

THIRTY-SIXTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2007-2008)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2008-2009)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 17.4.2008

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 21.4.2008



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2008/Chaitra, 1930 (Saka)

36

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2007-2008)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2008-2009)**

THIRTY-SIXTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(v)
ABBREVIATIONS	(vii)
INTRODUCTION	(ix)
REPORT	
CHAPTER I Introductory	1
CHAPTER II Status of implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in Twenty-Seventh Report under direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha	4
CHAPTER III General Analysis:	
A. Five Year Plans	6
(i) Allocations <i>vis-a-vis</i> utilisation during Tenth Plan (2002-07)	6
(ii) Annual Plan Outlays for 2007-08 and 2008-09	7
(iii) Proposed and Agreed outlay during Eleventh Plan (2007-12).....	9
B. Common Guidelines for Watershed Projects— need for setting up expeditious mechanism for generation of water shed projects	11
C. Need for effective online monitoring of Watershed Projects.....	17
(i) Progress made for the online monitoring of Monthly Progress Reports (MRPs) by States	18
(ii) Progress made for online monitoring of Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) by States	18
	(i)

	PAGE(S)
D. Need for Land Use Policy and issues related to SEZ Policy	20
E. Expeditious action on the National Mission on Bio-diesel	22
Scheme-wise-Analysis:	
A. Review of three Area Development Programmes.....	24
(a) Review of Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP).....	25
(b) Review of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP).....	26
(c) Utilisation certificates Outstanding under three Area Development Programmes.....	28
(d) Need for increasing per hectare cost norm for watershed development projects	30
(e) Review of IWMP in North-Eastern Region and need for special attention for watershed projects in North-Eastern States.....	31
B. Finalisation of National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) and review of Computerisation of Land Record (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Record Scheme (SRA&ULR).....	32

APPENDICES

I. Statement showing summary of Demands for Grants of the Department of Land Resources for the year 2007-2008 and 2008-2009	38
II. The status of States sending manual/online Monthly Progress Report (MPR)	40
III. State-wise pending Utilisation Certificates under IWDP as on 31.1.2008 and 20.3.2008	42

	PAGE(S)
IV. State-wise pending Utilisation Certificates under DPAP as on 31.1.2008 and 20.3.2008	43
V. State-wise pending Utilisation Certificates under DDP as on 31.1.2008 and 20.3.2008	44
VI. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 26.3.2008	45
VII Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 10.4.2008	48
VIII Statement of Recommendations/Observations	53

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2007-2008)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Shri George Fernandes
6. Shrimati Kiran Maheshwari*
7. Shri Zora Singh Mann
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri D. Narbula
10. Shri A. F. G. Osmani
11. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
12. Shrimati Tejaswini Gowda
13. Shri Neeraj Shekhar[§]
14. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
15. Shri Sita Ram Singh
16. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
17. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
18. Shri Tarit Baran Topdar[#]
19. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
20. Shri Beni Prasad Verma
21. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

Rajya Sabha

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

SECRETARIAT

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

*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shrimati Kiran Maheshwari, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Water Resources to Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 30 August, 2007, *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II, Para No. 4022 dated August 30, 2007.

@Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha nominated Shrimati Kanimozhi, MP, (RS) to Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 15 September, 2007 *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II, Para No. 4096 dated 19 September, 2007.

#Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of. Shri Tarit Baran Topdar, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Energy to Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 12 December, 2007 as intimated *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II, Para No. 4366 dated 12 December, 2007.

§Hon'ble Speaker has nominated Shri Neeraj Shekhar, MP, Lok Sabha to the Standing Committee on Rural Development *w.e.f.* 10 March, 2008. Consequent upon vacancy caused by resignation given by Shri T. Madhusudan Reddy, M.P. (LS) from the membership of Lok Sabha *w.e.f.* 4 March, 2008.

**Ceased to be member of the Standing Committee on Rural Development consequent upon the retirement from the membership of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 9 April, 2008.

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
NLRMP	—	National Land Records Modernisation Programme
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 (2007-2008) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Thirty-sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2008-2009) 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 26 March, 2008.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 10 April, 2008.

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;
16 April, 2008

27 Chaitra, 1930 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

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.

1.3 The functions assigned to the Department of Land Resources as per the Allocation of Business Rules are as under:

- (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 Areas 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 In order to carry out its 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).
- (vii) Promotion of Bio-diesel

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), the guidelines of which have been finalised and it will become operational *w.e.f.* 1 April, 2008. 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 decided to be merged into a new programme of National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP), which is likely to be finalised and made operational at the earliest. Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET) has further been reformed and restructured as part of 'Professional Support'. The aforesaid restructured programmes are to be implemented from the year 2008-2009.

1.6 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for the year 2008-2009 are Rs. 2,403.90 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.7 The Demands for Grants of the Department were presented to Lok Sabha under Demand No. 81.

1.8 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in Lok Sabha on 14 March, 2008.

1.9 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the overall analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demands for Grants (2008-2009).

CHAPTER II

STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE IN THEIR TWENTY-SEVENTH 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 the recommendations contained in the Reports of the Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry. The Committee had presented the Twenty-seventh Report on Demands for Grants (2007-08) of the Department of Land Resources on 14 May, 2007. In view of the aforesaid direction, the statement of the Minister had become due in November 2007. After several reminders to the Ministry, the Minister of Rural Development had made a statement under direction 73A in respect of the status of implementation of the recommendations contained in Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee in Lok Sabha on 14 March, 2008.

2.2 The details of the Minister's statement under direction 73A on various reports of the Committee pertaining to the Department of Land Resources are given below:

Report No.	Subject	Date of Presentation of Report in Parliament	Due Date for submission of Minister's statement under direction 73A	Date of Minister's statement
2nd	Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	18 August 2004	17 February 2005	12 May, 2006
10th	Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	20 April 2005	19 October 2005	12 May, 2006
19th	Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	18 May 2006	17 November 2006	09 March 2007
27th	Demands for Grants (2007-2008) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)	14 May 2007	13 November 2007	14 March 2008

2.3 When asked about the reasons for the delay in making the Statement on the status of implementation of the recommendations contained in the Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee, the Department have informed that the recommendations pertain mainly to amendment to Land Acquisition Act, Rehabilitation & Resettlement Policy, implementation of new schemes of Watershed Development, Computerisation/Update of Land Records and launching of Bio-Fuel scheme during the 11th Plan.

2.4 After collection of information/reports from the various Departments/State Governments and compilation, Action Taken Replies on Demands for Grants (2007-2008) could be submitted in the last week of August, 2007 and since then this Department was taking necessary action to make the statement in the Parliament. The National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy, 2007 was notified on 31 October, 2007. The National Rehabilitations and Resettlement Policy, 2007 and Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 2007 were introduced in Lok Sabha on 6th December, 2007. As for new schemes for watershed development "Common Guidelines for Watershed Development" got approved by the National Rainfed Area Authority on 11 February, 2008. In the process the statement could not be made in the last Winter Session of the Parliament. However, the statement has been made in both Houses of Parliament in the first part of the Budget Session – on 14 March, 2008 in Lok Sabha and on 19 March, 2008 in Rajya Sabha.

2.5 The Committee note that direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha is not being followed in the right spirit. This is evident from the considerable delay in making the statement by the Minister on various reports of the Committee. As per the direction, the Minister should make the statement within six months of presentation of the Report to Parliament, which has not been done. The statements have been made after 10 to 21 months of the presentation of the concerned Reports. The Committee desire that, in future, the statement under direction 73A should be made within the prescribed time limit.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL ANALYSIS

The Demands for Grants (2008-2009) laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 14 March, 2008 make a provision of Rs.2403.90 crore with a Plan Component of Rs.2400 crore and Non-Plan Component of Rs.3.90 crore. The outlay allocated during the year 2008-09 *i.e.* Rs.2403.90 crore is Rs.1000.04 crore higher if compared to RE and Rs.900.12 crore higher if compared to BE of the previous year. The scheme-wise provisions are as follows:—

S.No.	Name of the Programme/Scheme	Allocation (Rs. in crore)
(i)	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) including Professional Support	1692.50
(ii)	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resource Management (NPCLRM)	425.50
(iii)	Bio-fuel	45.00
(iv)	Lumpsum Provision for North East Region and Sikkim	235.00
(v)	Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy & other Schemes	2.00
(vi)	Professional Support	Outlay included in IWMP
	Total	2400.00

The details of the Outlay have been given in *Appendix-I*.

A. Five Year Plans

(i) Allocation *vis-a-vis* utilization during Tenth Plan (2002-2007)

3.2 The following are the proposed outlay, agreed outlay, actual expenditure and shortfall during the Tenth Plan relating to the Department of Land Resources:

Outlays		(Rupees)	
Proposed	Agreed	Actual Expenditure	Shortfall
Rs. 5965 crore	Rs. 6526 crore	Rs.5509 crore (As on 15.03.2007)	Rs.1017 crore

3.3 When asked about the reasons for a shortfall of Rs.1017 crore during the Tenth Plan period, the Department have informed that during the Tenth Plan period, out of the agreed outlay of Rs.6,526 crore an outlay of Rs.1,000 crore was kept for new initiatives. This provision could not be utilised. As against the balance of Rs.5,526.00 crore, there is utilisation of Rs.5,509 crore as on 15 March 2007. Further by 31 March 2007, the expenditure has been to the tune of Rs.5686.25 crore.

(ii) Annual Plan Outlays for 2007-08 and 2008-09

3.4 The following are the Budget Outlay, Revised Outlay and Releases during 2007-08 and Budget Outlay for 2008-09:

(Rs. in crore)				
Annual Plan	Proposed	Budget	Revised	Actual (Releases)
2007-08 (First year of the Eleventh Plan)	2840.46	1500	1400	1094.31 (as on 31.1.08) 1337.69 (as on 15.03.2008)
2008-09 (Second year of the Eleventh Plan)	3622.50	2400	—	

3.5 When asked about the reasons for reduction of Rs.100 crore at R.E. level during the year 2007-08, the Department have informed that it was due to slow expenditure made on the scheme of 'Professional Support' and the low absorption capacity of States as compared to the allocation under 'Externally Aided Projects'. The outlay under these two schemes was reduced by Rs. 61 crore and Rs. 35 crore respectively totaling to Rs. 96 crore. Further, the reduction of Rs. 4 crore was for the other schemes.

3.6 The Committee further pointed out that as on 31 January, 2008 there has been a shortfall of Rs.305.69 crore between RE and the actual releases during the year 2007-08. The Department have informed that as against R.E. of Rs.1400 crore upto 15 March, 2008, Rs. 1337.69 crore have been released representing 95.55 per cent of R.E. Further, a proposal for re-appropriation of Rs.50 crore from Bio-fuel to IWMP is pending approval. The Department are hopeful of releasing entire amount of Rs.1400 crore during the year 2007-08 by 31 March, 2008.

3.7 During the year 2008-09 an outlay of Rs. 2400 crore has been proposed. As regards the strategy of the Department to utilise allocation, the Committee have been informed that as it has revamped the monitoring mechanism to keep a close watch on the physical and financial achievements during the year 2008-09, quarterly targets will be fixed for ensuring regular flow of funds in different schemes. In addition, zonal performance review meetings with the State Governments have been scheduled from the month of May, 2008. Issues like Information, Education & Communication (IEC), Capacity Building, online monitoring, pending UCs, unspent balances, completion of projects and progress of works etc. shall be reviewed for taking necessary corrective measures in time.

3.8 The Committee find that the Department have been allocated Rs. 6,526 crore as against the proposed allocation of Rs. 5,965 crore during the Tenth Plan. Out of the allocated amount of Rs. 6,526 crore, the actual expenditure as on 31 March, 2007 was Rs. 5,526 crore, thus the underspending was to the tune of Rs. 1000 crore. The Committee further find that the main reason for not utilizing the allocated amount during the Tenth Plan was on account of no new initiative having been taken during the Tenth Plan, for which Rs. 1,000 crore were exclusively earmarked. The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made. Even when no specific scheme was proposed, a substantial outlay of Rs. 1,000 crore was earmarked at the start of the Tenth Plan. No new scheme could be taken during the whole period of five years resulting in shortfall in expenditure of Rs. 1,000 crore. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending for proper planning, particularly, with regard to launching of new schemes. All the preparatory works should be undertaken before the specific outlay for a scheme is earmarked. There is entirely no justification for allocating substantial amount for vague initiatives for which there are no concrete proposals. The Committee would like the Department to convey the concerns of the Committee to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in this regard.

3.9 The Committee note that during the year 2007-08 *i.e.* the first year of the Eleventh Plan, the Department had proposed allocation of Rs. 2840.46 crore, out of which Rs. 1500 crore were allocated at Budget Estimates stage. The allocation was further reduced at RE stage by Rs. 100 crore, thus Rs. 1400 crore were actually allocated during the aforesaid year. The actual releases as on 15 March 2008 are over Rs. 1337.69 crore, thus resulting into underspending of Rs. 62.31 crore. Further during the year 2008-09, out of the proposed

allocation of Rs. 3622.50 crore, the outlay earmarked was Rs. 2400 crore. The Committee note from the aforesaid position that the Department have not been able to utilise even the reduced allocation during the year 2007-08. The main underspending has been stated to be under 'Professional Support', due to its being a new scheme and 'Externally Aided Projects' due to the low absorption capacity of the State Government. The Committee hope that during the year 2008-09, there would be cent per cent utilisation of outlay under the scheme 'Professional Support'. As regards 'Externally Aided Projects', the Committee would like to be apprised what the Department mean by the absorption capacity of the State Governments. The Committee would also like that all the corrective actions should be taken so as to achieve the indicated objectives under the aforesaid scheme/proposal.

3.10 The detailed analysis scheme-wise has been done in the subsequent paras of the Report. Here the Committee conclude from the analysis of the data given by the Department during the first two years of Eleventh Plan that the Department are not getting adequate allocation. Further the Committee also observe that to get the allocation as estimated and proposed, the Department have to strive hard to ensure cent per cent utilisation under different schemes along with achieving the physical targets.

(iii) Proposed and Agreed Outlay during the Eleventh Plan

3.11 The proposed and agreed outlay of the Department during the Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) are Rs. 25,835.67 crore and Rs. 17,205.48 crore respectively.

3.12 During the course of examination it has come out that initially the agreed outlay was higher than the proposed outlay for the Department for the Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) period. As against the proposed outlay of Rs. 16,420.84 crore for the Eleventh Plan, mainly comprising of Rs. 11,700 crore for IWMP, the agreed outlay was Rs. 17,205.48 crore. When asked about the reasons behind higher agreed outlay than the proposed allocation, the Department have stated that Rs. 16,420 crore was the projected outlay at the initial stage of Plan discussions with the Planning Commission. Subsequently, the requirement of the Department had been reworked based on the needs of the Department and keeping in view the suggested changes in design and content of programmes of IWMP, NLRMP, National Mission on Bio-diesel (NMB), Externally Aided Projects (EAP) and National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy. During Plan discussions with

the Planning Commission on 20 December, 2007, the Department forcefully put forward its case for higher allocation particularly in the area of IWMP and NLRMP. The Planning Commission decided to raise the allocation to Rs. 17,205.48 crore, mainly comprising of Rs. 15,359.46 crore for IWMP, Rs. 1500 crore for Bio-fuel and Rs. 428 crore for Professional Support.

3.13 Thereafter, the Department have informed that the agreed allocation for the Ministry of Rural Development was again reviewed as a whole by the Minister of Rural Development and it was felt that agreed allocation of Department of Land Resources would be inadequate and a further enhancement was sought in view of its need in entirety. A total outlay of Rs. 25,835.67 crore was proposed for the Department, comprising Rs. 20,700 crore for Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). The Department while giving break up of Rs. 20,700 crore proposed for IWMP has further informed that Rs. 6522 crore will be for meeting committed liability of on-going projects whereas Rs. 12,300 crore would be needed for funding the new watershed projects over the next three years. Further, Rs. 1000 crore would be required for necessary institutional support, thus making a total of Rs. 19,822 crore.

3.14 In order to plead for more funds for IWMP, the Department have stated that according to the Parthasarathy Committee Report an estimated 125 million hectare of degraded land in rainfed areas including 80 million hectare of land under dryland farming needs to be developed in the next 15 years with an investment of Rs. 1,50,000 crore. Out of 125 million hectare, 75 million hectare is to be covered by the Department during coming three Five Year Plans. Thus target before the Department for the Eleventh Plan is 25 million hectare. The Department have, therefore, submitted that funds of Rs. 15,359.46 crore for Eleventh Plan would not be sufficient for the purpose of meeting committed liabilities of on-going projects as well as for new watershed projects.

3.15 The Committee find that the Department had proposed an outlay of Rs 25,835.67 crore to the Planning Commission for the Eleventh Plan mainly comprising of Rs. 20,700 crore for IWMP. Under IWMP Rs. 6,522 crore are for committed liabilities of on going watershed projects in the first two years of the Eleventh Plan period, Rs. 12,300 crore for funding new watershed projects over the next three years of the Plan and Rs. 1000 crore for necessary 'Infrastructural Support' totaling to Rs. 19,822 crore. The Planning Commission initially agreed to the allocation of Rs. 16,420.84 crore,

which has subsequently been revised to Rs. 17,205.48 crore. The revision was necessitated after reviewing the needs of the Department and in view of the suggested modifications in design and contents of the major programmes envisaged for the current Plan. These Programmes are Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP), National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP), National Mission on Bio-diesel, Externally Aided Projects (EAPs), Professional Support and National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy. In this connection, the Committee have been informed that as per the Parthasarthy Committee Report an estimated 125 million hectares of rainfed areas is to be developed with an investment outlay of Rs. 1,50,000 crore in the next 15 years. Out of 125 million hectares, 75 million hectares of rainfed area is to be developed by the Department of Land Resources in the next 15 years by way of covering 25 million hectares in each of the coming three Five Year Plans. Therefore, the target before the Department during the Eleventh Plan is the treatment of 25 million hectares of rainfed areas in the country. After perusal of the outlays as proposed by the Department and work to be taken up by the Department during the current Plan, the Committee find that the Plan allocation of Rs. 17,205.48 crore is not sufficient for the Department to accomplish the task.

3.16 The Committee further note that during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan *i.e.* during 2007-08 and 2008-09, Rs. 3800 crore have been allocated. The total amount of allocation for the Eleventh Plan is Rs. 17,205.48 crore. Thus the proportional allocation for the two years comes to around Rs. 6,880 crore. Thus there is shortfall of Rs. 3080 crore in the proportionate allocation during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan. Keeping in view the aforesaid scenario of allocations being made under different schemes of the Department, the Committee have their apprehensions about the set target of development of rainfed area of 25 million hectares during the Eleventh Plan being achieved. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend that adequate allocation should be provided to the Department to achieve the set targets under different schemes. While recommending for higher outlay during the Eleventh Plan, the Committee would also like that the Department should make every effort to ensure that the allocation provided in a year is meaningfully utilised.

B. Common Guidelines for Watershed Projects – need for setting up expeditious mechanism for generation of watershed projects

3.17 Pursuant to the recommendations of the Standing Committee in their Reports presented during 12th, 13th and 14th Lok Sabhas that

all the activities related to watershed programmes being undertaken by different Ministries of Union Government should be brought under one umbrella, the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech (2007-08) had informed about the setting up the National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) under Ministry of Agriculture to coordinate all the schemes related with watershed development and aspects of land use. The NRAA has representations from Ministries of Agriculture, Rural Development, Water Resources, Environment and Forests along with the Planning Commission. The role of NRAA is to provide State Governments with technical support, R&D etc. and help the country to move forward in improving the utilisation of rainfed areas through various programmes and coordinate efforts of various Ministries. Further, three Watershed Programmes of IWDP, DDP and DPAP were merged into a single Programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) from 2007-08 in order to have optimum use of resources, sustainable outcomes and integrated planning.

3.18 During the course of examination of the Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Department, it came out that 'Common Guidelines' for watershed development projects have been finalised by the NRAA on 11 February, 2008 and these would be operational with effect from 1 April, 2008.

3.19 On being asked about the reasons for taking almost a year to finalise the 'Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects' and their operationalisation *w.e.f.* 1 April 2008 even though the decision of merger of erstwhile three Area Development Programmes of IWDP, DDP and DPAP was taken in March, 2007, the Department informed that although a decision for merger of the three Area Development Programmes was taken in March, 2007, the Working Group on the Rainfed Area for the Eleventh Plan recommended that the efforts of the different Ministries implementing the watershed programme should also be consolidated into a unified approach in the form of new Common Guidelines. At the instance of the Planning Commission, the Department took an initiative to prepare Common Guidelines on the above lines. This required consultations and discussions with the other Departments, Ministries, States and stakeholders. Two brainstorming sessions were held on 14 February 2007 and 7 March 2007. These sessions were attended by the representatives of the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment & Forests and Panchayati Raj, State Governments, Research Institutes like ICAR and NERIWALM and prominent NGOs in watershed management. A series of meetings then took place with the Planning Commission and NRAA. With the inputs from all these deliberations, Common

Guidelines for watershed development were drafted and submitted to the National Rainfed Area Authority. The guidelines were discussed by the members of the Executive Committee of NRAA in its meeting held on 29 November 2007 and 18 December 2007. The modifications suggested were incorporated and the final draft was placed before the Governing Board of the NRAA on 11 February 2008. The Governing Board approved the draft in its meeting held on 11 February 2008 and also decided that the Guidelines will come into force from 1 April, 2008.

3.20 The following are the key features of these Guidelines for ensuring proper implementation of watershed development projects:-

- (i) Livelihood orientation by integrating livestock management and production and marketing of dairy products;
- (ii) Watershed development through cluster of micro watersheds with average size of 1000-5000 hectares;
- (iii) Scientific Planning for wasteland development with the help of Geographical Information System (GIS) and Global Positioning System (GPS);
- (iv) Coordination with programmes like NREGS and BRGF;
- (v) Delegation for sanctioning of projects at State level;
- (vi) Institutional Framework for professional support at National, State and District level;
- (vii) Cost norms per hectare to be revised upwards;
- (viii) Capacity Building by annual training plans by State Governments;
- (ix) There will be both concurrent and post project evaluation of projects;
- (x) Implementation will be through PRIs; and
- (xi) Awareness will be through Voluntary Organisations. (VOs)

3.21 On being asked about the overall preparedness for the implementation of the aforesaid Guidelines, the Department informed as under:

“The Department is making all preparations for implementing the new Common Guidelines. The guidelines have been put on the website of the Department. The Department has prepared elaborate formats for the implementation of the new guidelines

by the States. These formats will be discussed and preparedness of the States for implementation of the new guidelines will be reviewed with individual States in the Zonal Meetings. The Department is also taking help from Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) and National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) to design courses on capacity building including awareness and training modules for various stakeholders and functionaries involved in the execution of the programme. The course contents will have adequate emphasis on livelihood orientation which is a new feature in the Common Guidelines”.

3.22 Prior to these, ‘The Hariyali Guidelines, 2003’ were in operation for watershed projects. A comparison between Hariyali Guidelines, 2003 and Common Guidelines, 2008 is as under:

Watershed Guidelines – A Comparison

Contents	Hariyali Guidelines, 2003	Common Guidelines, 2008
1	2	3
Programmes	Three programmes IWDP, DPAP, DDP	Single Programme IWMP
Project Area	One microwatershed (500 ha average size)	A cluster of microwatersheds (1000 ha to 5000 ha)
Cost per ha.	Rs. 6,000	Rs. 12,000
Project Period	5 years	4 to 7 years
Number of Instalments	5 (15%, 30%, 30%, 15%, 10%)	3 (20%, 50%, 30%)
Fund Allocation	Training & Comm. Mobi. 5% Admm. 10% Works 85%	Training 5% Mon. & Eval. 2% Admm. 10% Works & EPA 78% Consolidation 5%
Institutional Support	Weak Institutional arrangements	Dedicated Institutional Structures at National, District, Project and Village level
Role of States	Only advisory and supervisory with no budget support	Sanctioning authority for projects with funding support for monitoring

1	2	3
PIA at Project level	Line Departments/ Autonomous Body/PRI	Line Departments/ Autonomous Body/ VO
PIA at Village level	Gram Panchayat	Watershed Committee
Training	2.5% of project funds	5% of project funds
Planning	No separate component	1% for DPR Preparation with scientific inputs
Monitoring & Evaluation	No separate component Mid-term & final evaluation	2% of project cost Concurrent & Post Project evaluation including evaluation of DPR
Sustainability	Weak mechanism with WDF as a tool	Consolidation Phase with WDF and livelihood component as a tool.
Foreclosure	Not provided	Provided

3.23 After perusal of the above comparison it is revealed that Dedicated Institutional Structures at National, State, District and Village levels are to be set up for operationalisation of the 'Common Guidelines'. At the apex level it will be the Central Level Nodal Agency followed by State Level Nodal Agency at State Level and District Watershed Development Unit (DWDU) at the District level. Project Implementing Agency at Project Level and Watershed Committee at Village level have also been proposed.

3.24 It came out during the course of evidence of the representatives of the Department that there is no infrastructure available at Gram Panchayat level for watershed programmes in different States especially in Orissa and grievance redressal for watershed projects is also non-existent at the level of the Collector. It also came out during the course of evidence of the Department that a four Phase time table has been drawn by the Department for making the Guidelines fully operational within one year from April, 2008 to April, 2009.

3.25 The Committee have persistently been recommending in their Reports presented during 12th, 13th and 14th Lok Sabha that all the activities related to watershed programmes being undertaken by the different Ministries of Union Government should be brought under one umbrella. Pursuant to the aforesaid recommendation of

the Committee, the Ministry of Rural Development initially transferred DDP, DPAP and Watershed component of its 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. With the continuous pursuance of the issue of bringing the watershed activities of different Ministries under one umbrella, the Government finally agreed to the recommendation of the Committee and the National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) was constituted under the Ministry of Agriculture with the initial allocation of Rs. 100 crore during the year 2007-08. As a further initiative on the issue of convergence, the Department have merged three area development programmes *viz.* Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) into a single programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). In the sitting of the National Rainfed Area Authority held on 11 February, 2008, the Hariyali Guidelines 2003 have been revised and named as Common Guidelines, 2008. The Common Guidelines were prepared by the Department and finally approved by the Governing Body of the National Rainfed Area Authority on 11 February, 2008. The Department have informed that the aforesaid Guidelines would come into force from 1 April, 2008. Further, the Guidelines would be made fully operational by January, 2009. While appreciating the initiatives taken by the Department for bringing convergence into the watershed activities being undertaken by the different Departments/Ministries in pursuance of the persistent recommendations of the Standing Committee, the Committee find that there is an inordinate delay in the finalisation of the Common Guidelines. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the process of operationalisation of the Guidelines should be accelerated keeping in view the task of covering target of 25 million hectare of rainfed areas during the current Plan period of which the first year i.e. 2007-08 is already over. For this, the time frames for various stages of operationalisation of the guidelines need to be tightened considerably and strict monitoring be ensured.

3.26 The Committee have also been repeatedly emphasizing on the convergence of watershed activities at the State level as well as at the ground level. In this regard, the Committee find that under the Common Guidelines, a provision has been made for setting-up dedicated institutional structures at national, district, project and village level. The Committee appreciate the aforesaid initiative taken by the Department which is in line with the persistent

recommendations of the Committee. The Committee would like that the institutional structures at national, district, project and village level are set up expeditiously so as to have proper coordination and an idea of the actual work being undertaken at the ground level with regard to watershed activities in the country.

3.27 The Department have furnished a statement indicating the comparison between the various features of Hariyali Guidelines 2003 and Common Guidelines 2008. The Committee note that one of the provisions with regard to foreclosure which was not provided under the previous Guidelines has now been provided under the revised Common Guidelines, 2008. The Committee in their respective Reports have been observing that a number of projects under different watershed schemes *viz.* Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) were being foreclosed (refer para 4.59 of 27 Report). On the insistence of the Standing Committee, the Department have even indicated the position of foreclosure in the Outcome Budget (2008-09). The Committee fail to understand how the projects were being foreclosed when there was no provision in the Hariyali Guidelines in this regard. Further, the Committee understand that foreclosure of a project is the last resort available with the implementing agency when it is noticed that the project is not at all viable. The foreclosure of a project leads to crucial wastage of the resources. The Committee are unable to comprehend the justification of making a special provision for foreclosure in the Common Guidelines, 2008, which indicates that the implementing agencies may be free to foreclose any project at any time. The Committee would like a specific clarification of the Department in this regard so as to understand the concept and comment further on the issue.

C. Need for effective online monitoring of Watershed Projects

3.28 The Department have stated that in pursuance of the concerns expressed by the Standing Committee for effective monitoring mechanism and performance grading of projects, the Department has taken the initiative for three stage monitoring i.e. at preparatory, implementation and completion stages. These include online monitoring at projects of Department/State and DRDA/Zila Parishad level etc. and the Department intend to make the online system functional by the year 2008-09.

3.29 In this connection, during the course of examination, it came out that on 3 March, 2008, the Union Minister for Rural Development

while making a statement in Lok Sabha informed that online reporting of monthly progress reports of rural development programmes including IWDP, DDP, DPAP, CLR would now be available for the information of citizens of the country.

3.30 It also came out that monitoring of watershed projects has not been at desired level throughout the country, especially in Bihar, Orissa and North-Eastern States. When asked about the progress made in this regard, the Committee were apprised about the level of Monthly as well as Quarterly Progress Reports made by different States for watershed projects as detailed in the succeeding paragraphs.

(i) Progress made for the online monitoring of Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) by States

3.31 About progress in regard to sending Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) by different States, the Department of Land Resources have clarified that the system of online reporting of MPRs has been operationalised only during the year 2007-08 and Andhra Pradesh is the only State in the country which has started online reporting of MPRs of all the three Areas Development Programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP, whereas Haryana has started online reporting of its MPRs for IWDP and DDP only. Besides, Chhattisgarh has started online reporting of its MPRs for IWDP and DPAP only. The Department of Land Resources have also furnished the State wise data of online as also manually reporting of MPRs as shown at *Appendix II*.

(ii) Progress made for online monitoring of Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) by States.

3.32 As regards the progress made by the different States with regard to sending online Quarterly Progress Report (QPRs), the Department have informed that majority of the States have started reporting QPRs online. About Programme wise online reporting of QPRs by States, the Department of Land Resources informed that under IWDP, 24 States out of 28 States, under DPAP 13 States out of 16 States and under DDP 5 out of 7 States are reporting online. The Department of Land Resources also informed that for online reporting of QPRs, agencies in the States of Goa, Himachal Pradesh and Tripura are yet to be trained to use online QPRs system and by the first quarter of the year 2008-09, the training in these States would commence. Elaborating progress of online reporting of QPRs by different Districts under each of the three Area Development Programme of IWDP, DPAP and DDP, the Department of Land

Resources have stated that 289 districts out of 470 districts under IWDP, 109 districts out of 185 districts under DPAP and 33 districts out of 40 districts under DDP have started online data entries of their QPRs.

3.33 On being asked about the situation of online reporting of Monthly/Quarterly Progress Reports from Northern-Eastern States and the States like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the Department of Land Resources in a written note stated as under:

“The Ministry is releasing programme funds to all the States including Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and North Eastern States through electronic transfer. The Department have developed and hosted web based systems for monitoring of all its programmes. Implementation agencies can upload the data directly to online system using their login and passwords. Where implementation agencies don't have computer and connectivity in their offices, National Informatics Centre (NIC) district centres could be used for transmitting the data to our centralized system. NIC centres are available in 35 States/UTs and 602 districts of the country. NIC has also set up 555 Computer Centres at Block level in North Eastern States”.

3.34 The Committee learn from a statement made by the Minister of Rural Development in Lok Sabha on 3 March, 2008 that Ministry of Rural Development have developed a system for online reporting of Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) of rural development schemes including IWDP, DPAP and DDP. Although sufficient progress in this regard has been made with regard to sending Quarterly Progress Reports on-line, the progress with regard to Monthly Progress Reports is far from satisfactory. For instance, under IWDP out of 28 States only 3 States of Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Haryana have the system of online reporting of Monthly Progress Reports. Similarly, out of 16 States under DPAP and 7 States under DDP only 2 States have a system of reporting online the Monthly Progress Reports. Andhra Pradesh is the only State, which has developed online monitoring of all these Area Development Programmes. The Committee further note that the process of online monitoring has been started by the Department of Land Resources during the year 2007-08 and the Department propose to make it fully operational by the year 2008-09. Keeping in view the status of implementation of the project of online monitoring of Monthly Progress Reports as indicated above, the Committee have doubts about achieving the target of making the system fully operational by 2008-09. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Department should work on a war footing so as to achieve the targets by the stipulated deadline.

D. Need for the Land Use Policy and issues related to SEZ Policy

3.35 The Committee while examining Demands for Grants 2007-08 had emphasized that there is an urgent need to ensure a balanced use of land for different purposes *viz* agriculture, industries, forestation, housing etc. Further while noting the stand of the Department that industries, Special Economic Zones should preferably be established on wastelands, degraded forest land, the Committee had recommended that the Government should permit acquisition of land cautiously keeping in view the limited land resources of the country. The Committee had also emphasized for having 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.

3.36 The Committee during the course of oral evidence desired to know about the name of the Ministry/Department responsible for bringing such Policy. The Secretary informed that there is National Land Use and Conservation Board under the Ministry of Agriculture who decides about this. When asked about the number of meetings of the National Land Use and Conservation Board held so far, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary that as per their knowledge, no meeting had been held for the last many years.

3.37 The Committee further desired to know about the data with regard to acquisition of agricultural land for setting up of Special Economic Zones. In this regard, the Committee have been informed that the matter regarding Special Economic Zones is dealt with by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Further the data regarding the land acquisition including agricultural land for setting up SEZs has been called for from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. In this regard, the Department has also informed that the Minister of Rural Development had written to the Minister of Commerce and Industry that prime agricultural land should not be acquired for establishing SEZs and these Zones need to be established invariably on wastelands. In unavoidable situations if it is necessary to acquire agricultural land for a SEZ, the requiring body must develop equal area of wastelands simultaneously so that the loss of agricultural land could be compensated.

3.38 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year (refer para 3.19 of 27th Report) while expressing

concern over the acquisition of agricultural land for setting up SEZs had recommended as under:—

“...there is an urgent need to ensure a balanced use of land for different purposes *viz* agriculture, industries, forestation, housing etc. Further while noting the stand of the Department that industries, Special Economic Zones should preferably be established on wastelands, degraded forest land, the Committee recommended that the Government should permit acquisition of land cautiously keeping in view the limited land resources of the country.”

3.39 The Committee note that the Minister of Rural Development has taken up the issue of acquisition of agricultural land for setting up of SEZs with the Minister of Commerce and Industry and has emphasized that prime agricultural land should not be acquired for establishing SEZs and these Zones need to be established invariably on wastelands. In unavoidable situation if it is necessary to acquire agricultural land for SEZs, the requiring body must develop equal area of wastelands simultaneously so that the loss of agricultural land could be compensated. While appreciating the initiatives taken by the Minister of Rural Development, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue this issue further with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Besides, the concerns of the Committee in this regard expressed while examining Demands for Grants of the previous year and reiterated here again should be brought to the knowledge of the Ministry of Commerce & Industry and the Cabinet Secretariat. The Committee desire that not only in the case of SEZs including housing colonies whenever agricultural land is acquired for any non-agricultural purpose, it should be made mandatory on the requisitioning authority to develop at least an equal area of wasteland into agricultural land. Exemption from the development of equal area of wasteland into agricultural land may be considered only in the States where adequate area of wastelands is not available.

3.40 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year had also recommended to have a National Land use Policy (refer para 3.19 of 27th Report) 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 note that the National Land use and Conservation Board under the Ministry of Agriculture is dealing with the issue of the Land Use Policy. The Committee are concerned to note that no sitting

of the aforesaid Board has been held for the last many years as informed by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources, during the course of oral evidence. The Committee deplore the way such an important national issue is being addressed by the Government. The Committee strongly recommend to take up the issue urgently with the Ministry of Agriculture so that a National Land Use Policy is formulated expeditiously. The Committee may be informed about the concrete action taken in this regard.

3.41 The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year (refer para 3.19 of 27th Report) had been informed that the data with regard to the acquisition of land for Special Economic Zones is being collected by the Department from the concerned Ministry of Commerce and Industry. While examining the Demands for Grants for the year 2008-09 again, the Department have informed that the aforesaid data as asked by the Committee is being collected. The Committee fail to understand even after one year has elapsed since the Committee desired the aforesaid data, the same could not be collected from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The Committee while deploring the casual manner of the Ministry in this regard desired that the data should be obtained expeditiously and furnished to the Committee. Besides, the specific data with regard to the acquisition of agricultural land for setting up SEZs may also be obtained. The information in this regard may separately be asked for single crop, double crop and multi crop agricultural land.

E. Expeditious action on the National Mission on Bio-Diesel

3.42 After submission of a report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on 'Development of Bio-fuel' in April, 2003, a proposal for launching a National Mission on Bio-Diesel is under consideration of the Government since October, 2006 with the objective of bringing unutilized wasteland/degraded land for productive use by way of *Jatropha curcas* (Ratanjot) and *Pongamia* (Karanj) plantations for producing bio-diesel from such plantations which would reduce the country's dependence of imported petroleum. The National Mission on Bio-diesel is to be implemented in two phases. In Phase-I, the 'National Mission on Bio-diesel' will be taken up as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme to be implemented by the State Governments as demonstration phase as no data base is available on various aspects of bio-diesel like its cultivation cost and returns involved. In October, 2006 the proposal was processed with the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) and on 8 March, 2007 it was considered by the

Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA). Thereafter it has been referred to the Group of Ministers (GoMs) for further examination and recommendation. In the first meeting of Group of Ministers held on 16 May, 2007, it was decided to have the presentation of the Ministries of Rural Development and Environment & Forests before the final view is taken. The sitting of the Group of Ministers is yet to be held.

3.43 During the year 2007-08, an outlay of Rs. 50 crore was earmarked for National Mission on Bio- diesel. However, no releases were made under this head. Again in 2008-09, a same amount has been proposed for the same head. The Committee wanted to know the logic for earmarking outlay for this scheme particularly when it was not utilized in the previous year. The Department of Land Resources informed that the proposal on the demonstration phase of the National Mission on Bio-diesel was put up to the CCEA in March 2007. In anticipation of the approval of the scheme by the CCEA, an ad-hoc provision of Rs. 50 crore was made for the scheme in the budget allocations of 2007-08. As the Group of Ministers could not meet, therefore, the 2007-08 allocation of Rs. 50 crore could not be utilized on the bio-diesel programme. The same reason has been given for earmarking the allocations for this scheme during 2008-09.

3.44 During the course of evidence of Department of Land Resources it was pointed out that plantation of 16.49 crore saplings of *Jatropha* and *Pongamia* plants has already been raised in 2005-06 at a cost of Rs. 49.50 crore and an amount of Rs. 49.50 crore has already been released to States for the same purpose. It was also pointed out that the early decision on the proposal on National Mission on Bio-diesel is necessary for saving the aforesaid nursery sampling for sustaining the programme by way of making available the required funds to the different States which have done such plantation.

3.45 The Committee are unhappy to note that an important scheme 'National Mission on Bio-diesel' that seeks to reduce country's 20 per cent import dependence on petroleum is still at a nascent stage even after submission of the Report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on 'Development of Bio-diesel' way back in April, 2003. The Committee have been informed that the aforesaid 'National Mission on Bio-diesel' seeks to obtain Bio-diesel from seeds of plants like *Jatropha (Ratanjot)* and *Pongamia (Karanj)* by their plantation on wasteland/degraded land available in different States. It is alarming to note that even after an elapse of five years since the submission of the report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on the aforesaid matter, the

proposal has still not been approved by the Government. As per the latest information furnished by the Department on the above issue, the proposal has been processed by the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) on 9 October, 2006 and has been considered by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) on 8 March, 2007 and currently is before the Group of Ministers (GoM) wherein a presentation by the Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Science & Technology and ICAR is awaited on the proposal. The Committee have further been informed that the next meeting is yet to take place. In this connection during the course of evidence, it came out that around 16.49 crore saplings of *Jatropha* and *Pongamia* plants have already been planted with an expenditure of Rs. 49.50 crore in different States and an early clearance of the proposal from the Group of Ministers is essential in order that this expenditure does not go waste. In this connection the Committee in their all previous Reports on Demands for Grants relating to the Department of Land Resources from 2004-05 onwards have been pursuing the Government for expeditious clearance of the proposal. The Committee are, however, constrained to note that the desired results are not forthcoming. Since the danger of loss of saplings as stated above is looming large for want of necessary funds, the Committee, therefore, once again recommend expeditious clearance of the proposal by the Group of Ministers so that Rs. 50 crore Plan outlay is utilised by the Department during 2008-09. While recommending for expeditious clearance of 'National Mission on Bio-diesel', the Committee may like to emphasise that the *Jatropha/Pongamia* cultivation in the country should be done without affecting the food security and agricultural land of the country.

SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS

A. Review of three Area Development Programmes

3.46 Prior to 2007-2008, the Department of Land Resources was implementing the following three Area Development Programmes on watershed basis with a view to improving productivity of non-forest wastelands by checking land degradation, conserving soil moisture etc.:—

- (i) Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP)*
- (ii) Desert Development Programme (DDP)** and
- (iii) Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)***

* It is being run in Blocks not covered under DDP and DPAP.

** It is being implemented in 972 Blocks of 185 districts in 16 States.

*** It is being implemented in 235 Blocks in 40 districts in 7 States.

3.47 The Department was also implementing the following two centrally Sponsored Schemes in order to provide policy, financial and technical assistance to States in land reforms measures:—

- (iv) Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and;
- (v) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating land records (SRA&ULR)

3.48 The review of all the three Area Development Programmes revealed that the performance of DPAP and DDP during Tenth Plan was quite good. The performance of IWDP is as under:

(a) Review of Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP)

3.49 Under IWDP proposals for the development of non-forest wastelands used to be prioritized in consultation with the State Governments for a period of five years @ Rs. 6,000 per hectare. Since a project under IWDP was implemented for over a period of five years, the committed liabilities were spread over subsequent years till the project's completion.

Allocation vis-a-vis utilisation during the Tenth Plan (2002-2007)

3.50 The year-wise allocation *vis-a-vis* utilisation under IWDP have been as under:

(Rs. in Crore)		
Period	Outlay	Release /Exp
2002-03	450.00 *	413.45 (91.87%)
2003-04	402.00 **	368.17 (91.58%)
2004-05	448 ***	414.42 (90.88%)
2005-06	565 ***	567.64 (100.47%)
2006-07	565 ***	559.47 (99.02%)
Total	2430.00	—

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

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

*** includes Rs. 80.00 crore for DFID Projects in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

3.51 According to the Department of Land Resources, the performance of IWDP during the Tenth Plan has been good except in North-Eastern States. The Department of Land Resources has attributed the huge amount spent on meeting the committed liabilities of on-going projects during the first year and no demand of funds/poor absorption of funds for IWDP projects in North-Eastern States during 2003-04 and 2004-05 as the reasons for slow progress under IWDP.

3.52 While reviewing the performance of IWDP during the Tenth Plan (2002-07), the Committee find that as against the outlays, the utilisation in terms of percentage of releases was 91.87 per cent, 91.58 per cent and 90.88 per cent respectively during the first three years of the Tenth Plan i.e. 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05. The Committee also find that in the remaining two years viz. 2005-06 and 2006-2007 of the Tenth Plan, utilisation in terms of percentage of releases was 100.47 per cent and 99.02 per cent. The Committee find that the reason for under-spending in the first three years of the Tenth Plan as indicated by the Department is that a large amount of outlays was utilised for meeting the committed liabilities of on going watershed projects as also failure on the part of North Eastern States to utilise funds for these projects. For instance during 2002-03, out of Rs. 450 crore earmarked for IWDP as high as Rs. 150 crore was spent on meeting the committed liabilities of on going projects. Similarly during 2003-04 under-spending of Rs. 88 crore was due to non-receipt of new projects from the North Eastern Region. Again during 2004-05 poor absorption of funds by North Eastern States was the reason for slow progress. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid scenario that the expenditure position during the Tenth Plan has been satisfactory except in the case of the North Eastern States where no new projects were demanded. The Committee, therefore, feel that there is an urgent need to review the position of development of wastelands in the North Eastern Region. The various problems encountered in North Eastern Region have been dealt with in subsequent paras of the Report. Here the Committee wish to emphasize that all corrective action should be taken so as to ensure full utilization of outlay during the Eleventh Plan.

(b) Review of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)

3.53 From 2007-08 onwards, all the three area development programmes including IWDP were merged into IWMP. The proposed amount, BE, RE and actual releases during the year 2007-08 and the proposed outlay and BE for the year 2008-09 are as under:

(Rs. in crore)				
Year	Proposed	BE amount	RE	Actual Releases
2007-08	2086.46	1201	1166	1160.64 (as on 15.03.08)
2008-09	2750	1875	-	-

3.54 During the course of evidence, the representatives of the Department informed the Committee that keeping in view 45,000 ongoing watershed projects, it was not sustainable to ask for the new watershed projects. It was, therefore, consciously decided to complete the on-going watershed projects during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan. In a written note, the Department have also stated that in the first two years of the Eleventh Plan, the Department is focusing on the completion of the on-going projects.

3.55 The Committee note that the three programmes of the Department *viz.* Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP), the major programme of the Department related to wastelands development in the country alongwith two other area development programmes *viz.* Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) have been merged into an integrated programme i.e. Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) during the Eleventh Plan. Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) is being implemented from the year 2007-08 *i.e.* the first year of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee note that during the year 2007-08 against the proposed allocation of Rs. 2086.46 crore, Rs. 1201 crore were provided at BE stage. The allocation was reduced by Rs. 35 crore at RE stage, thus Rs. 1166 crore were available during the year 2007-08. Out of Rs. 1166 crore, the expenditure as on 15 March, 2008 is Rs. 1160.64 crore. During the year 2008-09, Rs. 1875 crore have been allocated against the proposed allocation of Rs. 2750 crore. The Committee have been apprised that the Department have decided to complete 45,000 ongoing watershed projects in the first two years of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee further note that Rs. 6,522 crore have been proposed for the committed liabilities of ongoing projects during the Eleventh Plan. Even if the total allocation earmarked during the first two years under IWMP is taken into consideration, only Rs. 3,041 crore (Rs. 1166 crore R.E. of 2007-08 + Rs. 1875 crore B.E. of 2008-09) have been allocated during the aforesaid years. Thus, if only the committed liabilities are taken into consideration, there is shortfall of Rs. 3,481 crore even to meet the committed liabilities for the ongoing projects. The Committee fail to understand how the Department propose to meet the committed liabilities during the first two years of Eleventh Plan with the aforesaid shortfall in the allocations. Further the Committee are unable to comprehend how the new projects would be taken under IWMP with the meagre allocation of resources. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid scenario that the target of developing 25 million hectares of rainfed area during the Eleventh Plan seems to be a distant reality with the

position of the allocation of resources during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan as being stated above. The Committee strongly recommend that desired initiatives should be taken to complete the 45,000 ongoing projects in the stipulated timeframe of two years so that the additional projects as per the modified guidelines can be taken up and the set targets could be achieved. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should pursue with the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for adequate outlay under IWMP.

(c) Utilisation Certificates (UCs) outstanding under Area Development Programmes

3.56 The Outcome Budget (2008-09) indicates that a total of 357 Utilisation Certificates (UCs) amounting to Rs. 281.67 crore were outstanding as on 31 December, 2007. The position in respect of three Area Development Programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP was as under:-

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	Programme	UCs outstanding	Amount involved
I	IWDP	153	59.58
II	DPAP	115	58.43
III	DDP	24	21.50

3.57 During the course of examination the Committee enquired about the latest position in respect of these outstanding Utilisation Certificates, the Department of Land Resources have given the following figures:—

Sl. No.	Programme	As on 20.3.2008	
		UCs outstanding	Amount involved (Rs. in crore)
I	IWDP	91	39.47
II	DPAP	101	51.91
III	DDP	8	12.45

3.58 The State-wise, programme-wise and Scheme-wise position of outstanding Utilisation Certificates as on 31.01.2008 and 20.03.2008 has been given at *Appendix-III, IV & V*.

3.59 The position of outstanding Utilisation Certificates under IWDP, DPAP and DDP between 31 January, 2008 and 20 March, 2008 in some of the major defaulting States is as under:—

IWDP

(Rs. in lakh)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1	Assam	35	1802.56	16	856.35
2	Kerala	10	409.03	10	409.03
3.	Orissa	10	421.938	9	380.688
4.	Manipur	8	387.75	8	387.75
5.	Sikkim	8	284.20	8	284.20

DPAP

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1	Bihar	26	9.19	26	9.19
2	Jharkhand	23	14.95	23	14.95
3.	West Bengal	18	10.26	18	10.26
4.	Uttarakhand	13	5.46	13	5.46
5.	Maharashtra	10	3.31	10	3.31

DDP

(Rs. in lakh)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1.	Rajasthan	16	905.06	0	0
2.	Himachal Pradesh	4	695.25	4	695.25
3.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	337.50	2	337.50
4.	Karnataka	2	212.40	2	212.40

3.60 After reviewing the comparative position of outstanding Utilisation Certificates (UCs) between 31.01.2008 and 20.03.2008 the Committee pointed out that except Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh *status quo* is prevailing in the rest of the States. The Committee wanted to know the problems in these States in not sending Utilisation Certificates (UCs) regularly. The Department have informed that the inherent problems in these States are capacity constraints, weak monitoring, inadequate will to trace out older records etc. Nevertheless, the matter is being regularly pursued with the respective State Governments to make special efforts for speedy utilisation of funds and submission of Utilisation Certificates (UCs) in time.

3.61 The Committee are constrained to note that as many as 357 Utilisation Certificates (UCs) amounting to Rs. 281.67 crore are outstanding as on 31 December 2007 in respect of the three Area Development Programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In this connection the Committee also find that out of these as many as 153 UCs pertain to IWDP and 115 UCs relate to DPAP involving approximately Rs. 60 crore each. Remaining 24 UCs relate to DDP amounting to Rs. 21.50 crore. The Committee further find that as on 20 March, 2008 there has been a slight reduction in the aforesaid outstanding UCs. For instance, under IWDP 91 UCs with an amount of Rs. 39.47 crore, under DPAP 101 UCs with an amount of 51.91 crore and under DDP 8 UCs with an amount of 12.45 crore are outstanding. From the available data, the Committee find that the major defaulting States are Assam, Kerala, Orissa, Manipur and Sikkim under IWDP; Bihar, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Uttarakhand and Maharashtra under DPAP; and Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and Karnataka under DDP. The capacity constraints, weak monitoring and lack of will to track out older records etc. have been attributed as the reasons for the above UCs remaining outstanding from various State Governments. The Committee fail to understand how the States like Kerala, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Orissa who have done considerable progress on e-governance are not submitting Utilisation Certificates in time. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend to pursue with the State Governments in this regard. The concrete action taken should be communicated to the Committee.

(d) Need for increasing per hectare cost norm for watershed development projects

3.62 The Department have informed that at the time of commencement of watershed programme in 1995, the rate of the

treatment of wasteland was Rs. 4000 per hectare. This was raised to Rs. 6000 per hectare *w.e.f.* 1 April 2000 and the same is prevailing as of now. The Parthasarthy Committee in its Report has stated that various State Governments had represented for upward revision of the cost norm. In view of this, the Parthasarthy Committee has recommended to revise the per hectare cost of wastelands to Rs. 12,000.

3.63 The Committee find that the per hectare norms of the treatment of wasteland were revised from Rs. 4000 per hectare to Rs. 6000 per hectare *w.e.f.* 1 April 2000. Eight years have passed since the per hectare cost was revised and the various State Governments have represented to the Parthasarthy Committee for increase in the per hectare cost of wasteland. In view of this, the Committee recommend that the issue of hike in per hectare cost needs to be examined by the Department. In this connection, the Committee would like to refer to their earlier recommendation made in this regard as reproduced below (refer para 4.30 of 27th Report):—

“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 while reiterating their stand in this regard would like that the aforesaid observations should be taken into consideration while arriving at the decision on the revised per hectare cost norms.

(e) Review of IWMP in North-Eastern Region and need for special attention for watershed projects in North-Eastern States

3.64 During the year 2008-09, a lump sum provision of Rs. 182.50 crores has been made under IWMP for North-Eastern States including Sikkim.

3.65 Slow progress of IWDP projects in North-Eastern Region also came up for discussion during the course of evidence of the representatives of Department of Land Resources. The Committee

pointed out that the soil and vegetation in North-Eastern States is fragile. As such, while dealing with land management in these States, a special care is needed because if the original vegetation is removed, it cannot be replaced or replanted. The Committee also pointed out that there are many Departments in States like Tribal Development Department, DRDA, IWDP, Department of Land Management but none of them is coordinating with each other. As a result, no visible results are achieved. The Committee also pointed out that most of the IWDP projects are not properly implemented. The Committee also further wanted to know whether the Department of Land Resources have even interacted with North-Eastern Council for getting the detailed information on the land management of the resources. In this regard, the Department clarified that a Zonal meeting is planned in Shillong in May, 2008. It is planned to interact with the members of the North Eastern Council during the visit.

3.66 The Committee note that there are serious problems in the implementation of the watershed programmes in the North-Eastern Region including Sikkim. One of the issue, which needs consideration is the lack of coordination between different Departments of the State Governments which are mainly responsible for implementing watershed projects in the entire North Eastern Region. Further, in view of the fragile nature of soil and vegetation in North Eastern Areas, the Committee underline the need for special care for preserving the original soil and vegetation while dealing with the land management in these areas. The Committee have been informed by the Department that a zonal meeting is planned in Shillong in May, 2008 for an interaction with the members of the North Eastern Council. The Committee therefore, recommend that the aforesaid issues should be discussed at the ensuing Zonal meeting to be held in Shillong and the outcome of the same may be apprised to the Committee.

B. Finalisation of the National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) and review of existing Schemes of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR)

(i) National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP)

3.67 The Department have stated that with a view to provide computerized Record of Rights (RoRs) and other data based certificates

etc. to citizens for securing agricultural and non-agricultural credit based on land assets, a modified programme *viz.* National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM), rechristened as National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP), has been formulated by merging the two schemes of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). The Department have stated that Rs. 3104 crore have been proposed during the Eleventh Plan for NLRMP. The NLRMP is awaiting EFC clearance, which would be placed before the Cabinet for approval thereafter. When asked about the comments of the concerned Departments/Ministries and the Planning Commission on the draft EFC Memo Note, the Department have informed that the comments on the EFC Memo Note for the scheme of NLRMP have not been received from the concerned Departments/Ministries (except the Ministries of Space and Panchayati Raj, who have offered their comments and have generally supported the proposal). The others have been reminded to submit their comments to this Department at the earliest.

3.68 The Committee note from the Outcome Budget that from the year 2007-08 onwards, Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) and Comprehensive Modernisation of Land Records (CMLR) have been shown as merged into National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP). While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, the Committee had been informed that the aforesaid two schemes were proposed to be merged into the 'National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management' (NPCLRM), which was proposed to be started on a pilot basis. The information furnished by the Department during the course of the examination of the current Demands for Grants indicates that the NPCLRM has been renamed as NLRMP and the programme is awaiting EFC Clearance, which would be placed before the Cabinet for approval thereafter. Besides the comments on EFC Note from some of the Ministries/Departments are still awaited. The Committee note that there is utter confusion with regard to the name and restructuring of the schemes related to land records and its computerisation. The Committee fail to understand how a restructured programme can be implemented without getting EFC Clearance and the Cabinet approval. It is difficult to analyse the performance of such an important scheme in the absence of clarity with regard to guidelines and restructuring of the programme. The Committee strongly disapprove the way the planning and restructuring of the schemes is being made by the Department. The whole process of

restructuring and preparation of guidelines should be completed before 1 April of the year in which a Five Year Plan starts so as to ensure effective implementation of the schemes. Almost one year has been wasted and till today, there is no clarity on the stand of the Department with regard to merging, restructuring of the programme. The Department owe an explanation with regard to utter confusion in the implementation of the important schemes of the Department. The modalities and the guidelines of the restructured programme should be furnished to the Committee expeditiously.

3.69 The Committee, while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, had expressed series reservations on the proposed restructured programme *i.e.* NPCLRM, now restructured as NLRMP. The aforesaid reservations were again reiterated in 31st Action Taken Report (refer para 31) as under:—

- (i) the restructured programme would help only the good performing States and the worse performing States again would be at a disadvantageous situation;
- (ii) there is a peculiar problem in North-eastern States where cadastral survey has not been done in some of the States and no land records exist. In view of this scenario, the Committee had strongly recommended the Government to continue SRA&ULR and address the shortcomings by restructuring some of its components.”

The Committee would like the Department to clarify how the concerns expressed by the Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year and reiterated in the Action Taken Report would be taken into consideration in the restructured programme.

- (ii) Evaluation of programmes related to Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

3.70 Started in 1988-89 as a pilot scheme in eight States the Scheme envisages computerisation of ownership and plot-wise details for ensuring that land owners get computerized copies of Record of Rights (RoRs) on demand. During the Ninth Plan (1997-2002) Rs. 169.13 crore were released whereas during Tenth Plan (2002-2007) Rs. 152 crore were released under the scheme.

3.71 Some achievements under the scheme of CLR are given below:—

- (a) States which have completed RoR data entry: Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal.

- (b) States which have placed RoR data on websites : Andhra Pradesh, (adangal Pani) Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Uttarakhand.
- (c) States which have stopped manual issue of RoRs : Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal.

3.72 No separate provision has been made for CLR during the years 2007-08 and 2008-09 as the Scheme has been merged with NLRMP under which funds are being released. Rs. 145 crore have been released during 2007-08 for items common under CLR and NLRMP and SRA and NLRMP. During 2008-09 under the Budget Estimates of Department of Land Resources Rs. 473 crore has been provided for NLRMP.

3.73 The Outcome Budget (2008-09) of Department of Land Resources has indicated that during the year 2006-07 as against the Quantifiable Deliverables of the installation of Hardware and Software in 75 sub-Divisions, the achievement was 2 sub-Divisions. Delay in the release of funds by the States to implementing agencies, non-availability of data entry agencies in some of the States and lack of trained staff to manage the Computer Centres have been indicated as the main constraints in this regard. Again with regard to setting up of district data level centres for 50 districts, the achievement has been indicated as 27 districts.

3.74 While reviewing the work done under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) so far, the Committee find that although a total of Rs. 321.13 crore has been released for CLR, very little work has been done at the ground level. For instance there are only three States viz Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand which have completed the RoR data entry work and put the same on their website and stopped manual issue of RoRs. In the remaining States the progress varies from State to State. For instance Chhattisgarh has completed the RoR data entry work and put on the website. However, it has not stopped the issue of manual RORs. Further, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have completed the RoR data entry work and stopped issue of manual RoRs. However, these States have not put the RoR data on the website. Goa has completed data entry work only.

The Committee while reviewing the State-wise progress would like to emphasize that urgent steps should be taken to ensure that the RoR data entry work is completed in the remaining States and

the data is put on the website. Besides where the RoR data work has been computerized, there is an urgent need to stop the manual issue of RoR. The Department should take the desired steps in this regard.

3.75 As regards the performance of CLR during the years 2006-07 and 2007-08, the Committee find that although the financial achievement is almost 100 per cent, there are serious shortfalls in the physical achievement. Against the physical target of installation of Hardware and Software in 75 sub-Divisions, the achievement upto 31 March, 2007 as indicated in the Outcome Budget is 2 sub-Divisions only. Again with regard to setting up of district data level centres for 50 districts, the achievement has been indicated as 27 districts. Various reasons like the delay in the release of funds by the States to implementing agencies, non-availability of data entry agencies and lack of trained staff to manage the Computer Centres have been cited as the reasons for under-performance. The Committee express serious concern over the mis-match between the physical and financial achievement during the year 2006-07. During the year 2007-08 in the Outcome Budget in the Quantifiable Deliverables and achievement column the specific targets have not been indicated. The Committee express serious concern over not indicating specific targets during the year 2007-08. In this regard, the Committee would like that the physical achievement under the programme during the year 2007-08 may be indicated in clear terms so as to analyze the position of the implementation of the programme during the aforesaid year. Besides, corrective actions with regard to the various problems being faced in the implementation of the programme should be taken urgently so as to achieve the objective of computerization of land records in all the States within the stipulated time frame.

Need for Satellite imaging of land records

3.76 The Committee note that land records are vital documents. In the absence of proper land records, there are always apprehensions in the mind of a person who wants to purchase property. In the absence of a clear title, there is no guarantee that a person gets the conclusive right with regard to the property purchased by him. Besides, the land records are always needed for various purposes like getting loans from Banks and getting benefits under various schemes of the Government like Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY). The efforts made by the State Governments with regard to updation and computerisation of land records are being supplemented by making

allocations under the schemes related to computerisation of land records, now named as NLRMP. The Committee note that the thrust of the Government is on computerisation of land records. However, they wish to emphasise that the very purpose of computerisation of land records is defeated if proper land records are not available. Therefore, there is an urgent need, first of all, to have the correct and updated land records. The Committee feel that a solution to the problem should be sought through technological intervention. Nowadays e-enabled database through satellite imagery have been developed through which any plot of land or house can be easily located through the web. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that ways and means should be found out through technological intervention to achieve the objective of having correct and up-to-date land records so as to give the required security to the owner of the land. The Department should take the desired initiatives in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

NEW DELHI;
16 April, 2008

27 Chaitra, 1930 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT SHOWING SUMMARY OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES FOR THE YEAR 2007-2008 AND 2008-2009

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

Summary of Demand for Grants

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme/ Programme	Major Head	Budget Estimates 2007-08	Revised Estimates 2007-08	Budget Estimates 2008-09
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Plan				
	Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)	2501 3601	1088.45 0.10	1053.45 0.10	1692.40 0.10
	TOTAL (IWMP)		1088.55	1053.55	1692.50
2.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)**	2506 3601 3602	1.50 129.00 1.00	1.50 129.00 1.00	5.00 415.50 5.00
	TOTAL (NPCLRM)		131.50*	131.50	425.50
3.	Professional Support etc. Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.	2501 3601	83.10 6.00	28.20 6.00	#
	TOTAL – PROF. SUPPORT		89.10	34.20	
4.	Bio-fuel	2501	45.00	45.00	45.00
5.	R&R Policy & Others Schemes	2501 3601	3.00 1.50	0.90 0.00	2.00 0.00
	TOTAL – R&R POLICY & OTHERS SCHEMES		4.50	0.90	2.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Lumpsum Provision for the N.E Region and Sikkim				
1.	Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)	2552	112.45	112.45	182.50
2.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)	2552	13.50	13.50	47.50
3.	Professional Support etc. Professional Support, Capacity Building, M&E, IEC, TDET etc.	2552	9.90	3.80	#
4.	Bio-fuel	2552	5.00	5.00	5.00
5.	R&R Policy & Others	2552	0.50	0.10	0.00
	TOTAL : NE Region		141.35	134.85	235.00
	TOTAL PLAN : (Land Resources)		1500.00	1400.00	2400.00
	NON-PLAN				
1.	Sectt.-Economic Services	3451	3.78	3.86	3.90
	GRAND TOTAL - PLAN & NON PLAN		1503.78	1403.86	2403.90

#Provision merged with the provision for IWMP.

**Renamed as National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP)

APPENDIX II

THE STATUS OF STATES SENDING MANUAL/ONLINE MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORTS (MPR)

State	Online/Manual Reporting		
	IWDP	DPAP	DDP
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh	Online	Online	Online
Arunachal Pradesh	Manual	X	X
Assam	Manual	X	X
Bihar	Manual	Manual	X
Chhattisgarh	Online	Online	X
Goa	Manual	X	X
Gujarat	Manual	Manual	Manual
Haryana	Online	X	Online
Himachal Pradesh	Manual	Manual	Manual
Jammu & Kashmir	Manual	Manual	Manual
Jharkhand	Manual	Manual	X
Karnataka	Manual	Manual	Manual
Kerala	Manual	X	X
Madhya Pradesh	Manual	Manual	X
Maharashtra	Manual	Manual	X
Manipur	Manual	X	X
Meghalaya	Manual	X	X
Mizoram	Manual	X	X
Nagaland	Manual	X	X
Orissa	Manual	Manual	X

1	2	3	4
Punjab	Manual	X	X
Rajasthan	Manual	Manual	Manual
Sikkim	Manual	X	X
Tamil Nadu	Manual	Manual	X
Tripura	Manual	X	X
Uttar Pradesh	Manual	Manual	X
Uttarakhand	Manual	Manual	X
West Bengal	Manual	Manual	X
Total States	28	16	7
Online Reporting	3	2	2
Manual Reporting	25	14	5

APPENDIX III

IWDP-STATE-WISE PENDING UTILIZATION CERTIFICATES

(Rs. in lakh)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	49.04	1	49.04
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	14	364.68	7	166.06
3.	Assam	35	1802.56	16	856.35
4.	Bihar	8	330.00	7	288.75
5.	Gujarat	1	81.50	1	81.50
6.	Haryana	5	203.34	1	41.25
7.	Himachal Pradesh	4	176.41	0	0.00
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	1	41.25	1	41.25
9.	Jharkhand	1	41.25	1	41.25
10.	Karnataka	6	337.70	5	296.45
11.	Kerala	10	409.03	10	409.03
12.	Madhya Pradesh	1	49.50	0	0.00
13.	Maharashtra	1	41.25	0	0.00
14.	Manipur	8	387.75	8	387.75
15.	Meghalaya	23	303.96	0	0.00
16.	Orissa	10	421.938	9	380.688
17.	Rajasthan	1	41.25	1	41.25
18.	Sikkim	8	284.20	8	284.20
19.	Tamil Nadu	6	290.06	6	290.06
20.	Uttar Pradesh	1	99.70	1	99.70
21.	West Bengal	8	201.64	8	201.64
	Total	153	5958.00	91	3947.318

APPENDIX IV

DPAP – STATE-WISE PENDING UTILIZATION CERTIFICATES

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	0.23	0	0
2.	Bihar	26	9.19	26	9.19
3.	Chhattisgarh	2	0.61	0	0
4.	Gujarat	3	1.79	3	1.79
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	3	5.23	3	5.23
6.	Jharkhand	23	14.95	23	14.95
7.	Madhya Pradesh	3	0.95	0	0
8.	Maharashtra	10	3.31	10	3.31
9.	Orissa	8	4.73	0	0
10.	Tamil Nadu	2	0.17	2	0.17
11.	Uttar Pradesh	3	1.55	3	1.55
12.	Uttarakhand	13	5.46	13	5.46
13.	West Bengal	18	10.26	18	10.26
	Total	115	58.43	101	51.91

APPENDIX V

DDP- STATE-WISE PENDING UTILIZATION CERTIFICATES

(Rs. in lakh)

S. No.	State	As on 31.1.2008		As on 20.03.2008	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1.	Himachal Pradesh	4	695.25	4	695.25
2.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	337.50	2	337.50
3.	Karnataka	2	212.40	2	212.40
4.	Rajasthan	16	905.06	0	0
	Total	24	2150.21	8	1245.15

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2007-2008)

MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26 MARCH, 2008

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room G-074, Ground Floor, Parliament Library Building (PLB), New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
7. Shri Sita Ram Singh
8. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
9. Shri Tarit Baran Topdar
10. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
11. Shri Beni Prasad Verma

Rajya Sabha

12. Shri Balihari Babu
13. Shri Jayantilal Barot
14. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
15. Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal
16. Dr. Ram Prakash
17. Shri P.R. Rajan
18. Ms. Sushila Tiriya

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Veena Sharma — *Director*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Deputy Secretary-II*
5. Shri Hoti Lal — *Deputy Secretary-II*

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

1. Shrimati Rita Sinha, Secretary
2. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, Special Secretary and Financial Adviser
3. Shri Bhaskar Chatterjee, Additional Secretary
4. Shri B. Pradhan, Joint Secretary
5. Shri A.K. Singh, Director
6. Dr. D. Ramakrishnaiah, Director
7. Shri V.M. Arora, Director

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened for taking oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2008-2009).

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

3. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2008-2009). The Secretary, Department of Land Resources, made a brief presentation on main features of various schemes in the context of examination of Demands for Grants (2008-2009) of the Department.

4. The members, thereafter, raised several issues such as need for bringing out a 'Land Use Policy' for addressing issues arising out of acquisition of agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes like setting up of Special Economic Zones (SEZs), housing etc., creation of infrastructure to carry out watershed programmes by Panchayats, satellite mapping of land particularly in hilly areas of the North-East, stepping-up of monitoring mechanism for Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) etc.

5. The Secretary, Department of Land Resources, responded to the queries raised by the members. The Chairman, then asked the Secretary to furnish written information on the queries raised by members replies to which were not readily available with them during the sitting.

6. A verbatim record of the proceeding has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2007-2008)

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 10 APRIL, 2008

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'D', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri D. Narbula
7. Shri A.F.G. Osmani
8. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
9. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
10. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
11. Shri Tarit Baran Topdar
12. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
13. Shri Beni Prasad Verma

Rajya Sabha

14. Shri Balihari Babu
15. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
16. Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal
17. Dr. Chandan Mitra
18. Shri P.R. Rajan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Director*
4. Shri A.K.Shah — *Deputy Secretary Grade-II*
5. Shri Hoti Lal — *Deputy Secretary Grade-II*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Chairman then considered and adopted the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) with slight modifications.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) and adopted the report with slight modifications as indicated in the *Annexure*.

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

The Committee then adjourned to meet after lunch at 1400 hrs.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of the Minutes dated 10.04.2008)

S.No.	Page No.	Para No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4
1.	21	3.39	<p><i>Add after para 3.38 as under:</i></p> <p>"The Committee note that the Minister of Rural Development has taken up the issue of acquisition of agricultural land for setting up of SEZs with the Minister of Commerce and Industry and has emphasized that prime agricultural land should not be acquired for establishing SEZs and these Zones need to be established invariably on wastelands. In unavoidable situation if it is necessary to acquire agricultural land for SEZs, the requiring body must develop equal area of wastelands simultaneously so that the loss of agricultural land could be compensated. While appreciating the initiatives taken by the Minister of Rural Development, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue this issue further with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Besides, the concerns of the Committee in this regard expressed while examining Demands for Grants of the previous year and reiterated here again should be brought to the knowledge of the Ministry of Commerce & Industry and the Cabinet Secretariat. The Committee desire that not only in the case of SEZs including housing colonies whenever agricultural land is acquired for any non-agricultural purpose, it should be made mandatory on the requisitioning authority to develop at least an equal</p>

1	2	3	4
			area of wasteland into agricultural land. Exemption from the development of equal area of wasteland into agricultural land may be considered only in the States where adequate area of wastelands is not available.
2.	23	3.45	<p><i>Add after para 3.44 as under :</i></p> <p>“The Committee are unhappy to note that an important scheme ‘National Mission on Bio – diesel’ that seeks to reduce country’s 20 per cent import dependence on petroleum is still at a nascent stage even after submission of the Report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on ‘Development of Bio–diesel’ way back in April, 2003. The Committee have been informed that the aforesaid ‘National Mission on Bio–diesel’ seeks to obtain Bio–diesel from seeds of plants like <i>Jatropha (Ratanjot)</i> and <i>Pongamia (Karanj)</i> by their plantation on wasteland/degraded land available in different States. It is alarming to note that even after an elapse of five years since the submission of the report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on the aforesaid matter, the proposal has still not been approved by the Government. As per the latest information furnished by the Department on the above issue, the proposal has been processed by the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) on 9 October, 2006 and has been considered by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) on 8 March, 2007 and currently is before the Group of Ministers (GoM) wherein a</p>

presentation by the Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Science & Technology and ICAR is awaited on the proposal. The Committee have further been informed that the next meeting is yet to take place. In this connection during the course of evidence, it came out that around 16.49 crore saplings of *Jatropha* and *Pongamia* plants have already been planted with an expenditure of Rs. 49.50 crore in different States and an early clearance of the proposal from the Group of Ministers is essential in order that this expenditure does not go waste. In this connection the Committee in their all previous Reports on Demands for Grants relating to the Department of Land Resources from 2004-05 onwards have been pursuing the Government for expeditious clearance of the proposal. The Committee are, however, constrained to note that the desired results are not forthcoming. Since the danger of loss of saplings as stated above is looming large for want of necessary funds, the Committee, therefore, once again recommend expeditious clearance of the proposal by the Group of Ministers so that Rs. 50 crore Plan outlay is utilised by the Department during 2008-09. While recommending for expeditious clearance of 'National Mission on Bio-diesel', the Committee may like to emphasise that the *Jatropha/Pongamia* cultivation in the country should be done without affecting the food security and agricultural land of the country."

APPENDIX VIII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

S.No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.5	<p>The Committee note that direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha is not being followed in the right spirit. This is evident from the considerable delay in making the statement by the Minister on various reports of the Committee. As per the direction, the Minister should make the statement within six months of presentation of the Report to Parliament, which has not been done. The statements have been made after 10 to 21 months of the presentation of the concerned Reports. The Committee desire that, in future, the statement under direction 73A should be made within the prescribed time limit.</p>
2.	3.8	<p>The Committee find that the Department have been allocated Rs. 6,526 crore as against the proposed allocation of Rs. 5,965 crore during the Tenth Plan. Out of the allocated amount of Rs. 6,526 crore, the actual expenditure as on 31 March, 2007 was Rs. 5,526 crore, thus the underspending was to the tune of Rs. 1000 crore. The Committee further find that the main reason for not utilizing the allocated amount during the Tenth Plan was on account of no new initiative having been taken during the Tenth Plan, for which Rs. 1,000 crore were exclusively earmarked. The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made. Even when no specific scheme was proposed, a</p>

1	2	3
		<p>substantial outlay of Rs. 1,000 crore was earmarked at the start of the Tenth Plan. No new scheme could be taken during the whole period of five years resulting in shortfall in expenditure of Rs. 1,000 crore. The Committee have repeatedly been recommending for proper planning, particularly, with regard to launching of new schemes. All the preparatory works should be undertaken before the specific outlay for a scheme is earmarked. There is entirely no justification for allocating substantial amount for vague initiatives for which there are no concrete proposals. The Committee would like the Department to convey the concerns of the Committee to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in this regard.</p>
3.	3.9	<p>The Committee note that during the year 2007-08 <i>i.e.</i> the first year of the Eleventh Plan, the Department had proposed allocation of Rs. 2840.46 crore, out of which Rs. 1500 crore were allocated at Budget Estimates stage. The allocation was further reduced at RE stage by Rs. 100 crore, thus Rs. 1400 crore were actually allocated during the aforesaid year. The actual releases as on 15 March 2008 are over Rs. 1337.69 crore, thus resulting into underspending of Rs. 62.31 crore. Further during the year 2008-09, out of the proposed allocation of Rs. 3622.50 crore, the outlay earmarked was Rs. 2400 crore. The Committee note from the aforesaid position that the Department have not been able to utilise even the reduced allocation during the year 2007-08. The main underspending has been stated to be under 'Professional Support', due to its being a new scheme and 'Externally Aided Projects' due to the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>low absorption capacity of the State Government. The Committee hope that during the year 2008-09, there would be cent-per cent utilisation of outlay under the scheme 'Professional Support'. As regards 'Externally Aided Projects', the Committee would like to be apprised what the Department mean by the absorption capacity of the State Governments. The Committee would also like that all the corrective actions should be taken so as to achieve the indicated objectives under the aforesaid scheme/proposal.</p>
4.	3.10	<p>The detailed analysis scheme-wise has been done in the subsequent paras of the Report. Here the Committee conclude from the analysis of the data given by the Department during the first two years of Eleventh Plan that the Department are not getting adequate allocation. Further the Committee also observe that to get the allocation as estimated and proposed, the Department have to strive hard to ensure cent-per cent utilisation under different schemes along with achieving the physical targets.</p>
5.	3.15	<p>The Committee find that the Department had proposed an outlay of Rs 25,835.67 crore to the Planning Commission for the Eleventh Plan mainly comprising of Rs. 20,700 crore for IWMP. Under IWMP Rs. 6,522 crore are for committed liabilities of on going watershed projects in the first two years of the Eleventh Plan period, Rs. 12,300 crore for funding new watershed projects over the next three years of the Plan and Rs. 1000 crore for necessary 'Infrastructural Support' totaling to Rs. 19,822 crore. The Planning Commission</p>

initially agreed to the allocation of Rs. 16,420.84 crore, which has subsequently been revised to Rs. 17,205.48 crore. The revision was necessitated after reviewing the needs of the Department and in view of the suggested modifications in design and contents of the major programmes envisaged for the current Plan. These Programmes are Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP), National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP), National Mission on Bio-diesel, Externally Aided Projects (EAPs), Professional Support and National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy. In this connection, the Committee have been informed that as per the Parthasarthy Committee Report an estimated 125 million hectares of rainfed areas is to be developed with an investment outlay of Rs. 1,50,000 crore in the next 15 years. Out of 125 million hectares, 75 million hectares of rainfed area is to be developed by the Department of Land Resources in the next 15 years by way of covering 25 million hectares in each of the coming three Five Year Plans. Therefore, the target before the Department during the Eleventh Plan is the treatment of 25 million hectares of rainfed areas in the country. After perusal of the outlays as proposed by the Department and work to be taken up by the Department during the current Plan, the Committee find that the Plan allocation of Rs. 17,205.48 crore is not sufficient for the Department to accomplish the task.

6.

3.16

The Committee further note that during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan *i.e.* during 2007-08 and 2008-09, Rs. 3800 crore have been allocated. The total amount of

1	2	3
		<p>allocation for the Eleventh Plan is Rs. 17,205.48 crore. Thus the proportional allocation for the two years comes to around Rs. 6,880 crore. Thus there is shortfall of Rs. 3080 crore in the proportionate allocation during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan. Keeping in view the aforesaid scenario of allocations being made under different schemes of the Department, the Committee have their apprehensions about the set target of development of rainfed area of 25 million hectares during the Eleventh Plan being achieved. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend that adequate allocation should be provided to the Department to achieve the set targets under different schemes. While recommending for higher outlay during the Eleventh Plan, the Committee would also like that the Department should make every effort to ensure that the allocation provided in a year is meaningfully utilised.</p>
7.	3.25	<p>The Committee have persistently been recommending in their Reports presented during 12th, 13th and 14th Lok Sabha that all the activities related to watershed programmes being undertaken by the different Ministries of Union Government should be brought under one umbrella. Pursuant to the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee, the Ministry of Rural Development initially transferred DDP, DPAP and Watershed component of its 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. With the continuous pursuance of the issue</p>

of bringing the watershed activities of different Ministries under one umbrella, the Government finally agreed to the recommendation of the Committee and the National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) was constituted under the Ministry of Agriculture with the initial allocation of Rs. 100 crore during the year 2007-08. As a further initiative on the issue of convergence, the Department have merged three area development programmes *viz.* Integrated Watershed Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) into a single programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). In the sitting of the National Rainfed Area Authority held on 11 February, 2008, the Hariyali Guidelines 2003 have been revised and named as Common Guidelines, 2008. The Common Guidelines were prepared by the Department and finally approved by the Governing Body of the National Rainfed Area Authority on 11 February, 2008. The Department have informed that the aforesaid Guidelines would come into force from 1 April, 2008. Further, the Guidelines would be made fully operational by January, 2009. While appreciating the initiatives taken by the Department for bringing convergence into the watershed activities being undertaken by the different Departments/Ministries in pursuance of the persistent recommendations of the Standing Committee, the Committee find that there is an inordinate delay in the finalisation of the Common Guidelines. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the process of operationalisation of the Guidelines should be accelerated keeping in view the task of

1	2	3
		covering target of 25 million hectare of rainfed areas during the current Plan period of which the first year <i>i.e.</i> 2007-08 is already over. For this, the time frames for various stages of operationalisation of the guidelines need to be tightened considerably and strict monitoring be ensured.
8.	3.26	The Committee have also been repeatedly emphasizing on the convergence of watershed activities at the State level as well as at the ground level. In this regard, the Committee find that under the Common Guidelines, a provision has been made for setting-up dedicated institutional structures at national, district, project and village level. The Committee appreciate the aforesaid initiative taken by the Department which is in line with the persistent recommendations of the Committee. The Committee would like that the institutional structures at national, district, project and village level are set up expeditiously so as to have proper coordination and an idea of the actual work being undertaken at the ground level with regard to watershed activities in the country.
9.	3.27	The Department have furnished a statement indicating the comparison between the various features of Hariyali Guidelines 2003 and Common Guidelines 2008. The Committee note that one of the provisions with regard to foreclosure which was not provided under the previous Guidelines has now been provided under the revised Common Guidelines, 2008. The Committee in their respective Reports have been observing that a number of projects under different watershed schemes <i>viz.</i> Integrated Watershed Development Programme

(IWDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) were being foreclosed (refer para 4.59 of 27 Report). On the insistence of the Standing Committee, the Department have even indicated the position of foreclosure in the Outcome Budget (2008-09). The Committee fail to understand how the projects were being foreclosed when there was no provision in the Hariyali Guidelines in this regard. Further, the Committee understand that foreclosure of a project is the last resort available with the implementing agency when it is noticed that the project is not at all viable. The foreclosure of a project leads to crucial wastage of the resources. The Committee are unable to comprehend the justification of making a special provision for foreclosure in the Common Guidelines, 2008, which indicates that the implementing agencies may be free to foreclose any project at any time. The Committee would like a specific clarification of the Department in this regard so as to understand the concept and comment further on the issue.

10.

3.34

The Committee learn from a statement made by the Minister of Rural Development in Lok Sabha on 3 March, 2008 that Ministry of Rural Development have developed a system for online reporting of Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) of rural development schemes including IWDP, DPAP and DDP. Although sufficient progress in this regard has been made with regard to sending Quarterly Progress Reports on-line, the progress with regard to Monthly Progress Reports is far from satisfactory. For instance, under IWDP out

1	2	3
		<p>of 28 States only 3 States of Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Haryana have the system of online reporting of Monthly Progress Reports. Similarly, out of 16 States under DPAP and 7 States under DDP only 2 States have a system of reporting online the Monthly Progress Reports. Andhra Pradesh is the only State, which has developed online monitoring of all these Area Development Programmes. The Committee further note that the process of online monitoring has been started by the Department of Land Resources during the year 2007-08 and the Department propose to make it fully operational by the year 2008-09. Keeping in view the status of implementation of the project of online monitoring of Monthly Progress Reports as indicated above, the Committee have doubts about achieving the target of making the system fully operational by 2008-09. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Department should work on a war footing so as to achieve the targets by the stipulated deadline.</p>
11	3.39	<p>The Committee note that the Minister of Rural Development has taken up the issue of acquisition of agricultural land for setting up of SEZs with the Minister of Commerce and Industry and has emphasized that prime agricultural land should not be acquired for establishing SEZs and these Zones need to be established invariably on wastelands. In unavoidable situation if it is necessary to acquire agricultural land for SEZs, the requiring body must develop equal area of wastelands simultaneously so that the loss of agricultural land could be compensated. While appreciating the initiatives taken by the Minister of Rural</p>

Development, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue this issue further with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Besides, the concerns of the Committee in this regard expressed while examining Demands for Grants of the previous year and reiterated here again should be brought to the knowledge of the Ministry of Commerce & Industry and the Cabinet Secretariat. The Committee desire that not only in the case of SEZs including housing colonies whenever agricultural land is acquired for any non-agricultural purpose, it should be made mandatory on the requisitioning authority to develop at least an equal area of wasteland into agricultural land. Exemption from the development of equal area of wasteland into agricultural land may be considered only in the States where adequate area of wastelands is not available.

12.

3.40

The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year had also recommended to have a National Land use Policy (refer para 3.19 of 27th Report) 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 note that the National Land use and Conservation Board under the Ministry of Agriculture is dealing with the issue of the Land Use Policy. The Committee are concerned to note that no sitting of the aforesaid Board has been held for the last many years as informed by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources, during the course of oral evidence. The Committee

1	2	3
		<p>deplere the way such an important national issue is being addressed by the Government. The Committee strongly recommend to take up the issue urgently with the Ministry of Agriculture so that a National Land Use Policy is formulated expeditiously. The Committee may be informed about the concrete action taken in this regard.</p>
13.	3.41	<p>The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year (refer para 3.19 of 27th Report) had been informed that the data with regard to the acquisition of land for Special Economic Zones is being collected by the Department from the concerned Ministry of Commerce and Industry. While examining the Demands for Grants for the year 2008-09 again, the Department have informed that the aforesaid data as asked by the Committee is being collected. The Committee fail to understand even after one year has elapsed since the Committee desired the aforesaid data, the same could not be collected from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The Committee while deploring the casual manner of the Ministry in this regard desired that the data should be obtained expeditiously and furnished to the Committee. Besides, the specific data with regard to the acquisition of agricultural land for setting up SEZs may also be obtained. The information in this regard may separately be asked for single crop, double crop and multi crop agricultural land.</p>
14.	3.45	<p>The Committee are unhappy to note that an important scheme 'National Mission on Bio – diesel' that seeks to reduce country's</p>

20 per cent import dependence on petroleum is still at a nascent stage even after submission of the Report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on 'Development of Bio-diesel' way back in April, 2003. The Committee have been informed that the aforesaid 'National Mission on Bio-diesel' seeks to obtain Bio-diesel from seeds of plants like *Jatropha (Ratanjot)* and *Pongamia (Karanj)* by their plantation on wasteland/degraded land available in different States. It is alarming to note that even after an elapse of five years since the submission of the report by the Committee set up by the Planning Commission on the aforesaid matter, the proposal has still not been approved by the Government. As per the latest information furnished by the Department on the above issue, the proposal has been processed by the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) on 9 October, 2006 and has been considered by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) on 8 March, 2007 and currently is before the Group of Ministers (GOMs) wherein a presentation by the Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Science & Technology and ICAR is awaited on the proposal. The Committee have further been informed that the next meeting is yet to take place. In this connection during the course of evidence, it came out that around 16.49 crore saplings of *Jatropha* and *Pongamia* plants have already been planted with an expenditure of Rs. 49.50 crore in different States and an early clearance of the proposal from the Group of Ministers is essential in order that this expenditure does not go waste. In this connection the Committee in their all

previous Reports on Demands for Grants relating to the Department of Land Resources from 2004-05 onwards have been pursuing the Government for expeditious clearance of the proposal. The Committee are, however, constrained to note that the desired results are not forthcoming. Since the danger of loss of saplings as stated above is looming large for want of necessary funds, the Committee, therefore, once again recommend expeditious clearance of the proposal by the Group of Ministers so that Rs. 50 crore Plan outlay is utilised by the Department during 2008-09. While recommending for expeditious clearance of 'National Mission on Bio-diesel', the Committee may like to emphasise that the *Jatropha/Pongamia* cultivation in the country should be done without affecting the food security and agricultural land of the country.

15.

3.52

While reviewing the performance of IWDP during the Tenth Plan (2002-07), the Committee find that as against the outlays, the utilisation in terms of percentage of releases was 91.87 per cent, 91.58 per cent and 90.88 per cent respectively during the first three years of the Tenth Plan i.e. 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05. The Committee also find that in the remaining two years viz. 2005-06 and 2006-2007 of the Tenth Plan, utilisation in terms of percentage of releases was 100.47 per cent and 99.02 per cent. The Committee find that the reason for under-spending in the first three years of the Tenth Plan as indicated by the Department is that a large amount of outlays was utilised for meeting the committed liabilities of on going watershed projects as also failure on the part of North Eastern States

1	2	3
		<p>to utilise funds for these projects. For instance during 2002-03, out of Rs. 450 crore earmarked for IWDP as high as Rs. 150 crore was spent on meeting the committed liabilities of ongoing projects. Similarly during 2003-04 under-spending of Rs. 88 crore was due to non-receipt of new projects from the North Eastern Region. Again during 2004-05 poor absorption of funds by North Eastern States was the reason for slow progress. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid scenario that the expenditure position during the Tenth Plan has been satisfactory except in the case of the North Eastern States where no new projects were demanded. The Committee, therefore, feel that there is an urgent need to review the position of development of wastelands in the North Eastern Region. The various problems encountered in North Eastern Region have been dealt with in subsequent paras of the Report. Here the Committee wish to emphasize that all corrective action should be taken so as to ensure full utilization of outlay during the Eleventh Plan.</p>
16.	3.55	<p>The Committee note that the three programmes of the Department <i>viz.</i> Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP), the major programme of the Department related to wastelands development in the country alongwith two other area development programmes <i>viz.</i> Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) have been merged into an integrated programme i.e. Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) during the Eleventh Plan. Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) is being</p>

implemented from the year 2007-08 *i.e.* the first year of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee note that during the year 2007-08 against the proposed allocation of Rs. 2086.46 crore, Rs. 1201 crore were provided at BE stage. The allocation was reduced by Rs. 35 crore at RE stage, thus Rs. 1166 crore were available during the year 2007-08. Out of Rs. 1166 crore, the expenditure as on 15 March, 2008 is Rs. 1160.64 crore. During the year 2008-09, Rs. 1875 crore have been allocated against the proposed allocation of Rs. 2750 crore. The Committee have been apprised that the Department have decided to complete 45,000 ongoing watershed projects in the first two years of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee further note that Rs. 6,522 crore have been proposed for the committed liabilities of ongoing projects during the Eleventh Plan. Even if the total allocation earmarked during the first two years under IWMP is taken into consideration, only Rs. 3,041 crore (Rs. 1166 crore R.E. of 2007-08 + Rs. 1875 crore B.E. of 2008-09) have been allocated during the aforesaid years. Thus, if only the committed liabilities are taken into consideration, there is shortfall of Rs. 3,481 crore even to meet the committed liabilities for the ongoing projects. The Committee fail to understand how the Department propose to meet the committed liabilities during the first two years of Eleventh Plan with the aforesaid shortfall in the allocations. Further the Committee are unable to comprehend how the new projects would be taken under IWMP with the meagre allocation of resources. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid scenario that the target of developing 25 million hectares of rainfed

1	2	3
17.	3.61	<p>area during the Eleventh Plan seems to be a distant reality with the position of the allocation of resources during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan as being stated above. The Committee strongly recommend that desired initiatives should be taken to complete the 45,000 ongoing projects in the stipulated timeframe of two years so that the additional projects as per the modified guidelines can be taken up and the set targets could be achieved. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should pursue with the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for adequate outlay under IWMP.</p> <p>The Committee are constrained to note that as many as 357 Utilisation Certificates (UCs) amounting to Rs. 281.67 crore are outstanding as on 31 December 2007 in respect of the three Area Development Programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In this connection the Committee also find that out of these as many as 153 UCs pertain to IWDP and 115 UCs relate to DPAP involving approximately Rs. 60 crore each. Remaining 24 UCs relate to DDP amounting to Rs. 21.50 crore. The Committee further find that as on 20 March, 2008 there has been a slight reduction in the aforesaid outstanding UCs. For instance, under IWDP 91 UCs with an amount of Rs. 39.47 crore, under DPAP 101 UCs with an amount of 51.91 crore and under DDP 8 UCs with an amount of 12.45 crore are outstanding. From the available data, the Committee find that the major defaulting States are Assam, Kerala, Orissa, Manipur and Sikkim under IWDP; Bihar, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Uttarakhand and Maharashtra under DPAP; and</p>

1	2	3
18.	3.63	<p>Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and Karnataka under DDP. The capacity constraints, weak monitoring and lack of will to track out older records etc. have been attributed as the reasons for the above UCs remaining outstanding from various State Governments. The Committee fail to understand how the States like Kerala, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Orissa who have done considerable progress on e-governance are not submitting Utilisation Certificates in time. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend to pursue with the State Governments in this regard. The concrete action taken should be communicated to the Committee.</p> <p>The Committee find that the per hectare norms of the treatment of wasteland were revised from Rs. 4000 per hectare to Rs. 6000 per hectare <i>w.e.f.</i> 1 April 2000. Eight years have passed since the per hectare cost was revised and the various State Governments have represented to the Parthasarthy Committee for increase in the per hectare cost of wasteland. In view of this, the Committee recommend that the issue of hike in per hectare cost needs to be examined by the Department. In this connection, the Committee would like to refer to their earlier recommendation made in this regard as reproduced below (refer para 4.30 of 27th Report):-</p> <p>“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>i.e.</i> Rs. 6,000 per hectare. Besides, the Committee may also be informed whether there is any noticeable cost difference between the development of wastelands</p>

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 while reiterating their stand in this regard would like that the aforesaid observations should be taken into consideration while arriving at the decision on the revised per hectare cost norms.

19.

3.66

The Committee note that there are serious problems in the implementation of the watershed programmes in the North-Eastern Region including Sikkim. One of the issue, which needs consideration is the lack of coordination between different Departments of the State Governments which are mainly responsible for implementing watershed projects in the entire North Eastern Region. Further, in view of the fragile nature of soil and vegetation in North Eastern Areas, the Committee underline the need for special care for preserving the original soil and vegetation while dealing with the land management in these areas. The Committee have been informed by the Department that a zonal meeting is planned in Shillong in May, 2008 for an interaction with the members of the North Eastern Council. The Committee therefore, recommend that the aforesaid issues should be discussed at the ensuing Zonal meeting to be held in Shillong and the outcome of the same may be apprised to the Committee.

1	2	3
20.	3.68	<p>The Committee note from the Outcome Budget that from the year 2007-08 onwards, Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) and Comprehensive Modernisation of Land Records (CMLR) have been shown as merged into National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP). While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, the Committee had been informed that the aforesaid two schemes were proposed to be merged into the 'National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management' (NPCLRM), which was proposed to be started on a pilot basis. The information furnished by the Department during the course of the examination of the current Demands for Grants indicates that the NPCLRM has been renamed as NLRMP and the programme is awaiting EFC Clearance, which would be placed before the Cabinet for approval thereafter. Besides the comments on EFC Note from some of the Ministries/Departments are still awaited. The Committee note that there is utter confusion with regard to the name and restructuring of the schemes related to land records and its computerisation. The Committee fail to understand how a restructured programme can be implemented without getting EFC clearance and the Cabinet approval. It is difficult to analyse the performance of such an important scheme in the absence of clarity with regard to guidelines and restructuring of the programme. The Committee strongly disapprove the way the planning and restructuring of the schemes is being made by the Department. The whole process of</p>

restructuring and preparation of guidelines should be completed before 1 April of the year in which a Five Year Plan starts so as to ensure effective implementation of the schemes. Almost one year has been wasted and till today, there is no clarity on the stand of the Department with regard to merging, restructuring of the programme. The Department owe an explanation with regard to utter confusion in the implementation of the important schemes of the Department. The modalities and the guidelines of the restructured programme should be furnished to the Committee expeditiously.

21.

3.69

The Committee, while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, had expressed series reservations on the proposed restructured programme *i.e.* NPCLRM, now restructured as NLRMP. The aforesaid reservations were again reiterated in 31st Action Taken Report (refer para 31) as under:—

- (i) the restructured programme would help only the good performing States and the worse performing States again would be at a disadvantageous situation;
- (ii) there is a peculiar problem in North-eastern States where cadastral survey has not been done in some of the States and no land records exist. In view of this scenario, the Committee had strongly recommended the Government to continue SRA & ULR and address the shortcomings by restructuring some of its components.”

The Committee would like the Department to clarify how the concerns expressed by

1	2	3
22.	3.74	<p>the Committee while examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year and reiterated in the Action Taken Report would be taken into consideration in the restructured programme.</p> <p>While reviewing the work done under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) so far, the Committee find that although a total of Rs. 321.13 crore has been released for CLR, very little work has been done at the ground level. For instance there are only three States <i>viz.</i> Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand which have completed the RoR data entry work and put the same on their website and stopped manual issue of RoRs. In the remaining States the progress varies from State to State. For instance Chhattisgarh has completed the RoR data entry work and put on the website. However, it has not stopped the issue of manual RORs. Further, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have completed the RoR data entry work and stopped issue of manual RoRs. However, these States have not put the RoR data on the website. Goa has completed data entry work only.</p> <p>The Committee while reviewing the State-wise progress would like to emphasize that urgent steps should be taken to ensure that the RoR data entry work is completed in the remaining States and the data is put on the website. Besides where the RoR data work has been computerized, there is an urgent need to stop the manual issue of RoR. The Department should take the desired steps in this regard.</p>

1	2	3
23.	3.75	<p>As regards the performance of CLR during the years 2006-07 and 2007-08, the Committee find that although the financial achievement is almost 100 per cent, there are serious shortfalls in the physical achievement. Against the physical target of installation of Hardware and Software in 75 sub-Divisions, the achievement upto 31 March, 2007 as indicated in the Outcome Budget is 2 sub-Divisions only. Again with regard to setting up of district data level centres for 50 districts, the achievement has been indicated as 27 districts. Various reasons like the delay in the release of funds by the States to implementing agencies, non-availability of data entry agencies and lack of trained staff to manage the Computer Centres have been cited as the reasons for under-performance. The Committee express serious concern over the mis-match between the physical and financial achievement during the year 2006-07. During the year 2007-08 in the Outcome Budget in the Quantifiable Deliverables and achievement column the specific targets have not been indicated. The Committee express serious concern over not indicating specific targets during the year 2007-08. In this regard, the Committee would like that the physical achievement under the programme during the year 2007-08 may be indicated in clear terms so as to analyze the position of the implementation of the programme during the aforesaid year. Besides, corrective actions with regard to the various problems being faced in the implementation of the programme should be taken urgently so as to achieve the objective of computerization of land records in all the States within the stipulated time frame.</p>

1	2	3
24.	3.76	<p>The Committee note that land records are vital documents. In the absence of proper land records, there are always apprehensions in the mind of a person who wants to purchase property. In the absence of a clear title, there is no guarantee that a person gets the conclusive right with regard to the property purchased by him. Besides, the land records are always needed for various purposes like getting loans from Banks and getting benefits under various schemes of the Government like Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY). The efforts made by the State Governments with regard to updation and computerisation of land records are being supplemented by making allocations under the schemes related to computerisation of land records, now named as NLRMP. The Committee note that the thrust of the Government is on computerisation of land records. However, they wish to emphasise that the very purpose of computerisation of land records is defeated if proper land records are not available. Therefore, there is an urgent need, first of all, to have the correct and updated land records. The Committee feel that a solution to the problem should be sought through technological intervention. Now-a-days e-enabled database through satellite imagery have been developed through which any plot of land or house can be easily located through the web. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that ways and means should be found out through technological intervention to achieve the objective of having correct and up-to-date land records so as to give the required security to the owner of the land. The Department should take the desired initiatives in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.</p>