started survey and settlement with the financial support from Government of India under the scheme of SRA & ULR. The Committee find that the restructured scheme of Computerization of Land Records would be of no help to North Eastern States because these States have no land records. Some initiatives were being undertaken by these States under the existing SRA & ULR Scheme and with the closure of that support, there is no hope of having proper land records in these States. In view of the aforesaid observation, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to continue SRA & ULR. However, the shortcomings of the existing scheme can be addressed by restructuring some of its components.

Keeping in view the existing position of land records in North Eastern States, the Committee strongly recommend as under:

- (i) Detailed survey of the land resources including watershed areas, catchment areas, drainage, forest areas, arable land areas etc. of each village through satellite and remote sensing devices should be carried out;
- (ii) Nodal authorities at the State and District level for coordinated functioning among the departments engaged for the upliftment of rural economy through the use of land and its resources should be set up;
- (iii) The Expert Committee on land management of the hill areas at the State and District level should be set up;
- (iv) The recommendations of the Expert Committee should be mandatorily followed by all the Departments.
- (v) The detailed survey of District and Sub-Divisional Headquarter areas for maintaining land records of Government office plots, individual plots, public land etc. should be carried out.

The Committee further observe that there is an urgent need to assure the people in North-East that the aforesaid Schemes are meant for the upkeep and maintenance of existing land records and in no way proposed to change the age old traditions and customs. Such an assurance is altogether required keeping in view the peculiar position of land records in North-East.

5.28 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year had been informed that some of the States *viz.* Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have amended the necessary revenue rules/regulations to stop issue of manual copies of Record of Rights (RoR) and to provide legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR. The Committee had recommended to persuade the remaining States through various seminars, conferences to amend the revenue rules/regulations so that the computerized system of land records may be given legal sanctity. The Committee feel that the real purpose of the computerization of land records can be achieved only when the legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR is provided by the various State Governments. While reiterating the earlier recommendation of the Committee, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to pursue further with the remaining State Governments to amend the revenue rules/regulations to provide legal sanctity to computerized RoRs.

5.29 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year was also informed that some thinking was being given to link the data of land records with the computers of the lending bankers so that the bankers can access the land records directly without any charge. The Committee feel that such a move can not only reduce the transaction cost but also would be a great relief to the poor persons whose applications are rejected by the Banks due to non-availability of proper copy of land records. Besides, the loan can easily be made available under various schemes of the Government as well as State Governments relating to housing, agriculture self-help groups etc. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to evolve some modalities whereby the aforesaid proposed initiative can be transformed into reality.

CHAPTER VI

BIO-FUEL

During the year 2004-05, Rs. 10 crore were allocated for a new initiative bio-fuel, out of which Rs. 0.20 crore could actually be spent. Subsequently, during the year 2005-06 Rs. 50 crore were allocated under the new initiative and the expenditure indicated in the Budget document is Rs. 49 crore. For the year 2007-08 also again Rs. 50 crore has been allocated for the aforesaid initiative. The following information giving the history of the aforesaid initiative is given in the Outcome Budget:

“The Planning Commission had set up a Committee on the development of Bio-fuels. The Committee, in its report of April 2003, made recommendations relating to Ethanol and Bio-diesel. On Bio-diesel, the Report suggested that a National Mission on Bio-diesel with special focus on plantation of *Jatropha curcas* (tree bearing non-edible oilseed) be launched with the ultimate objective of producing Bio-diesel to be blended with diesel to the extent of 20 per cent. *Jatropha curcas* was chosen for propagation because of its adaptability to different agro-climatic conditions, shorter gestation period, ease of harvesting fruits, higher oil content etc.

The proposed National Mission is to be implemented in two phases *i.e.* Phase-I as Demonstration Project and Phase-II a self-sustaining expansion of Bio-diesel Programme to cover enough land to produce the required quantity of *Jatropha curcas* seed. The Demonstration Project under the National Mission on Bio-diesel will be taken up in a Mission Mode and will be a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. Under the Demonstration Phase, it is proposed to take up 5 lakh hectare *Jatropha/Pongamia* plantations on forest and non-forest lands.

The Planning Commission made a presentation to the Prime Minister on the report of the Committee on Development of Bio-fuel on 11 July, 2003 wherein it was decided that the Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD) would act as a Nodal Ministry for operationalizing the Demonstration Phase.

In October, 2006, the EFC recommended the implementation of the demonstration programme by the Ministry of Rural Development. The Note for the CCEA for obtaining the approval of the CCEA is under circulation for eliciting the comments of the concerned Ministries/Departments.”

6.2 Further the Department has informed in the written note that the basic emphasis in the demonstration phase of the National Mission on Bio-diesel is on development of quality seed for wide scale plantation through convergence of R&D efforts. Under the demonstration phase, it is proposed to take up over a period of five years, plantation of jatropha and pongamia in five lakh hectares. The plantation would be taken up on waste, degraded and marginal lands belonging predominantly to public agencies. The activities to be funded are nursery development, plantation and research and development. While nursery development and plantation on five lakh hectares would be implemented by the States on 100 per cent Central assistance basis, R&D component would be coordinated by the Ministry of Rural Development. The Department has further informed that promotional and R&D efforts are scattered in different Departments and agencies of the Central and State Governments. The Department of Land Resources would coordinate these efforts under the demonstration phase.

6.3 The Committee note that a new initiative *viz.* development of Bio-fuel has been undertaken by the Government with the ultimate objective of producing bio-diesel to be blended with diesel to the extent of 20 per cent. To achieve this objective under the first phase *i.e.* demonstration phase, it is proposed to take up over a period of five years plantation of jatropha and pongamia in five lakh hectares. The basic emphasis in the demonstration phase is on the development of quality seed material for wide scale plantation through convergence of R&D efforts. The Committee also note that different Ministries/Departments/Agencies are involved in the R&D efforts and the Department of Land Resources has been given the responsibility to coordinate these efforts in the demonstration phase. The Committee recommend that the efforts of the Department in this regard should be intensified with a view to achieve the desired objectives. The Committee further note that out of Rs. 50 crore allocated during the year 2005-06, Rs. 49 crore were actually utilized. The Committee note from the various documents and have been informed during the course of oral evidence that the aforesaid project has not been cleared by the Group of Ministers. The Committee would like to know how the expenditure to the tune of Rs. 49 crore was done even when the programme has not been finalized so far. The Committee would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard.

NEW DELHI;
9 May, 2007

19 Vaisakha, 1929 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER UNDER DIRECTION 73A REGARDING STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN DRSCS REPORTS

Subject of the Report	:	Tenth Report (14th Lok Sabha) of Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
Date of Presentation	:	5 April, 2005
Date of receipt of Action Taken Notes	:	25 August, 2005
Date of Presentation of Action Taken Report	:	21 December, 2005
Date of Minister's Statement	:	12 May, 2006

The Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2005-06) was presented to Parliament on 20 April, 2005. As per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, the Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development was supposed to make a statement in Lok Sabha on the Status of implementation of each recommendation contained in the Tenth Report of the Committee within six months of the presentation of Report *i.e.* by 20 October, 2005. The Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development, however, made a delayed statement in the Lok Sabha on 12 May, 2006. the analysis of the aforesaid statement is given below:

Name of Committee	Ministry/ Department	Total Number of Reco- mmenda- tions	Total No. of Recs. Accepted	No. of Recs. Imple- mented	Nos. of Recs. Under Process	No of Recs. Not Imple- mented	No of Recs. Yet to be Implemented
Standing Committee on Rural Development	Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources)	36	16	09*	26**	01***	26 (25 under process + 1 not implemented)

* 1 Recommendation at para No. 2.37 is under do not desire to pursue category.

** 15 Recommendations categorised under not accepted category and are under process.

*** 1 Recommendation at para No. 3.76 is under not accepted category has not been implemented.

APPENDIX II
DETAILS OF DISTRIBUTION OF CEILING SURPLUS LAND
(SEPTEMBER, 2006)

(Area in acres)

Sl.No.	States/UTs	Area Declared Surplus	Area Taken Possession	Area Distributed to Individual Beneficiaries	Total No. of Benefi- ciaries
1.	Andhra Pradesh	8,43,183	6,51,823	5,88,925	5,30,852
2.	Assam	6,13,405	5,75,337	5,45,875	4,45,862
3.	Bihar	4,15,447	3,90,752	3,06,964	3,79,528
4.	Chhattisgarh	30,397	29,224	24,568	27,452
5.	Gujarat	2,27,643	1,74,585	1,56,353	35,410
6.	Haryana	1,05,783	1,01,932	1,01,166	29,351
7.	Himachal Pradesh	3,16,556	3,04,895	6,167	6,259
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	8,836	Nil	Nil	Nil
9.	Karnataka	2,68,783	1,64,601	1,23,775	34,039
10.	Kerala	1,70,588	99,193	76,664	1,65,142
11.	Madhya Pradesh	2,23,264	1,90,449	1,34,178	47,054
12.	Maharashtra	7,11,727	6,34,813	6,14,913	1,35,599
13.	Manipur	1,830	1,685	1,682	1,258
14.	Orissa	1,82,828	1,70,244	1,59,246	1,42,291
15.	Punjab	1,58,250	1,17,915	1,12,580	30,067
16.	Rajasthan	6,14,417	5,70,462	4,64,799	83,255
17.	Tamil Nadu	2,06,933	1,98,413	1,88,110	1,48,834
18.	Tripura	1,995	1,944	1,599	1,424
19.	Uttar Pradesh	3,69,362	3,39,385	2,63,225	3,03,867
20.	West Bengal	13,98,139	13,07,848	10,20,373	28,47,821
21.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	NR	NR	7,267	3,749
22.	Delhi	1,132	394	394	654
23.	Pondicherry	2,326	1,286	1,070	1,464
	Total	68,72,824	60,27,180	48,99,893	54,01,232

APPENDIX III

DETAILS OF DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT WASTELANDS (September, 2006)

Sl.No.	Name of State/UT	Area Distributed in Lakh Acres
1.	Andhra Pradesh	42.02
2.	Assam	5.89
3.	Bihar*	13.21
4.	Gujarat	13.81
5.	Haryana	0.00
6.	Himacal Pradesh	0.17
7.	Karnataka	13.72
8.	Kerala	4.57
9.	Madhya Pradesh#	0.79
10.	Maharashtra	10.23
11.	Manipur	0.32
12.	Punjab	1.10
13.	Orissa	7.33
14.	Tamil Nadu	2.89
15.	Tripura	1.32
16.	Uttar Pradesh@	24.89
17.	West Bengal	4.32
18.	Goa	0.05
19.	Mizoram	0.74
20.	Rajasthan	1.12
21.	Delhi	0.06
22.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	No Wasteland
	Total	148.55

*Including Jharkhand

#Including Chhattisgarh

@Including Uttaranchal

APPENDIX IV

DETAILS OF NUMBER OF TENANTS CONFERRED OWNERSHIP
RIGHTS (OR RIGHTS PROTECTED) AND AREA
ACCRUED TO THEM
(September, 2006)

Sl.No.	States	No. of Tenants (In lakhs)	Area Accrued (lakh acres)
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1.07	5.95
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Tenancy law not enacted	
3.	Assam	29.08	31.75
4.	Bihar	NR	NR
5.	Chhattisgarh	Nil	Nil
6.	Gujarat	12.76	25.92
7.	Goa	NR	NR
8.	Haryana	Tenancy not prevalent	
9.	Himachal Pradesh	4.01	NR
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	6.10	NR
11.	Jharkhand	NR	NR
12.	Karnataka	6.05	26.32
13.	Kerala	28.42	14.50
14.	Madhya Pradesh	Tenancy not prevalent	
15.	Maharashtra	14.92	42.90
16.	Manipur	NR	NR
17.	Meghalaya	Nil	Nil
18.	Mizoram	Nil	Nil
19.	Nagaland	NR	NR

1	2	3	4
20.	Orissa	2.97	1.15
21.	Punjab	NR	NR
22.	Rajasthan	0.18	NR
23.	Sikkim	NR	NR
24.	Tamil Nadu	4.98	6.95
25.	Tripura	0.14	0.39
26.	Uttar Pradesh	NR	NR
27.	Uttaranchal	NR	NR
28.	West Bengal	15.07	11.11
Union Territories			
29.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Nil	Nil
30.	Chandigarh	Nil	Nil
31.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	0.07	0.21
32.	Delhi	NR	NR
33.	Daman & Diu	NR	NR
34.	Lakshadweep	Neg	Neg
35.	Pondicherry	0.03	0.007
Total		125.85	167.157

NR-Not reported.

APPENDIX V

DETAILS OF STATE-WISE INFORMATION ON ALLIENATION AND RESTORATION OF TRIBAL LANDS (September, 2006)

(Area in acres)

Sl.No.	State	Cases Decided In favour of Tribals	Area	Cases in which land was restored to Tribals	Area
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2,64,75	1,06,225	23,383	94,312
2.	Assam	50	19	50	19
3.	Bihar*	44,634	45,421	44,634	45,421
4.	Gujarat	19,320	1,77,751	376	4,797
5.	Karnataka	21,834	67,862	21,834	67,862
6.	Madhya Pradesh#	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	Maharashtra	19,943	99,486	19,943	99,486
8.	Orissa	61,431	56,879	61,364	56,854
9.	Rajasthan	187	587	187	587
10.	Tripura	9,027	7,255	8,932	7,144
	Total:	2,02,901	5,61,485	1,80,703	3,76,482

*Including Jharkhand

#Including Chhattisgarh

APPENDIX VI

STATE-WISE DATA OF TOTAL WASTELANDS AND AREAS COVERED UNDER IWDP SINCE 1995

(Area in million hectares)

Sl.No.	State	Total wasteland	Area covered under IWDP since 1995
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4.53	0.75
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1.82	0.35
3.	Assam	1.40	0.90
4.	Bihar	0.54	0.32
5.	Chhattisgarh	0.76	0.38
6.	Goa	0.05	0.01
7.	Gujarat	2.04	0.55
8.	Haryana	0.33	0.13
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2.83	0.44
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	7.02	0.22
11.	Jharkhand	1.12	0.14
12.	Karnataka	1.35	0.56
13.	Kerala	0.18	0.15
14.	Madhya Pradesh	5.71	0.76
15.	Maharashtra	4.93	0.53
16.	Manipur	1.32	0.27
17.	Meghalaya	0.34	0.18
18.	Mizoram	0.45	0.43
19.	Nagland	0.37	0.38

1	2	3	4
20.	Orissa	1.90	0.52
21.	Punjab	0.12	0.07
22.	Rajasthan	10.15	0.54
23.	Sikkim	0.38	0.15
24.	Tripura	0.13	0.09
25.	Tamil Nadu	1.73	0.46
26.	Uttarakhand	1.61	0.30
27.	Uttar Pradesh	1.69	0.86
28.	West Bengal	0.44	0.12
29.	Union Territories	0.03	—
	Total	55.27	10.56

APPENDIX VII (A)

**STATEMENT SHOWING PROPOSED ALLOCATION,
B.E./R.E. & ACTUAL EXPENDITURE**

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	10th Plan				Actual upto 15 March, 2007	Percentage utilization
		Proposed Allocation	Approved by Planning Commission	Budget Estimates	Revised Estimates		
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	1,600.00	1,500.00	1,558.00	1,558.00	1,530.63	98.24
2.	Desert Development Programme	1,200.00	1,100.00	1,203.00	1,133.00	1,146.18	101.16
3.	I.W.D.P.	1,900.00	1,800.00	2,060.00	2,047.00	1,954.95	95.50
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	4,700.00	4,400.00	4,821.00	4,738.00	4,631.76	97.76
4.	Computerisation of Land Records	500.00	400.00	345.00	325.00	278.87	85.81
5.	SRA&ULR	200.00	200.00	169.00	154.00	130.81	84.94
6.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)	—	—	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	365.00	365.00	369.00	351.00	335.18	95.49
8.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	100.00	90.00	86.00	82.00	76.77	93.62
9.	Investment Promotional Scheme	—	—	—	—	—	—
10.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	100.00	71.00	23.00	12.80	6.43	50.23
11.	Communication	—	—	—	—	—	—
	New Initiatives	—	1,000.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	—	—	200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13.	Bio Fuels	—	—	110.00	100.20	49.00	48.90
	Total Plan	5,965.00	6,526.00	6,125.00	5,764.00	5,508.82	95.57

APPENDIX VII (B)

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING
EXPENDITURE DURING TENTH PLAN
(FROM 2002-2003 TO 2006-2007 UPTO 15 MARCH 2007)

For The Year 2002-2003 (Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2002-2003			
		As Proposed	Agreed to/BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	270.00	250.00	250.00	250.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	210.00	185.00	185.00	185.00
3.	I.W.D.P.	440.00	387.00	380.00	354.45
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)				
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	920.00	822.00	815.00	789.45
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	100.00	55.00	35.00	31.18
6.	SRA&ULR	40.00	35.00	20.00	20.73
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)				
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	63.00	63.00	60.00	59.00
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	20.00	17.00	16.00	13.70
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme		1.00	0.10	3.13
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	20.00	5.95	2.95	
12.	Communication		1.05	0.95	
	New Initiatives				
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana				
14.	Bio Fuels				
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)				
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.				
	Total Plan	1163.00	1000.00	95.00	917.19
	Non-Plan				
	Secretariat Economic Services		3.81	3.62	2.68
	Total Plan & Non Plan	1163.00	1003.81	953.62	919.87

APPENDIX VII (C)

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING
EXPENDITURE DURING TENTH PLAN
(FROM 2002-2003 TO 2006-2007 UPTO 15 MARCH 2007)

For The Year 2003-2004 (Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2003-2004			
		As Proposed	Agreed to/BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	310.00	295.00	295.00	295.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	230.00	265.00	195.00	215.00
3.	I.W.D.P.	350.00	335.00	329.00	312.90
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)				
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	890.00	895.00	819.00	822.90
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	55.00	40.00	40.00	35.77
6.	SRA&ULR	35.00	25.00	25.00	24.46
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)				
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	66.00	66.00	51.00	55.28
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	20.00	17.00	14.00	15.08
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	10.00	0.10	0.10	0.96
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation		4.85	0.54	
12.	Communication		1.05	0.36	
	New Initiatives	100.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana				
14.	Bio Fuels				
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)				
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.				
	Total Plan	1176.00	1050.00	950.00	954.45
	Non-Plan				
	Secretariat Economic Services		3.66		2.83
	Total Plan & Non Plan	1176.00	1053.66	950.00	957.28

APPENDIX VII (D)

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING
EXPENDITURE DURING TENTH PLAN
(FROM 2002-2003 TO 2006-2007 UPTO 15 MARCH 2007)

For The Year 2004-2005 (Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2004-2005			
		As Proposed	Agreed to/BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	330.00	300.00	300.00	300.19
2.	Desert Development Programme	240.00	215.00	215.00	215.19
3.	I.W.D.P.	380.00	368.00	368.00	334.42
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)				
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	950.00	883.00	883.00	849.80
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	65.00	50.00	50.00	45.62
6.	SRA&ULR	35.00	20.00	20.00	19.66
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)				
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	15.00	15.00	15.00	14.99
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	6.00	0.10	0.10	0.54
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation		1.20	0.50	
12.	Communication		1.70	1.20	
	New Initiatives				
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	200.00	200.00	0.00	0.00
14.	Bio Fuels	10.00	10.00	0.20	0.00
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)				
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.				
	Total Plan	1361.00	1261.00	1050.00	1010.61
	Non-Plan				
	Secretariat Economic Services		3.48	3.43	3.00
	Total Plan & Non Plan	1361.00	1264.48	1053.43	1013.61

APPENDIX VII (E)

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING
EXPENDITURE DURING TENTH PLAN
(FROM 2002-2003 TO 2006-2007 UPTO 15 MARCH 2007)

For The Year 2005-2006 (Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2005-2006			
		As Proposed	Agreed to/BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1.	Drought Prone Area Programme	375.00	353.00	353.00	353.18
2.	Desert Development Programme	285.00	268.00	268.00	268.17
3.	I.W.D.P.	415.00	485.00	485.00	486.74
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)				
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	1075.00	1106.00	1106.00	1108.09
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	125.00	100.00	100.00	99.74
6.	SRA&ULR	65.00	40.00	40.00	39.99
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)				
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.99
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	20.00	17.00	17.00	17.00
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	3.00	0.10	0.10	1.18
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation		1.20	1.20	
12.	Communication		1.70	1.70	
	New Initiatives				
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana		0.00	0.00	
14.	Bio Fuels	120.00	50.00	50.00	49.00
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)				
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.				
	Total Plan	1488.00	1396.00	1396.00	1395.99
	Non-Plan				
	Secretariat Economic Services		3.44	3.29	3.29
	Total Plan & Non Plan	1488.00	1399.44	1399.29	1399.28

APPENDIX VII (F)

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING
EXPENDITURE DURING TENTH PLAN
(FROM 2002-2003 TO 2006-2007 UPTO 15 MARCH 2007)

For The Year 2006-2007 (Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2006-2007			
		As Proposed	Agreed to/BE	RE	Actual Exp. upto 15.3.2007
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	400.00	360.00	360.00	332.26
2.	Desert Development Programme	300.00	270.00	270.00	262.82
3.	I.W.D.P.	550.00	485.00	485.00	466.44
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)				
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	1250.00	1115.00	1115.00	1061.52
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	175.00	100.00	100.00	66.56
6.	SRA&ULR	90.00	49.00	49.0-0	25.97
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)	280.00	1.00	1.00	0
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	90.00	80.00	80.00	59.91
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	20.00	20.00	20.00	16
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	5.00	3.00	3.00	0.62
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation				
12.	Communication New Initiatives				
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana				
14.	Bio Fuels	200.00	50.00	50.00	0
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)				
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.				
	Total Plan	2110.00	1418.00	1418.00	1230.58
	Non-Plan				
	Secretariat Economic Services		3.70	3.66	3.56
	Total Plan & Non Plan	2110.00	1421.70	1421.66	1234.14

APPENDIX VII (G)

STATEMENT SHOWING PROPOSED AND AGREED
TO BE FOR THE YEAR 2007-2008

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2007-08	
		As Proposed	Agreed to B/E
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	775.00	0.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	425.00	0.00
3.	I.W.D.P.	800.00	0.00
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)		1114.54
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	2000.00	1114.54
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	}	The provisions for these schemes indicated against the scheme (NPCLRM)
6.	SRA&ULR		
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)		
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	86.46	86.46
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	21.00	—
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	5.50	5.00
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	—	—
12.	Communication	—	—
	New Initiatives	—	—
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	—	—
14.	Bio Fuels	250.00	50.00
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)	477.50	145.00
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.	—	99.00
	Total Plan	2840.46	1500.00
	Non-Plan		
	Secretariat Economic Services	3.90	3.78
	Total Plan & Non Plan	2844.36	1503.78

APPENDIX VII (H)

STATEMENT SHOWING PROPOSED OUTLAY FOR THE
ACTIVITIES/SCHEMES/PROGRAMMES FOR ELEVENTH PLAN

For the Year 2007-2012		(Rs. in crore)
Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	2007-2012
		As Proposed by DoLR
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	4,280.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	2,140.00
3.	I.W.D.P.	5,280.00
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)	—
	TOTAL WATERSHED PROGRAMME	11,700.00
5.	Computerisation of Land Records	} The provisions for these schemes indicated against the scheme (NPCLRM)
6.	SRA&ULR	
7.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)	
8.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	176.34
9.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	110.00
10.	Investment Promotional Scheme	16.50
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	—
12.	Communication	—
	New Initiatives	
13.	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	—
14.	Bio Fuels	1,304.00
15.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)	3,104.00
16.	Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.	—
17.	Implementation of Monitoring of National Rehabilitation Policy	10.00
	Total Plan	16,420.84

APPENDIX VIII

**PROGRAMME & STATE-WISE UNSPENT BALANCE
OF FUNDS AS ON 31.12.2006**

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of State/UT	DPAP	DDP	IWDP	CLR	SRA& ULR	Total ULR
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	33.65	9.18	29.87	12.12	1.53	86.35
2.	Arunachal Pradesh			1.51	0.02	0.23	1.76
3.	Assam			1.32	6.66	2.47	10.45
4.	Bihar	14.48		19.85	6.58	2.62	43.53
5.	Chhattisgarh	6.14		11.65	3.24	1.03	22.06
6.	Gujarat	36.12	85.23	31.79	7.20	1.64	161.98
7.	Goa			0.56	0.35	4.47	5.38
8.	Haryana		22.89	6.71	8.61	0.22	38.43
9.	Himachal Pradesh	8.95	23.18	26.32	4.03	2.00	64.48
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	14.07	2.09	8.65	0.21	2.91	27.93
11.	Jharkhand			4.43	1.02	2.50	7.95
12.	Karnataka	14.65	29.03	8.61	8.60	2.10	62.99
13.	Kerala				3.07	0.40	3.47
14.	Madhya Pradesh	53.82		17.88	9.61	3.20	84.51
15.	Maharashtra	56.75		17.46	1.21	4.23	79.65
16.	Manipur				1.28	0.60	1.88
17.	Meghalaya			1.26		0.00	1.26
18.	Mizoram			4.54	1.27	0.00	5.81
19.	Nagaland			3.16	0.86	3.83	7.85

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20.	Orissa			29.51	9.48	1.04	40.03
21.	Punjab			1.78	2.06	4.50	8.34
22.	Rajasthan	11.76	134.48	29.81	13.62	6.62	196.29
23.	Sikkim			5.75	0.27	0.83	6.85
24.	Tamil Nadu	14.07		23.04	18.98	3.16	59.25
25.	Tripura			3.31	0.62	1.04	4.97
26.	Uttar Pradesh	39.69		28.48	17.31	4.72	90.20
27.	Uttaranchal	9.12		14.01	15.40	1.70	40.23
28.	West Bengal	7.94		10.60	12.94	7.73	39.21
29.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands					0.15	0.15
30.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli				0.12	0.50	0.62
31.	Delhi				0.97	0.18	1.15
32.	Pondicherry				0.88	0.50	1.38
33.	Chandigarh				0.15	0.06	0.21
34.	Daman & Diu				0.25	0.00	0.25
35.	Lakshadweep					0.05	0.05
	Total	321.21	306.08	341.86	168.99	68.76	1206.90

APPENDIX X

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 29 MARCH, 2007

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hannan Mollah—*in the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri Zora Singh Mann
4. Shri D. Narbula
5. Shri A.F.G. Osmani
5. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
7. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
8. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
9. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Balihari
11. Shri Jayantilal Barot
12. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
13. Shri Payarelal Khandelwal
14. Dr. Chandan Mitra
15. Shri P.R. Rajan
16. Shri Bhagwati Singh
17. Ms. Sushila Tiriya

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Deputy Secretary Grade II*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

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

1. Dr. Subas Pani, Secretary (LR)
2. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, AS&FA
3. Shri Bhaskar Chatterjee, AS (LR)
4. Shri D.P. Roy, JS (LR)

2. In the absence of Hon'ble Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Hannan Mollah, MP 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 convened to take oral evidence of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2007-2008).

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

4. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources and drew their attention to the provisions of Direction 55(1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

5. The Committee thereafter took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources on Demands for Grants (2007-2008). The Committee during the course of oral evidence deliberated at length the issues related to the proposed amendments to Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the proposed legislation on rehabilitation. In the context of widely debated issues of acquiring land for setting up economic zones, industries and related activities and urbanization, the Secretary apprised the Committee about the stand of the Government on the various issues related to ensuring the interest of the persons whose land is acquired for the aforesaid purposes. The Committee also deliberated at length on the need of devising a land use policy by the Government.

6. The Committee thereafter discussed issues related to the Centrally Sponsored Schemes of Watershed Management with specific reference to Demands for Grants (2007-08). The issues discussed in detail included extent of wastelands in the country, confusing data about the targets and achievements and provision made for Tenth/Eleventh Plan for development of wastelands required for the purpose, merger of Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Desert

Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) into a comprehensive programme 'Integrated Watershed Management Programme' and setting up of National Rainfed Area Authority in order to achieve the convergence of programmes of wastelands development being run by different Ministries/Departments of the Government of India.

7. The Committee thereafter discussed the various issues related to the land records with specific reference to the Centrally Sponsored Schemes. The issues dealt with in detail included merger of the Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) and Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) into a comprehensive programme 'National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)'. The Committee also discussed in detail the position of Land Records in North-Eastern States and the peculiar problems of these States with specific reference to maintenance and updating of land records. The Committee also discussed the various issues related to the proposed programme of the Department 'Bio-fuel'.

8. During the deliberations valuable suggestions emerged on the various issues as made above. The representatives of the Department clarified the queries of the Members.

The Committee then adjourned.

A verbatim record of the proceeding was kept.

APPENDIX XI

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 12 APRIL, 2007

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo—*in the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri Zora Singh Mann
4. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri D. Narbula
7. Shri A.F.G. Osmani
8. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
9. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
10. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
11. Shri Sita Ram Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

Rajya Sabha

14. Shri Balihari
15. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
16. Shri Payarelal Khandelwal
17. Dr. Chandan Mitra
18. Shri P.R. Rajan
19. Shri Bhagwati Singh
20. Ms. Sushila Tiriya

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Deputy Secretary Grade II*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

2. In the absence of Hon'ble Chairman, the Committee chose Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo, MP 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 (2007-08) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

4. The Committee adopted the said draft Report on Demands for Grants (2007-08) with certain modifications as indicated in the *Annexure*.

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

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 4 of the Minutes dated 12.4.2007)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4
1.	17	3.32	<p><i>Add after para 3.31:</i></p> <p>“The Committee further note that in various States, there is a peculiar problem of people occupying land and using it for several years but not having the proper title. As dealt in detail in the preceding part of the report, the Secretary has assured that the proposed amendments to the Land Acquisition Act and the proposed Rehabilitation Legislation would address to the issue of providing due compensation to these categories of land holders. The Committee note that land acquisition is not the only area where these people are at a disadvantageous position, but otherwise also they are debarred from various facilities like availing of loan under different Central/State Schemes or for housing etc. There is an urgent need to address to this issue by bringing various reforms in land laws of various State Governments. The Union Government can play a role of facilitator by guiding these States through various guidelines to bring such reforms. The Committee recommend to the Department to take action in view of the aforesaid observation of the Committee.”</p>
2.	41	4.59	<p><i>Add after ground level.</i></p> <p>“The Committee express strong exception at the information not being furnished in</p>

1	2	3	4
			the Outcome Budget of the Department, inspite of the insistence by the Committee in the respective Reports.”
3.	42	4.59	<p><i>Add</i> At the end:</p> <p>“Besides the Department should categorically inform the Committee the reasons for huge under-spending under the three major schemes DDP, DPAP and IWDP and take corrective action to ensure that the allocation made under different programmes is meaningfully utilized. The Committee may also be kept apprised about this.”</p>
4.	47	4.77	<p><i>Add</i> after para 4.76</p> <p>“The Committee note that under the ambitious programme ‘National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, most of the permissible activities relate to land development. As indicated in the earlier part of the report, Parthasarthy Committee while projecting the annual allocation of the Department has suggested that out of the annual requirement of Rs. 10,000 crore, Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS. In this context, the Committee find that perhaps there is an urgent need to consider allowing development of wastelands as an activity under NREGS. This would further ensure sufficient works under the Guarantee Legislation to provide minimum 100 days of employment to each family who demand work as per the provisions made under the Act. The Department of Land Resources in this regard should discuss this matter with the sister Department of Rural Development and the outcome arrived at should be indicated to the Committee.</p>

1	2	3	4
5.	60	5.27	<p data-bbox="699 450 900 483"><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p data-bbox="699 510 1228 853">“The Committee further observe that there is an urgent need to assure the people in North-East that the aforesaid Schemes are meant for the upkeep and maintenance of existing land records and in no way proposed to change the age old traditions and customs. Such an assurance is altogether required keeping in view the peculiar position of land records in North-East.”</p>

APPENDIX XII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl. No.	Para	Recommendation/Observations
1	2	3
1.	3.15	<p>Land is one of the biggest resources for any country. With the enormous expansion of the State's role in promoting public welfare and economic development since Independence, acquisition of land for public purposes has become far more important than ever before. Further, with the changing scenario of industrialization, liberalization, urbanization and new economic policy there is an immense pressure on land. Now-a-days, land is being acquired for setting up Special Economic Zones (SEZs) so as to generate employment through industries and related activities. With the increased activity of land acquisition for public purposes as well as for setting up industries, the issues related to land acquisition and rehabilitation of the affected persons whose land is being acquired have been the matter of debate recently.</p> <p>The Committee note that land and its management falls under the State List. However, the Union Government has played a crucial role in the advisory capacity as well as a facilitator since Independence. In this scenario, the responsibility of the Department of Land Resources, being the nodal Union Department, to deal with the issues related to land is immense. On the one hand, there is a need to bring amendments to the old and outdated laws related to land acquisition to protect the interests of the persons whose land is being acquired, on the other hand, there is a need to</p>

ensure that there is no reduction in total agricultural land which may further aggravate the demand and supply mis-match of agricultural products. On both the accounts, the Department of Land Resources has the key responsibility. On the issue of bringing amendments to the old and outdated Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and rehabilitation policy, the Committee have persistently been recommending in the respective reports to expedite the same.

As regards the status of the amendments to Land Acquisition Act and rehabilitation policy, the Committee have been informed that the new rehabilitation policy has been drafted and is in the public domain at the websites of the Department of Land Resources and Ministry of Rural Development. The Ministry of Law and Justice has been requested to draft the amendments to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 on the lines of the new rehabilitation policy. The Committee also find that it is proposed to give the rehabilitation policy a statutory backing. As such, two separate legislations on the Land Acquisition and rehabilitation are proposed to be drafted and placed before the Parliament. As regards the major changes proposed in the revised Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation Legislations, the Secretary has informed that in the revised legislations, attempt is being made to protect the interests of the following three categories of persons:—

- (a) people whose land is being acquired directly;
- (b) people who are utilizing the land, they may not have title; and
- (c) labourers who derive livelihood from land though they may not have interest directly in the land either as owners or encroachers.

Further, the Secretary has also informed that the issue of giving land for land is being addressed in the aforesaid proposed legislations. As regards the deadline for bringing the aforesaid legislations, the Secretary has informed that the Department would like to do it as early as possible. While noting the aforesaid contents of the proposed legislations on Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to expedite finalisation of the aforesaid legislations and if possible, bring the same before Parliament during the second part of the current Session of Parliament.

The Committee would also emphasize that there is an urgent need to balance the larger interests of the community for which the land is being acquired and the right of the individual whose land is being acquired thereby depriving him/her of means of livelihood. Besides, there is an urgent need to address the issue of acquisition of land for private enterprises. The acquisition of land for private enterprises cannot be at the same footing as the land acquired for various projects of public welfare. The Committee also note the stand of the Department according to which land should be acquired absolutely for the functional needs of a particular industry or a project and should not exceed the particular purpose so as to include quotas of builders etc. The Committee find that there are various issues in this regard which need to be addressed strongly in the legislations, the foremost of which is the policy of giving land for land. The Committee note that land besides being the source of livelihood for a person is also a symbol of social status in the society where a person lives. Besides, with the land various emotional issues are also attached. In this scenario, it is of utmost

importance to address all these concerns and compensate the persons whose land is acquired not only with land but with the land of the same quality.

Besides, another issue which needs to be addressed is that the projects for which land is being acquired should be constructed within a specified time period and not extended unduly to get more profits with the rising prices of land. There is a need to ensure that only the specific project for which land is acquired is constructed on the land and not used for other commercial purposes. The Committee would like the Department to address to the aforesaid concerns of the Committee in the proposed legislations on Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation.

3. 3.17 On the issue of bringing two legislations, one for the purpose of land acquisition and the other for rehabilitation, the Department has informed that the Law Ministry and Attorney General have strongly advised to have two separate legislations in this regard because the rehabilitation policy is going beyond land acquisition. The Committee feel that the issues of land acquisition and rehabilitation are inter-linked and as such need to be addressed in a single legislation. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the details of the interactions and deliberations held with the Law Ministry and Attorney General in this regard so as to understand the matter in detail and recommend further in this respect.
4. 3.18 The erstwhile Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development during Tenth Lok Sabha had examined various provisions made under Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and presented Eighth Report on 'Land Acquisition Act, 1894'

to Lok Sabha on 15 December, 1994. Thereafter, the Standing Committee on Rural Development pursued various issues related to land acquisition and rehabilitation of the persons whose land is being acquired, in their various Reports presented to Parliament. The Committee would like that their various observations/recommendations made in the respective reports should be taken into consideration while making amendments to Land Acquisition Act and bringing in a new law related to the issue of rehabilitation.

5. 3.19

As stated earlier, there is an urgent need to ensure that there is no reduction in total agricultural land in the country. In this regard, the Committee note the stand of the Department according to which industries, Special Economic Zones should be established preferably on wastelands. Degraded forest land could also be considered but with higher than the usual norms for compensatory afforestation or reforestation. To the extent agricultural land is used for industries etc., there should be compensatory development of wastelands for the sake of food security of the country. The Committee also note that the data with regard to the land acquired for Special Economic Zones so far is being collected by the Department from the concerned Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The Committee also note that legislative provisions restricting use of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes exist in most of the States. In this regard, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to study the laws in various States. Further the Committee note that land is a non-renewable resource and is finite. It cannot be further extended. In view of this, there is an urgent need to ensure a balanced use of land for different purposes *viz* agriculture, industries,

forestation, housing etc. While noting the stand of the Department that industries, SEZs should preferably be set up on wastelands/degraded forest land, the Committee recommend that the Government should permit acquisition of land cautiously keeping in view the limited land resources of the country. In this scenario, perhaps there is an urgent need to have a National Land use Policy which can guide the various State Governments in having laws with regard to the use of land for different purposes with the objective of balanced and harmonious use of land for different purposes. In this regard, the Committee also note that the Department has requested the Ministry of Agriculture to convene the meeting of the National Land Use and Conversion Board to discuss the issues related to acquisition of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes. The aforesaid concerns of the Committee should specifically be brought before all concerned. Besides, the concern of Committee to have a National Land use Policy should also be brought to the knowledge of the concerned Ministries/Departments. The Committee should also be kept apprised about the follow up of the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee.

6. 3.29 The Committee note that the Department monitors the data with regard to distribution of surplus land to landless labourers. Besides, the Department persuades the State Governments from time to time to conduct special drives for distribution of surplus land over and above the ceiling to the eligible rural poor. The Department has furnished various data indicating the progress in regard to – (a) distribution of surplus land, (b) distribution of Government wastelands (c) number of tenants conferred ownership rights (d) information of

alienation and restoration of tribal land. The analysis of the data indicates that out of area of 68,72,824 acres declared surplus 60,27,180 acres could be taken possession of and out of that 48,99,893 acres could be distributed to 54,01,232 beneficiaries, out of which 39 per cent of the beneficiaries are Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. As regards distribution of Government wastelands so far, 148.55 lakh acres could be distributed in various States. As regards number of tenants conferred ownership rights, 125.85 lakh could be given 167.157 lakh acres of land. As regards alienation and restoration of tribal land, out of 2,02,901 cases decided in favour of tribals, in 1,80,703 cases, the land was restored to tribals. The analysis of the data indicates that there is much difference between the area taken possession of and area distributed to individual beneficiaries and between the cases decided in favour of tribals and cases in which land was restored to tribals. The Committee would like the Department to further pursue the matter with the various State Governments so that maximum number of beneficiaries could be helped in this regard.

As regards the distribution of Government's wastelands to individual beneficiaries, the Committee feel that besides distributing land to individuals, there is an urgent need to provide the facilities and technical know-how to the beneficiaries so that the wastelands can be developed and can become the means of livelihood for the individual beneficiaries.

7. 3.30

The Committee would like to point out an interesting situation. Whereby on the one hand land is being acquired for setting up industries, Special Economic Zones and urbanization, on the other hand, the emphasis is being given to

distribute the land to landless persons. The Committee also feel that the agenda of distribution of land to the landless persons would have got a backseat due to the current priorities of acquisition of land for setting up industries etc. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the data with regard to distribution of land/wastelands year-wise so as to understand the aforesaid change of priorities and comment further in this regard.

8. 3.31 The Committee note from the statement given with regard to number of tenants conferred ownership rights and area accrued to them in various States that in Arunachal Pradesh tenancy laws are not enacted. The Committee note that in the rural areas at present there may not be trend of renting the property but with the changing scenario of economic development there may be pressure on renting property for housing and other things. There is an urgent need to foresee the changing realities and bring tenancy reforms in rural areas too. The Committee would like to have the detailed information about the tenancy laws in various States so as to enable them to analyze the position.
9. 3.32 The Committee further note that in various States, there is a peculiar problem of people occupying land and using it for several years but not having the proper title. As dealt in detail in the preceding part of the report, the Secretary has assured that the proposed amendments to the Land Acquisition Act and the proposed Rehabilitation Legislation would address to the issue of providing due compensation to these categories of land holders. The Committee note that land acquisition is not the only area where these people are at a disadvantageous position, but

otherwise also they are debarred from various facilities like availing of loan under different Central/State Schemes or for housing etc. There is an urgent need to address to this issue by bringing various reforms in land laws of various State Governments. The Union Government can play a role of facilitator by guiding these States through various guidelines to bring such reforms. The Committee recommend to the Department to take action in view of the aforesaid observation of the Committee.

10. 4.12 The Standing Committee have persistently been recommending in their respective reports since the year 1998-1999 to bring all the activities related to wastelands being undertaken by different Ministries of Union Government under one umbrella. Pursuant to the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee, the Ministry of Rural Development initially transferred DDP, DPAP and watershed component of erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources to bring convergence of the activities related to watershed schemes in their own Ministry. The Committee continued pursuing the issue of bringing the watershed activities of the different Ministries under one umbrella and the Government have now finally agreed to the recommendation of the Committee and the National Rainfed Area Authority has been constituted under the Ministry of Agriculture with the initial allocation of Rs. 100 crore for the year 2007-08. With regard to the composition of the aforesaid authority, the Committee note that the authority has a two-tier structure consisting of a Governing Board and an Executive Committee. The Minister of Agriculture is the Chairman of Governing

Board and Ministers of Rural Development, Water Resources and Environment & Forests are Members of the Board. Further the Secretaries of various Ministries are also members of the aforesaid Board. As regards the Executive Committee, on the top is Chief Executive Officer, National Rainfed Area Authority. Besides, five eminent experts in the field of Water Management, Agriculture/ Horticulture, Animal Husbandry & Fisheries, Forestry and Watershed Development are also in the Executive Committee. One representative each from various concerned Ministries are also in the Executive Committee. Besides, Advisor, Agriculture, Planning Commission, Director (CAZRI), Director (CRIDA) and Subject matter Specialists are also in the Executive Committee. The Committee also note from the information furnished by the Department of Land Resources that with the implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme under which bulk of the works under watershed development would be undertaken, the Ministry of Rural Development is the largest implementing agency of the watershed programme. The Committee appreciate the convergence of activities related to watershed development under one Central Authority *i.e.* National Rainfed Area Authority and hope that tangible results would be seen in the coming years. The Committee feel that the said Authority should best have been located under the Ministry of Rural Development being the largest implementing agency of the watershed activities. The Committee would like to know from the Department of Land Resources the initiatives taken in this regard so as to analyze the position and comment further.

11. 4.13 Besides the convergence of the activities related to watershed development at the Union

Government level, the Committee have been recommending convergence of watershed activities at the State level as well as at the ground level. The Secretary during the course of evidence has acknowledged the need for some Centralized agency at the State level. The Secretary has further emphasized on the need for Centralized agency at the State level by giving a typical example of the number of cases which have to be dealt with at the National level. He has stated that at present 500 hectare proposals are coming to the Ministry at the National level and as such 45,000 live files are there with the Department of Land Resources. Once the State level organization is established, the power to look into the various projects can be delegated. The Central level agency will develop a small programme for a block or a mini watershed kind of programme and bring it at the State level where the representatives of the Department of Land Resources can go and the projects can be sanctioned. On the PMGSY model the funds can be released to State level agency and State level agency can do the day-to-day management with district level interaction. The Committee feel that the aforesaid mechanism is on the lines suggested by the Committee in their respective reports and therefore, emphasize for an early decision in this regard. The Committee feel that with the Centralized agency in every State the national level authority can concentrate more on the policy issues as well as evaluating the different programmes which may eventually bring noticeable impact on the implementation of various schemes of watershed management. The Committee while endorsing the decision of the Department in this regard recommend for early constitution of State level agencies and some district level mechanism to coordinate the ground level activities.

1	2	3
12.	4.21	<p>The Committee find that even when the Atlas (2000) and updated Atlas (2005), is available with the Government which contains the Scientific data of wastelands in the country mapped in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), different data of wastelands/untreatable land are indicated in various documents of the Government. Untreatable land as per the Atlas is 12.65 million hectares, whereas the Department has indicated it as 12.12 million hectares at one place. The Committee fail to understand how the untreatable land can further increase or decrease. The Department may explain the position in this regard.</p>
13.	4.22	<p>As regards the projections for treating the wastelands, it is imperative to have the exact information about the task ahead so as to have proper planning. In this regard different data of wastelands are given in different documents. Whereas, the Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan has estimated requirement of Rs. 80,000 crore for treatment of 80 million hectares of wastelands, as per the Parthasarthy Committee Report the projections have been made based on the data of 125 million hectares of wastelands. Further, the updated Atlas indicates the area of wastelands as 55.27 million hectares. Further clarifying the position the Secretary informed the Committee that estimates of 125 million hectares include area of DDP and DPAP land. As regards the estimates of Approach Paper, the Department at one place has indicated that they are not aware of this data whereas at another place it has been stated that when the draft of Approach Paper came to the Department for comments, it was clarified that there may be an estimated 125 million hectare of degraded land in rainfed area including 80 million hectares of land under</p>

dryland farming. The Committee conclude from what has been stated above that perhaps there is no clarity of the exact area which is rainfed area under DDP and DPAP blocks as well as dryland farming in the country. As regards wastelands since the district-wise data is available as per the scientifically obtained data in updated Atlas, perhaps the data can be relied upon. However, there is too much confusion when the data of wastelands is combined with data of other degraded/rainfed land which need treatment. In this scenario the Committee would like the Department to clarify whether the separate district based data of rainfed/ degraded land other than the wastelands data of Atlas is available with the Government and whether the outlays required for degraded/ rainfed area are different from those for the wastelands.

14. 4.23

The Committee further note that whereas wastelands is spread all over the country, DDP/ DPAP blocks are area specific and identified in various States. DDP blocks have been identified in seven States/UTs and DPAP blocks have been identified in sixteen States/UTs whereas wastelands are there in almost every State. However, the extent of wastelands may vary from State to State. Besides, the DDP, DPAP blocks may vary with the passage of time. Such frequent change may not be there in wastelands. In this scenario perhaps, there is a need to set targets separately for wastelands/ other degraded areas. Otherwise there will be utter confusion. The Committee would like the clarification from the Department on the aforesaid observation so as to analyse the position further.

15. 4.24

As regards the claim of the Department that 8.6 million hectares of wastelands was covered as reported in the updated Atlas, the

Committee would like to be informed of the States where the extent of wastelands has considerably come down. Besides, as per the data indicated by the Department in Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Kerala, Mizoram, Nagaland, considerable part of the wastelands have been covered. The Committee would also like to be informed whether the achievements reflected in these States match with the position of wastelands coming down in the updated Atlas which contain district-wise data obtained through Satellite imagery so as to draw the meaningful conclusion about the progress of work with regard to development of wastelands in the country and to chalk out further strategy in this regard.

16. 4.25 The Committee further note that as per the planning made by the Department 5 million hectares was proposed to be covered during Ninth Plan, 15 million hectares during Tenth Plan and 20 million hectares during Eleventh Plan. Now the targets for Eleventh Plan have been revised to 25 million hectares. The Committee may like to be clarified whether the aforesaid targets include the targets fixed for rainfed/degraded land other than wastelands areas. The Committee further observe that the Department is drawing the conclusion/making strategy with regard to the achievement/development of the wastelands keeping in view the efforts being made by the Department of Land Resources. However, besides the Department of Land Resources, the other Departments *viz.* the Department of Rural Development under NREGA and SGRY, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Forest and Environment and the various State Governments are making substantial allocation and doing considerable work for the treatment of wastelands. With the setting up of the

National Rainfed Area Authority, there is an urgent need to study the impact of the schemes at the ground level. Perhaps, there is an urgent need to have district based planning. The achievements need to be reflected district-wise while noting the actual work done in each State. Such district-wise data should be merged to know the State plans which should ultimately lead to the National Plan. Such district based monitoring of the data should be an annual exercise so as to have the exact idea of the ground position. The Committee would like the Department to convey the concerns of the Committee in this regard to the National Rainfed Area Authority and do the national planning on the lines suggested by the Committee.

17.

4.30

The Committee note that the cost of development of wastelands at the rate of Rs. 6,000 per hectare was fixed way back during the year 2001. With the increase in costs, there is an urgent need to hike the existing cost of development and make projections accordingly. In this regard, the Committee find that the Department has made projections for Eleventh Plan at the rate of Rs. 12,000 per hectare. However, the Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan has indicated the estimated requirement of outlay on the basis of Rs. 10,000 per hectare. Besides, another noticeable fact is that the projections, of the Department are based on the Parthasarthy Committee Report. While noting the contents of the Parthasarthy Committee Report, the Committee find that Rs. 12,000 per hectare cost is a maximal figure. The Department has further clarified that the figure of Rs. 12,000 per hectare has been used in order to prepare a credible projection. As far as, the question of actual costing is concerned, it will be done on project to project basis.

In this regard the Committee would like to be informed about the existing practice indicating clearly whether the allocation is being made on project to project basis or at the existing rate *i.e.* Rs. 6,000 per hectare. Besides, the Committee may also be informed whether there is any noticeable cost difference between the development of wastelands and the rainfed area. The Committee feel that the major portion of the cost of wastelands/rainfed area goes towards the wages of labourers, since, these are labour intensive work. As such another fact which needs to be considered while fixing the cost of treatment of wastelands is the hike in the wages of labourers in different States.

The Committee would like all the aforesaid observations to be taken into consideration while arriving at the decision on revised per hectare cost norms.

18. 4.41

The Committee find that during each year of Tenth Plan, the Department has achieved almost 100 per cent physical as well as financial achievements as compared to the allocation made and the targets fixed under different schemes of wastelands development. Further during each year of the Tenth Plan, the Department has been allocated nearly the same amount as proposed to Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance. However, during the first year of Eleventh Plan, the Department has been provided a little over 50 per cent of the proposed outlay. Not only that, during each year of Tenth Plan, there has been some enhancement in outlay as compared to previous year, however, the outlay provided during first year of Eleventh Plan has been pegged at the outlay provided during the terminal year of Tenth Plan *i.e.* 2006-07. The Committee strongly recommend the Government to enhance the

1	2	3
19.	4.42	<p>allocation during the year 2007-08 specifically when the Department has achieved 100 percent physical and financial targets and the year 2007-08 is the first year of Eleventh Plan which will reflect the priorities of the Government during the Plan.</p> <p>As regards the strategy of the Department during Eleventh Plan, Rs. 11,700 crore has been proposed for Eleventh Plan. The proposed allocation during Eleventh Plan is more than double the projections made during Tenth Plan. Further the Parthasarthy Committee has projected the requirement of outlay of Rs. 1,50,000 crore to complete the target of wastelands development by the year 2020. The Parthasarthy Committee has projected the annual allocation of Rs. 10,000 crore. To meet this Rs. 10,000 crore, it has been proposed that the current outlay should be doubled and another Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS. Against the proposed allocation of Rs. 1,50,000 crore, Approach Paper to Eleventh Plan has estimated the requirement of Rs. 80,000 crore. Perhaps the difference between the projections made in the Approach Paper and Parthasarthy Committee report is due to the difference in per hectare cost of wastelands development. While Approach Paper has estimated Rs. 10,000 as the projected per hectare cost of development, the Parthasarthy Committee has projected Rs. 12,000 as the per hectare cost of development. Besides, the projections made in regard to the total work ahead in the Approach Paper and Parthasarthy Committee report also differ. The aforesaid issues have been dealt in detail in the preceding part of the report where the Committee has emphasised the need to resolve the aforesaid issues. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the development of wastelands/</p>

degraded land is the top most priority area of the Government as indicated in the President's Address to Parliament and as indicated in the Approach Paper. However, from the allocation made during 2007-08, it seems that adequate priority has not been given to this sector. The Committee also note that in the present scenario of mismatch between the demand and availability of foodgrains, it is extremely necessary to increase the area of agriculture in the country. Besides, with the pressure on land for industries etc., there is pressure on the Government to develop the area of wastelands. The aforesaid issues have been adequately addressed in the third chapter of the report. Here the Committee strongly recommend the Government to provide adequate outlay under the different schemes after the detailed planning to be made at the national level by the Centralized agency *viz.* National Rainfed Area Authority.

20.

4.59

The Committee have reviewed the physical and financial achievement during each year of the Tenth Plan in the preceding chapter of the report whereby it has been noted that Department has achieved almost 100 per cent physical and financial targets. While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous years, the Committee have noted that the position is not so favourable if the ground situation in this regard is analyzed. The various Budget documents of the Department indicate that the releases to the State Governments/ implementing agencies are considered as spending. Besides, the area covered by different projects is considered to be developed without analyzing the ground situation. There is no mechanism to analyze the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes due to long gestation period. The data

indicated with regard to unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 969.15 crore under the three major schemes—Desert Development Programme (DDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) further substantiates the aforesaid observation of the Committee. As many as 1764 projects under DPAP, 300 projects under DDP and 7 projects under IWDP have been foreclosed by now. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to indicate the position of unspent balances as well as foreclosure of projects in the various Budget documents so as to know the position with regard to real achievement at the ground level. The Committee express strong exception at the information is not being furnished in the Outcome Budget of the Department in spite of the insistence by the Committee in the respective Reports.

The Standing Committee on Rural Development while examining the Demands for Grants 2005-06 of the Department [refer Para 2.16 of Tenth Report (14th Lok Sabha)] had suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects under the aforesaid three major schemes at various stages of implementation. The recommendation of the Committee in this regard is reproduced below:

“The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to evolve some sort of mechanism for evaluating the performance of different projects. Some sort of grading indicating poor, satisfactory or very good may be indicated against the number of projects being undertaken in various States. Besides, another mechanism can be to have some system indicating the projects at First stage, Second

stage, Third stage etc. Such type of analysis would enable a critical evaluation of the projects. The Committee would like the Department to consider the said aspect and apprise the Committee accordingly.”

The Committee note with satisfaction from the written replies that the Department has agreed to adopt the monitoring system suggested by the Committee. To conclude, the Committee again emphasize the strict monitoring of the projects being undertaken under the major schemes related to wastelands through various systems of monitoring *viz.* monitoring of projects at various stages, grading of projects, monitoring through area officers schemes. Besides, another mechanism to evaluate the performance of the project is through Vigilance Committees. The Committee strongly recommend to strengthen the monitoring mechanism as suggested above. Besides, the Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation to indicate the data with regard to unspent balances and foreclosure of projects in the various Budget documents. The aforesaid data may also be made available on the website of Department to bring transparency as well as to put pressure on the implementing agencies to perform better in this regard. Besides, the data and outcome of the meetings of Vigilance Committees as well as the area officers’ schemes should also be given in the Budget documents. Besides the Department should categorically inform the Committee the reasons for huge under-spending under the three major schemes DDP, DPAP and IWDP and take corrective action to ensure that the allocation made under different programmes is meaningfully utilized. The Committee may also be kept apprised about this.

1	2	3
21.	4.63	<p>The Committee find that out of total geographical area of 2,62,179 sq. Kms. of North-Eastern States including Sikkim, 62,106.64 sq. kms. <i>i.e.</i> 23.69 per cent of the total area is wastelands. In the North-Eastern States, out of the three schemes DDP, DPAP and IWDP related to watershed development, only one scheme <i>i.e.</i> IWDP is being implemented since these States have no DPAP and DDP blocks. As regards the achievement made with regard to the various projects being implemented in these areas, so far 558 projects were taken up during Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Plans under IWDP covering 2.76 million hectares of land. Out of this 2.76 million hectares only 1,19,324 hectares <i>i.e.</i> around 4 per cent of the total land could actually be treated as per the information provided by the Department. Another noticeable fact is that the strategy for Eleventh Plan is being chalked out based on the data of coverage <i>i.e.</i> 2.76 million hectares and as such the Department is very optimistic to cover the remaining 2.50 million hectares during the Eleventh Plan thus leaving only 0.95 million hectares in North-Eastern States. Further Rs. 20.85 crore is lying unspent with various North-Eastern States. The Committee have dealt with in detail the issue of releases being considered as spending as well as coverage being treated as really developed by the Department in the preceding chapter of the report. Similar trends are noticeable in the case of North-Eastern States. The Committee disapprove the way the projections are being made without noting the ground situation. There is an urgent need to understand the ground situation with regard to the implementations of various projects so as to know the real impact of these programmes. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to review the policy of monitoring</p>

1	2	3
		as given in detail in earlier part of the report and give adequate emphasis on the development of wastelands in North Eastern States which have a sizeable area of wastelands.
22.	4.76	The Committee note that the existing area development programmes <i>viz.</i> IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been converged into a comprehensive scheme Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) <i>w.e.f.</i> 2007-08. The Committee hope that the revised scheme would look into the various aspects with regard to monitoring of programme at the ground level and the issue of convergence as raised by the Committee from time to time in the earlier reports and re-emphasised in the preceding chapters of the report.
23.	4.77	The Committee note that under the ambitious programme 'National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, most of the permissible activities relate to land development. As indicated in the earlier part of the report, Parthasarthy Committee while projecting the annual allocation of the Department has suggested that out of the annual requirement of Rs. 10,000 crore, Rs. 5,000 crore would be dovetailed from NREGS. In this context, the Committee find that perhaps there is an urgent need to consider allowing development of wastelands as an activity under NREGS. This would further ensure sufficient works under the Guarantee Legislation to provide minimum 100 days of employment to each family who demand work as per the provisions made under the Act. The Department of Land Resources in this regard should discuss this matter with the sister Department of Rural Development and the outcome arrived at should be indicated to the Committee.

1	2	3
24.	4.78	<p>The Committee note that although the new programme IWMP has been proposed to be implemented from the year 2007-08, the modalities of revised programme has so far not been finalized. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Ministry of Rural Development to have the detailed homework done before launching a new scheme or restructuring a programme. It is difficult to understand how the subsumed programme would be implemented in the absence of the detailed guidelines and pending the finalisation of the detailed modalities. The year 2007-08 has already commenced <i>w.e.f.</i> 1st April 2007 and the Committee fail to understand how the revised programme would be implemented in this year in the absence of the detailed modalities. In view of the aforesaid scenario the Committee strongly recommend expeditious finalization of the guidelines and the detailed modalities.</p>
25.	4.79	<p>The Committee note that DDP and DPAP are being implemented in the specified identified DDP and DPAP blocks in various States of the country. Although the Department has informed that the operational identity of different programmes would be maintained in the revised programme, the Committee would strongly recommend to provide adequate priority to the DDP and DPAP blocks in the revised programme.</p>
26.	4.80	<p>The Committee further find that as many as 28,500 projects under IWDP, DDP and DPAP are continuing at present. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to ensure that the issue of committed liabilities for these ongoing projects is handled carefully while switching on from the earlier programmes to the new programmes so as to</p>

1	2	3
		have meaningful utilization of the outlays spent on these projects.
27.	4.83	The Committee note that a laudable initiative has been taken by the Department to strengthen the professional support for the successful implementation of various area development programmes. The Secretary has informed the Committee about the dedicated team of professionals so as to provide the technical support for these programmes. In some of the States like Andhra Pradesh, Orissa there is a dedicated team of professionals at the State level. Besides, at the district level also some professional support is there. The Secretary has assured that the experience of having dedicated team at State and district levels would be replicated in all the districts where the size of the programme is reasonable. While appreciating the idea given by the Secretary in this regard, the Committee would like that it should be implemented expeditiously so as to ensure the successful implementation of various programmes.
28.	5.24	The Committee observe that the existing Centrally Sponsored Schemes relating to Land records viz. (i) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) and (ii) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) have been integrated into a comprehensive programme 'National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)' w.e.f. 2007-08. The new feature of the restructured programme consists of emphasis on computerisation of whatever land records are available with professional input at State as well as Central level and the time bound approach to complete the task on a mission mode within three years. The Committee appreciate the firm resolve of

the Department to computerize the existing maps and land records within a time bound period of three years and hope that the various shortcomings of the existing programmes which include the matching share to be provided by the State Governments, training etc. would be properly addressed in the restructured programme. The Committee would like that the observations/recommendations made by the Committee in various reports, year after year should be considered while finalizing the modalities of the programme. Besides, the Committee would like to emphasise that the modalities of the programme which include the outsourcing of certain activities should be finalised expeditiously. The guidelines of the programme should be framed at the earliest. The Committee may be kept apprised of the same.

29. 5.25 As regards the transition from the existing programme to the restructured programme, the Committee strongly recommend that the various issues related to the existing projects including committed liability and unspent balances should be taken care of very carefully by the Department and the Committee may be kept apprised of the modalities finalised in this regard.
30. 5.26 The Committee further observe that at present two schemes are being undertaken for land records *viz.* SRA&ULR to supplement the efforts made by the State Governments to monitor/update land records and the other for Computerisation of Land Records. Maintenance and updation of land records are inter-related issues and no purpose can be served by computerisation unless the land records are properly maintained. Thus the core data is the essential input for the success of the

computerisation programme. The Committee also agree that it is of utmost importance to save in whatever way the information of maps/land records as available with the Revenue Departments so as to ensure that these maps do not decay further. The restructured programme would be addressing the aforesaid system. The Committee while supporting the Department in this regard strongly recommend to the Government to provide adequate outlay so as to enable the Department to complete the task in the country within the envisaged time frame of three years.

31.

5.27

The Committee while supporting the Department on the issue of restructuring the programme find that another area of concern is having correct land records. The proposed restructured scheme of computerisation of land records on the basis of the existing records would only serve the purpose of saving the decaying maps/land records but the real purpose of land records can be achieved only when the land records are correct and reflect the true ground position in this regard. In this regard, the State Governments' efforts were being supplemented by the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records. The Secretary has informed that under the restructured programme, there is no proposal for taking up any survey. He has also stated that preparation of land records is basically the task of State Governments and the original work has to be done by the States. The Secretary has also observed that SRA & ULR has been reduced into a building programme *i.e.* strengthening of land revenue administration which is not the genuine priority of the programme. The Committee differ here from the observation of the Secretary and note that

very good work has been done under the programme by some of the States as admitted by the Department in the various documents. Goa, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have been stated to be the States which have completed RoR data entry work with the assistance provided under the programme. It has also been mentioned that Orissa and Andhra Pradesh have also done good work. In this scenario, the Committee express strong concern over discontinuing the programme meant for maintenance and updating of land records *i.e.* SRA & ULR. While agreeing that there may be some problems in the implementation of the programme in some of the States, the Committee feel that the same can be addressed through bringing reforms in the various modalities of the programme. Since some States could do very good work, other States can also be motivated to emulate the good performing States. Besides, the Committee observe that with the proposed restructured programme only the States who could do something to have very good land records can be benefited. Again the worst performing States would be at a disadvantageous situation since these States have land records in a form which will serve no purpose after computerization.

The Committee further observe that in North Eastern States, the position of land records is further worse. In this regard, it is pertinent to highlight the observation of the Committee while examining the Demands for Grants 2006-07 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 States even the cadastral survey has not been

done and so no land records exist. The Committee had been informed at that stage that under the existing schemes some of the North Eastern States have done some work like Arunachal Pradesh has some land records and Manipur has land records for five valley districts and these States have started data entry work. The State Government of Meghalaya has no proper land records and has been requested to carry out survey and settlement. State Governments of Mizoram and Nagaland have already started survey and settlement with the financial support from Government of India under the scheme of SRA&ULR. The Committee find that the restructured scheme of Computerization of Land Records would be of no help to North Eastern States because these States have no land records. Some initiatives were being undertaken by these States under the existing SRA&ULR Scheme and with the closure of that support, there is no hope of having proper land records in these States. In view of the aforesaid observation, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to continue SRA & ULR. However, the shortcomings of the existing scheme can be addressed by restructuring some of its components.

Keeping in view the existing position of land records in North Eastern States, the Committee strongly recommend as under:—

- (i) Detailed survey of the land resources including watershed areas, catchment areas, drainage, forest areas, arable land areas etc. of each village through satellite and remote sensing devices should be carried out;
- (ii) Nodal authorities at the State and District level for coordinated functioning among

the Departments engaged for the upliftment of rural economy through the use of land and its resources should be set up;

- (iii) The Expert Committee on land management of the hill areas at the State and District level should be set up;
- (iv) The recommendations of the Expert Committee should be mandatorily followed by all the Departments.
- (v) The detailed survey of District and Sub-Divisional Headquarter areas for maintaining land records of Government office plots, individual plots, public land etc. should be carried out.

The Committee further observe that there is an urgent need to assure the people in North-East that the aforesaid Schemes are meant for the upkeep and maintenance of existing land records and in no way proposed to change the age old traditions and customs. Such an assurance is altogether required keeping in view the peculiar position of land records in North-East.

32.

5.28

The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year had been informed that some of the States *viz.* Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have amended the necessary revenue rules/regulations to stop issue of manual copies of Record of Rights (RoR) and to provide legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR. The Committee had recommended to persuade the remaining States through various seminars, conferences to amend the revenue rules/regulations so that the computerized system of land records may be given legal sanctity. The Committee feel that the real purpose of the

computerization of land records can be achieved only when the legal sanctity to computerized copies of RoR is provided by the various State Governments. While reiterating the earlier recommendation of the Committee, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to pursue further with the remaining State Governments to amend the revenue rules/regulations to provide legal sanctity to computerized RoRs.

33. 5.29 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year was also informed that some thinking was being given to link the data of land records with the computers of the lending bankers so that the bankers can access the land records directly without any charge. The Committee feel that such a move can not only reduce the transaction cost but also would be a great relief to the poor persons whose applications are rejected by the Banks due to non-availability of proper copy of land records. Besides, the loan can easily be made available under various schemes of the Government as well as State Governments relating to housing, agriculture self-help groups etc. The Committee strongly recommend to the Department to evolve some modalities whereby the aforesaid proposed initiative can be transformed into reality.
34. 6.3 The Committee note that a new initiative *viz.* development of Bio-fuel has been undertaken by the Government with the ultimate objective of producing bio-diesel to be blended with diesel to the extent of 20 per cent. To achieve this objective under the first phase *i.e.* demonstration phase , it is proposed to take up over a period of five years plantation of *jatropha* and *pongamia* in five lakh hectares. The basic emphasis in the demonstration phase

is on the development of quality seed material for wide scale plantation through convergence of R&D efforts. The Committee also note that different Ministries/Departments/agencies are involved in the R&D efforts and the Department of Land Resources has been given the responsibility to coordinate these efforts in the demonstration phase. The Committee recommend that the efforts of the Department in this regard should be intensified with a view to achieve the desired objectives. The Committee further note that out of Rs. 50 crore allocated during the year 2005-06, Rs. 49 crore were actually utilized. The Committee note from the various documents and have been informed during the course of oral evidence that the aforesaid project has not been cleared by the Group of Ministers. The Committee would like to know how the expenditure to the tune of Rs. 49 crore was done even when the programme has not been finalized so far. The Committee would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard.
