

5

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

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2004-2005)**

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

FIFTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

FIFTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)
FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA
MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2004-2005)

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

Presented to Lok Sabha on

Laid in Rajya Sabha on



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2005/Phalguna, 1926 (Saka)

C.R.D. No. 008

Price : Rs. 25.00

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

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

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2004-2005)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	11
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	42
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	44
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	49
APPENDICES	
I. Statement showing 9th Plan Outlay & Expenditure	50
II. Extract of the minutes of the tenth sitting of the Committee held on 14.2.2005	52
III. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Second Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha)	56

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

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

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

Rajya Sabha

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

(iv)

27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Secretary*
2. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Assistant Director*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fifth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2004-05) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Second Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 29 December, 2004.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 14 February, 2005.

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

NEW DELHI;
24 February, 2005

5 Phalguna, 1926 (*Saka*)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2004-05) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Second Report on the subject Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 41 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos. 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.37, 2.38, 2.41, 2.44, 2.51, 2.58, 2.69, 2.70, 2.71, 3.14, 3.15, 3.36, 3.37, 3.38, 3.40, 3.41, 3.54, 3.56, 3.65, 3.79, 3.80, 3.81, 3.92, 3.93 and 3.94.

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

Para Nos. 2.52 and 3.20.

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

Para Nos. 2.32, 2.33, 2.56, 3.39 and 3.55.

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

Nil

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

A. Realistic projections of the outlay**Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)**

4. The Committee had noted as below:

“As could be seen from the aforesaid analysis, the under spending of the outlay is the recurring feature during Ninth Plan as well as during the first two years of Tenth Plan. However, the Committee note with satisfaction that Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance have enhanced the allocation of the Department considerably due to the additional responsibilities given to the Department. The Department, during Tenth Plan, has got Rs. 926 crore more than what was proposed. While appreciating the increased allocation of the Department, the Committee would like to emphasise the proper and effective utilization of the scarce resources earmarked for each of the schemes of the Department. In no case there should be underspending and efforts should be made to go deep at the root of underspending and create a positive ground for optimum utilization of the scarce resources. The Committee would also like to emphasise that while projecting outlay to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission, it should be ensured that projections are neither on the higher side nor on the lower side. The projections to the extent possible should be realistic.”

5. The Government have replied as below:

“The Department is making all efforts for effective utilisation of the funds earmarked for each of the schemes. The underspending is a concern mainly in the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP). There is 100 percent utilization in respect of funds earmarked for non-North Eastern (NE) States, but it is lower in case of NE States. This is mainly due to poor absorption capacity of NE States. It may also be mentioned that due to non-applicability of Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) in NE States, the funding under the single programme, IWDP has considerably increased. Nevertheless, all efforts are being made for enhancing the utilization of funds by NE States.”

6. Since 2000-2001, 10 per cent of the outlay under different schemes is earmarked for North-Eastern States. Almost five years have passed since this concept of exclusive allocation was started.

The major area of concern in this regard is the non-utilisation of resources earmarked for such States. In case of the Department of Land Resources, the major factor responsible for under utilization is 10 per cent allocation of outlay under DPAP and DDP, although these schemes are not applicable there. The resources earmarked for these schemes are to be utilized under one watershed scheme being implemented in such areas *i.e.* IWDP. The Committee have no objection on allocating enhanced outlay for North-Eastern States, but the fact that outlay earmarked for the last five years could not be meaningfully utilized due to poor absorption capacity need to be probed. The Committee for the last several years have been expressing their concern on this issue. They would again like the Department to request the North-Eastern States to send their annual projections so that the scarce resources are meaningfully utilised.

B. Development of wastelands through corporate sector/private sector

Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.32 & 2.33)

7. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee find that there is no clarity with regard to objectives of launching Investment Promotional Scheme. On the one side, the Department states that the scheme was started to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/financial institutions; on the other hand, it has been mentioned that the scheme was meant to help poor land owners who own small wastelands by way of subsidy. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position in this regard so as to enable them to comprehend the position with regard to discontinuation of the scheme by Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance”.

Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)

“The Committee in their earlier reports had repeatedly been emphasizing to take certain steps to attract private sector/corporate sector in the field of development of wastelands. As regards, the steps taken by the Department in this direction, the Committee feel that these are not sufficient. Only one correspondence was made with the Chairman/Chief Executive of user industries/major corporate houses in the country. In this direction, the Committee further find that as per the Government’s own admission, the representatives of Ministry, National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), private sector, corporate sector,

Confederation of Indian Industries (CII), Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry (ASSOCHAM), in the various workshops/seminars had assured that they would submit proposals within a short time. It has also been mentioned that nothing came of it later on. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that some sort of enthusiasm was expressed by the corporate sector during the meetings but the need was to further pursue with them and convince them with the appropriate strategy as given by the Committee in their earlier report as stated above so as to really motivate them to this sector."

Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)

8. The Government have replied as below:

"Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) is a Central Sector Scheme launched in 1994-95 to stimulate involvement of corporate sector, financial institutions and private landowners in the development of wastelands. Under the Scheme, Central promotional subsidy to the extent of 25 percent project cost subject to ceiling of Rs. 25 lakh was available. It was envisaged that private landowners would come up to avail this provision for development of their follow wastelands while the corporate sector, with such attractive subsidy rate, would also be stimulated to lease in large chunks of Government wastelands for commercial cultivation. However, in the 8 years of its operation (upto 2002-03), the Scheme could not generate the expected enthusiasm, which was evident from the poor response it got in terms of proposals received under the Scheme. The reasons for this are different for the two categories of target groups *viz.*, landowners and corporate bodies. In case of private land owners, experience has shown that due to the large investments required, substantial loan component and relative attractiveness of other land development schemes like the watershed development programmes which provide more subsidy than the IPS, they had not taken up the scheme in a big way as originally envisaged. On the other hand, though the subsidy under the Scheme was attractive to the corporate sector, interested agencies could not come up with suitable proposals due to bottlenecks in obtaining long term lease rights from the concerned State Governments and the risk and uncertainty involved in wastelands development involving huge expenditures. In view of these facts, the IPS was discontinued from 2003-04."

Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)

“The IPS, initiated in 1994-95, was implemented for 8 years before its closure from 2003-04. During the 8 years of its operation, only 41 proposals covering an area of 1435 hectares with a total cost of Rs. 16.88 crore including a subsidy component of Rs. 1.09 crore only had been taken up. The poor performance was due to the reasons already explained in Para 2.32 above. Though the corporate sector is interested in availing of the provisions of the Scheme, it is handicapped by the lack of suitable means of obtaining long-term lease rights on Government wastelands. Since land is a State subject, the Central Government can only provide a policy direction but cannot force the State Governments for allotment of wastelands to the corporate sector. These issues need to be sorted out at the State level before the corporate sector could take up wastelands development in a big way.”

Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)

9. The Committee are concerned to note that the Investment Promotional Scheme launched with the objective of attracting corporate sector/private sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country was discontinued without addressing the various bottlenecks being faced in this regard. The Committee find that although corporate sector is interested in availing of the provision of the scheme, the major hurdle is lack of suitable means for obtaining long term lease rights on Government wastelands. The Committee would like that the Union Government should find out some solution in consultation with State Governments and corporate/private sector and the Committee should be apprised accordingly so as to enable them to appreciate the decision of the Government to close Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) and comment further in this regard.

C. Conversion of various watershed and other related programmes under Department of Land Resources

Recommendation (Para No. 2.56)

10. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee for the last six years have been recommending strongly to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands at present being handled by different Ministries of Government of India under one umbrella. By noting the latest position in this regard, the Committee feel that ‘in principle’ issue

of convergence has been agreed to by the concerned Ministries. However, the main reservation expressed by the Ministries is their unwillingness to transfer area of activity being undertaken by them in this regard. The Committee also find that Department of Land Resources, has again submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' under which all the activities related to watershed and soil conversion would be brought. They also note that the matter for the time being has been deferred. The Committee further note that in the absence of convergence, the Government has not been able to make some integrated planning on the huge task of developing wastelands in the country. In view of this scenario, the Committee again emphatically recommend to take this issue seriously and the matter regarding various reservations of respective Ministries should be sorted out by discussing the matter across the table and the issue should be finalised expeditiously. The Committee would also like that their concerns in this regard should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat".

11. The Government have replied as below:

"Ministry of Rural Development submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' to the Cabinet Secretariat on 1 October, 2003. A decision in this regard is yet to be taken. The concern of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

An inter-Ministerial Task-Group has also been set up by Planning Commission to examine the convergence of various watershed and other related programmes being implemented by different Ministries."

12. The Committee find that the decision on an important issue of convergence of various watershed and other related programmes being implemented by different Ministries is long pending. While expressing their concern on the undue delay being done in the matter, the Committee in their earlier reports had desired that their concerns should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat. The Department in the reply has simply stated that the concerns of the Committee have been noted for compliance. The Committee while expressing their unhappiness on the way such a serious issue is being taken up by the Government, would like to be clearly informed

whether the Cabinet Secretariat was informed about the concerns of the Committee. The Committee would also like to be informed when the inter-Ministerial Task Force to examine the matter was set up by Planning Commission and the details of the meetings held by the Task Force so far.

D. Performance of the State and District Level Vigilance Committees

Recommendation (Para No. 3.39)

13. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee also find that one aspect suggested by the Department to strengthen the monitoring mechanism is the establishment of State Level and District Level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to critically assess the monitoring of the projects. The Committee, would like to be apprised in how many States/Districts Vigilance Committees have so far been constituted. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the work done by such Vigilance Committees.”

14. The Government have replied as below:

“The State level and District level Vigilance and Monitoring Committees are meant to monitor and review all the programmes of Ministry of Rural Development and not specifically DPAP. No reference with regard to implementation of DPAP in any District/ State has so far received by Department of Land Resources (DoLR) from any such Committee.”

15. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had desired to know about the status and work done by the State and District Level Vigilance Committees. The Department instead of submitting the information categorically has tried to sidetrack the issue by stating that these Committees are meant to review all programmes and not specifically DPAP. The Committee are constrained to note the way the Department has addressed such an important issue which directly falls under the jurisdiction of the Department. They, while expressing their unhappiness, would like to be informed about the status alongwith the work done by such Committees so as to enable them to analyse the position of their usefulness in monitoring and reviewing rural development programmes.

E. Reasons for foreclosure of Desert Development Programme (DDP) Projects

Recommendation (Para No. 3.55)

16. The Committee had noted as below:

“While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee feel that emphasis has to be given in strengthening the monitoring mechanism so as to improve the implementation of the Programme. From the position of implementation as given by the Department, it seems that there are certain problems. Foremost is the issue of foreclosing projects. They find that during Ninth Plan, full allocation for 217 projects was made. Out of that, 36 projects were foreclosed. To enable the Committee to comprehend the position of foreclosure further, they would like to be apprised about the reasons for such foreclosure. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the number of projects foreclosed during each of the years of Tenth Plan. The Committee feel that there is some serious lacuna in implementation of such a priority Scheme due to which after making such heavy investments on projects, some are being foreclosed, thus wasting the valuable resources.”

17. The Government have replied as below:

“As has been clarified earlier only 1st instalment is released to Zila Parishad (ZP)/District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) with the sanctioning of new projects each year and since the programme is demand driven, subsequent instalments are released over the project period only on receipt of proposals from these agencies fulfilling the release criteria. Hence, the total central share of the project cost is not released at one go at the time of their sanction as apprehended by the Committee.

It is stated that implementation of DDP projects is generally satisfactory. During the Ninth Plan *i.e.* 1997-98 to 2001-02, a total of 4,954 projects were sanctioned to the States. Of these, central funding has been stopped for 36 projects because of excessive delay in implementation. In case of 217 projects, entire central share in 7 instalments has been released. The rest of the projects are at various stages of implementation.”

18. The Committee in their earlier recommendation while expressing their concern on the foreclosure of DDP projects had

desired to know the basic data stating the number of projects foreclosed in each of the year of Tenth Plan alongwith the reasons for such foreclosure. The Department has furnished a vague and incomplete reply. Not only that inspite of the fact that number of projects are being foreclosed thereby wasting the heavy investments made on the projects, the impression given by the Department in the reply is that the implementation of DDP projects is generally satisfactory. While expressing their unhappiness over the way the Department has responded to their recommendation, the Committee would like the categorical reply of the Government in this regard.

F. Revision of the existing funding pattern of the scheme Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.94)

19. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee note that the Government had a proposal to revise the existing funding ratio of 50 : 50 to 75 : 25 between the Centre and the States and 90 : 10 for the North-Eastern States. They also find that Planning Commission has not agreed to the said proposal. The Committee feel that the States which could not come forward for the Programme may have the main problem of providing 50 percent of the State’s share. In view of this, the Committee would like the Department to interact with the under performing States and accordingly place the position before Planning Commission so as to enable them to appreciate the proposals of the Department in this regard. The Committee should also be apprised about the final decision taken in this regard.”

20. The Government have replied as below:

“It has been apprised to the Planning Commission that the States of Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and most of the North-Eastern States are finding it difficult to provide matching share due to financial constraints which has adversely affected the implementation of the scheme of SRA & ULR. The Planning Commission has once again been requested to reconsider the proposal of the Department of Land Resources for enhancement of funding pattern from 50 : 50 to 75 : 25 between the Centre and the States and 90 : 10 for North-Eastern States under the scheme of SRA & ULR”.

21. The Committee note that pursuant to their recommendation, the Planning Commission has been requested to reconsider the issue of revising the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the States and 90:10 for North-Eastern States under the scheme of SRA & ULR. The Committee would like to be apprised about the decision taken in this regard.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

The Committee note that the Government has furnished two different types of information with regard to BE and actual expenditure during 9th Plan. By examining the two different types of data, the underspending according to one type of data comes to Rs. 184.33 crore whereas according to other type of information given, the underspending is around Rs. 300 crores. While examining Demands of the previous year, the Committee were informed that the underspending was Rs. 184.33 crore. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the accurate data with regard to 9th Plan outlay, revised estimates and actual expenditure, so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusions. Besides, the Committee would also emphasise that while furnishing information before Parliament as well as before the Standing Committee, utmost care should be taken to ensure that the data furnished is accurate.

Reply of the Government

As suggested by the Committee the instructions are noted for compliance. The utmost care would be taken while furnishing information to the Standing Committee. The accurate data with regard to 9th Plan Outlay, Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditure is given at Appendix I. According to this statement, the underspending during Ninth Plan was Rs. 290.38 crore under Plan.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)

As could be seen from the aforesaid analysis, the underspending of the outlay is the recurring feature during 9th Plan as well as during the first two years of Tenth Plan. However, the Committee note with satisfaction that the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance have enhanced the allocation of the Department considerably due to the

additional responsibilities given to the Department. The Department, during Tenth Plan, has got Rs. 926 crore more than what was proposed. While appreciating the increased allocation of the Department, the Committee would like to emphasise the proper and effective utilization of the scarce resources earmarked for each of the schemes of the Department. In no case there should be underspending and efforts should be made to do deep at the root of underspending and create a positive ground for optimum utilization of the scarce resources. The Committee would also like to emphasise that while projecting outlay to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission, it should be ensured that projections are neither on the higher side nor on the lower side. The projections to the extent possible should be realistic.

Reply of the Government

The Department is making all efforts for effective utilisation of the funds earmarked for each of the schemes. The underspending is a concern mainly in the IWDP. There is 100% utilization in respect of funds earmarked for non-NE States, but it is lower in case of NE States. This is mainly due to poor absorption capacity of NE States. It may also be mentioned that due to non-applicability of DPAP and DDP in NE States, the funding under the single programme, IWDP has considerably increased. Nevertheless, all efforts are being made for enhancing the utilization of funds by NE States.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 6 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)

Further analysis of the data indicate that whereas the overall position of the outlay indicates more than proposed allocation as has been mentioned above, the individual schemes of the Departments indicate another picture. In the major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR, the allocation is Rs. 100 crore less than what was proposed to Planning Commission. Similarly, under TDET and others the Department has got the reduced allocation. The Committee find that Tenth Plan allocation has been enhanced due to Rs. 1000 crore earmarked for 'New Initiatives'.

While analyzing the position of expenditure under 'New Initiatives' the Committee find that Rs. 210 crore were allocated during 2004-2005 to implement special projects that would be required to meet certain objectives that otherwise would not have been made through the regular Watershed Development Projects. The Committee are unable to comprehend the reasons for making separate allocations for Watershed Development Projects, when three comprehensive schemes IWDP, DDP, DPAP are the regular schemes of the Department. Not only that, DDP, DPAP cater to the special requirement of DDP, DPAP areas. The Committee fail to understand why a plethora of schemes have been launched by the Department to achieve a single objective. The Committee are of the view that this approach of the Department should be discouraged. The emphasis should be more on the strengthening of the delivery mechanism in the existing schemes and to get better results by more allocation as well as effective monitoring of the implementation.

Reply of the Government

Commonality of approach has been attempted in the department through Common Guidelines for implementation of DPAP, DDP & IWDP. While the former two are implemented in 972 and 235 identified blocks respectively in semi arid/dry sub humid and arid climatic zones in the country, IWDP is implemented in the rest of the blocks and also in Moist Sub Humid & Humid Zones.

Under new initiatives, two new schemes, namely, (i) renovation of traditional water bodies, and (ii) development of bio-fuel were proposed and the annual allocation of Rs. 200 crore and Rs. 10 crore respectively made in the Annual Plan (2004-2005). However, after consideration, it was decided that instead of launching a new scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies, it would be appropriate to enhance the budgetary provision of the existing watershed programmes, which has a major component of rainwater harvesting and conservation, and further action is being taken accordingly.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)

Further the Committee note that under 'New Initiatives' two schemes like (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and (ii) Development of Bio-Fuel are proposed to be launched but no

expenditure has been incurred under this head. The Committee appreciate the launching of the aforesaid schemes specifically when the ground water is fast depleting and the Government has to think over reviving the traditional water bodies. However, they note that no planning on the part of the Government is being made before launching a new scheme for which Rs. 1000 crore has been allocated during Tenth Plan and almost half of the time has already elapsed and no expenditure could be made for the 'New Initiatives'. The Committee would like the Department to finalise the guidelines of the scheme expeditiously. They would also like that in future, proper planning should be made before launching and earmarking allocation for the new schemes so that the existing schemes do not suffer in the resources starved economy of the country.

Reply of the Government

Under New Initiatives, two new schemes namely (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and (ii) Development of bio-fuel were proposed to be launched during the year. In case of the first scheme of renovation of traditional water bodies, subsequent to the Finance Minister's announcement in his Budget Speech, the Ministry of Water Resources, which has been made the nodal agency for launching the scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies, has been pursuing this matter. The Planning Commission as well as the Ministry of Finance were of the view that strengthening the water resource development component of watershed development programmes of the Department of Land Resources by supplementing the budget provisions of these programmes would be a better proposition rather than launching a separate scheme with the same objective. Accordingly, it is proposed to utilize the funds available for this purpose in supplementing the budgetary allocations to DPAP, DDP and IWDP.

A provision of Rs. 10 crore has been made in the current financial year for the new scheme for the National Mission on Bio-Fuel. It is expected that the DoLR would be in a position to launch this scheme, after obtaining the requisite clearances and approvals on the DPR from the Planning Commission, Department of Expenditure/EFC and the Cabinet.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)

The Committee have analysed the performance of each of the schemes in detail in the subsequent chapters of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight here that in major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DDP and DPAP, there is shortfall in achievement of targets as may be seen from the position given in Appendix-II. Not only in 9th Plan, but also in the two years of Tenth Plan that have passed, the performance of the schemes is not very satisfactory. For example, under IWDP, against the target of 68 lakh hectares, the actual covered area is 13.42 lakh hectares during the half of the time that has passed since the Tenth Plan was launched. The Committee would like the Department to analyse the reasons for the shortfall in targets and take the corrective steps expeditiously. The Committee further note that under DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA&ULR during 9th Plan and under SRA, ULR and CLR during 10th Plan, no targets could be fixed by the Department. The Committee fail to understand how the achievements under the schemes could be assessed in the absence of targets fixed for the schemes. The Committee would like the Department to indicate the reasons for not fixing the targets under the aforesaid schemes.

Reply of the Government

During the Ninth Plan, against the financial target of Rs. 2393.60 crore under DPAP, DDP and IWDP the actual expenditure was Rs. 2150.33 crore, which is 89.84% of BE. The physical achievement was 8 million ha. Thus both physical and financial targets were substantially achieved during the Ninth Plan.

During the first two years of the Tenth Plan, against the financial target of Rs. 1796 crore under DPAP, DDP and IWDP, the achievement was Rs. 1726 crore which is 96% of BE. The physical achievement is 5.4 million ha. against the target of 18 million ha. The outlay under these programmes is utilized towards meeting the liabilities of ongoing projects and sanctioning of new projects. Hence, the actual achievement of physical target depends on the availability of funds for sanctioning of new projects. The Department is making all efforts to achieve the Tenth Plan target substantially.

The schemes of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) are demand-driven and proposals are received from the Revenue Department of the State as per their requirements and capacity

to utilize the available funds. The activities involved under these schemes take lot of time to complete them in a particular year. Therefore, available funds are carried over to the next financial year. Keeping in view the nature of these schemes and facts stated above, State-wise allocation could not be done.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.17)

The Committee note that a new scheme is proposed to be launched for renovation of traditional water bodies on a pilot basis, the estimated cost of which is Rs. 100 crore. They also find that funds for pilot projects would be drawn from the existing programme such as SGRY, PMGJSY, DPAP, DDP & IWDP. While the Committee appreciate the proposal of launching the scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies which is the need of the hour, they do not approve of the implementation of the scheme at the cost of the other major schemes of the Department. The Committee deplores the way the planning on the part of the Government is made. They would like that before launching any new schemes, the financial implications should be properly ascertained so that the allocation for other schemes is not disturbed.

Reply of the Government

Consequent upon the announcement of a new scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies in the Finance Minister's Budget Speech, the Ministry of Water Resources (MoWR) have initiated the process of formulating and launching a new scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies with a command area of more than 40 ha. Since a huge percentage of small water bodies (less than 40 ha. command) are under the control of Gram Panchayats, which are not being considered for renovation under the MoWR Scheme, the DoLR proposed a new scheme for renovation of these structures as well, for which budgetary allocation available under the PMGJSY was proposed to be utilized.

However, after consideration at a later stage, it is proposed that instead of launching a new scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies, it would be appropriate to enhance the budgetary provision of existing watershed development programmes, which also have a major component of rainwater harvesting and conservation.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.24)

The Committee are happy to note that the Department could exceed the projected targets during 9th Plan period. Against the target of 5 million hectares, the Department could achieve 8.02 million hectares of wasteland during 9th Plan. The Committee further note that during Tenth Plan, the Department has projected to cover 15 million hectares. They find that during the first two years of Tenth Plan 5,460 million hectares could be covered. Similarly, the committee note that although the targets during Tenth Plan are three times of the targets of 9th Plan, the commensurate allocation during Tenth Plan has not been provided.

Reply of the Government

The budget available for watershed projects is utilized towards sanctioning of new projects and meeting the liabilities of ongoing projects. Hence, the actual achievement of the physical target will depend on the availability of funds for sanctioning new projects. The targets of the Ninth Plan have been substantially achieved and it is expected that by the end of Tenth Plan, the targets would be met. Planning Commission is also being pursued to allocate adequate funds to meet the Tenth Plan targets.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.25)

During 9th Plan under the three area development schemes of the Department i.e. DDP, DPAP and IWDP, Rs. 1605 crore were earmarked. Against this during Tenth Plan Rs. 4,400 crore have been allocated which is less than three times of what was given during 9th Plan. They also find that the cost of treating wastelands has increased and allocation of the Department has also been enhanced from Rs. 4000 to Rs. 6000 per hectare. In view of this scenario, the Committee find that it will not be possible to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. The Committee strongly recommend to convince the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to provide the adequate allocation to the Department so as to enable them to achieve the set targets during Tenth Plan. While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee would also like the Department to gear up their pace of implementation as the physical achievement during the first two years is not up to the mark. The Committee note that the Department has itself admitted

that the physical annual targets of 2.5 million hectares of wastelands have to be doubled in the coming years to achieve the desirable level and as such, doubling of the financial allocation for the area development programmes would be required.

Reply of the Government

The budget available for watershed projects is utilized towards sanctioning of new projects and meeting the liabilities of ongoing projects. Hence, the actual achievement of the physical target will depend on the availability of funds for sanctioning new projects. The targets of the Ninth Plan have been substantially achieved and it is expected that by the end of Tenth Plan, the targets would be met. Planning Commission is also being pursued to allocate adequate funds to meet the Tenth Plan targets.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.26)

The Committee are surprised to note that the Government has never tried to analyse the position of wastelands development and technology being used by the other countries for the wastelands development for the reasons best known to them. In Committee's opinion, such a review can help in evolving cost effective and efficient technologies for wastelands development in years to come. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to undertake a review of development of wastelands and technologies being used in other countries in the context of wastelands development within the country and apprise the committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

The Committee's suggestions is noted and the Department with the involvement of NIRD is taking necessary steps to study international experiences in the field of wasteland development.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.37)

From the survey results, the Committee find that in some of the States the survey indicates positive trends by way of availability of

fuel, fodder, increase in vegetative cover and above all in generation of wage employment. The studies reveal that 60 per cent of the expenditure in the execution of watershed projects generate wage employment. The Committee also find that as per the Minimum Needs Programme of UPA Government to the assurance of 100 days wage employment to each bread earner of the family has been given. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid position that development of wastelands is an option to provide wage employment to the poor strata of society. The need of the hour is to chalk out a strategy in coordination with all the Ministries involved in the task and after interaction with State Governments, Panchayats and through them public at large, private sector etc., involved in the task. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over it and chalk out the strategies expeditiously. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

Reply of the Government

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

“As the Watershed Development Programmes aim at holistic development of watershed areas, the convergence of all other non-land based programmes of Government of India, particularly those of the Ministry of Rural Development would enhance the ultimate output and lead to sustainable economic development of the village community. The ZP/DRDA, therefore, shall take all possible measures to ensure convergence of other programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development such as the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), the Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) and the Rural Drinking Water Supply Programme in the villages chosen for the implementation of the watershed development projects. It would also be worthwhile to converge programmes of similar nature of the other Ministries *e.g.* Health & Family Welfare, Education, Social Justice and Empowerment and Agriculture, as also of the State Governments, in these villages.

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

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.38)

The Committee further find that a survey to know about the impact of assessment studies by State Governments is being undertaken. The Committee would like to be informed about the results of the said survey. Besides the Committee feel that after the survey results are available, the same should be revalidated by some independent evaluator and the follow up action with the suitable strategy and corrective action should be undertaken so that the big challenge of developing huge wastelands in the country can be successfully met.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry of Rural Development had commissioned nation-wide studies on the impact of watershed development programmes *i.e.* DPAP, DDP and IWDP. For this purpose 230 districts in 16 States were covered on a sample basis and 20 independent Field Agencies were engaged. The major findings of these Impact Assessment Studies of watershed development programmes are as follows:

- Drought proofing measures have contributed to better availability of irrigation facilities and increased ground water table.
- Increase in net area sown, area sown more than once, gross cropped area, land under miscellaneous crops and availability of fodder and fuel wood.
- Increase in milk production.
- Plantations are in good condition and efforts for maintenance of assets are being made.
- Positive impact on control of soil erosion, arrest of runoff water and improvement in *in-situ* soil and moisture conservation.
- Improvements in cropping pattern.
- Community mobilization activities are visible.

- Increase in annual income of the beneficiaries from agricultural production and increase in average annual income were observed.
- Out migration of non-agricultural labour has reduced.

Defects pointed out in these studies are communicated to the States for taking corrective action.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.41)

The Committee feel that to analyse the problem related to development of wastelands in the country, it is imperative to know about the ownership status of wastelands. They note that no steps have been taken to maintain the data with regard to wastelands under Common Property Resources. The Committee recommend the Government to take steps to collect the necessary data on ownership basis so as to enable them to address the specific problems of Government CPRs, privately owned land etc.

Reply of the Government

The exercise is carried out by the concerned DRDAs/ZPs and the PIAs in the areas which are taken up under the projects. District-wise wastelands data is available in the Wastelands Atlas prepared by the Department in collaboration with NRSA, Hyderabad, which is sufficient for undertaking planning upto district level.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.44)

The Committee note that important observations have been made by the Planning Commission with regard to functioning of watershed development projects for wastelands development in the country. From the reply furnished by the Government the Committee feel that in some States like Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa and Tamilnadu, real work on watershed development projects is already under way. The Committee feel that the work done by these States needs to be emulated by other States in order to address the concerns of the Planning Commission

adequately. The Committee hope that the Department of Land Resources being nodal Department will take necessary action in this regard. The Committee are informed that under the guidelines for Hariyali, PRIs have been given a pivotal role to secure greater participation of the people. The Committee would like to know the achievements made in this regard. Mere assignment of the role is not enough. The concerns expressed by Planning Commission with regard to watershed programmes need serious introspection. The reply of the Ministry is not adequate. They need to address the observation of Planning Commission categorically to have the remedies.

Reply of the Government

At the national level, Ministry organises All India Project Directors Conference every year to share the experience as well dissemination of best practices in different programmes of Ministry of Rural Development. In addition, the States do organize workshops/seminars involving different States for the purpose of experience sharing and dissemination of best practices in the implementation of watershed programme.

Watershed Development Programmes have been included in the list of subjects to be devolved to the PRIs and the State Governments are in the process of devolving necessary financial and administrative powers to the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). Institutional frameworks of Watershed Development Associations and Watershed Committees for implementation of Watershed Development Programmes are being gradually replaced by Gram Panchayats/Gram Sabhas. To strengthen the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the State Governments are linking field functionaries of departments responsible for execution of watershed projects with PRIs as reported recently in Rajasthan. The Watershed projects under Hariyali Guidelines have been sanctioned from 2003-04 onwards for execution through PRIs. NIRD is studying the performance of PRIs in implementation of the programmes and it is premature to make any comment at this stage.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.51)

The Committee are happy to note that in major wastelands development schemes of the Department, there is an in-built mechanism for the capacity building of Panchayats. Five per cent of outlay under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is earmarked for the purpose. The Committee

feel that besides making provision in this regard, there is an urgent need to monitor that the earmarked outlay is spent for the desired purpose for which strict monitoring by the Department is required. The Committee hope that State Government would come forward in this regard and after taking the benefit of this allocation and pooling in other Union and State resources meant for Panchayati Raj empowerment, the schemes will be implemented by PRIs in the true spirit of the Constitution.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted. Zilla Parishads/District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) supervise the programmes for capacity building of PRIs to ensure better formulation and execution of the watershed projects. The Government of India also calls regular meetings of the Secretaries and senior officers of State Governments for sharing views and reviewing progress towards training and capacity building of PRIs.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.58)

The Committee find that even the enhanced allocation of Rs. 6,000 per hectare being provided for the development of wastelands under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is not justified keeping in view the actual higher per hectare cost involved in this task. To appreciate the position further, the Committee would like to be apprised of the actual rate of expenditure involved in developing per hectare of land. Further, the Committee find that due to regional imbalances, the cost of developing wastelands in hilly areas may be much more. As such the Committee may also like to be apprised of the actual cost of developing land per hectare in such difficult areas so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusion and to recommend for higher outlay.

Reply of the Government

In a watershed, it is not necessary that every piece of land requires treatment. For example, for water harvesting through check dams, there is a catchment area and command area. The expenditure incurred on structures is in the catchment area only and for related developments required there. In a micro-watershed of 500 ha., the cost is Rs. 30.00 lakhs. Within this project cost, a micro plan is prepared

depending on the site specific requirements and various activities as provided for in the watershed guidelines are suggested.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.69)

The Committee find that the allocation for North Eastern States has considerably been increased since 2000-2001, when the concept of 10 per cent exclusive allocation to North Eastern States was started. They also note that DDP, DPAP Schemes are not applicable in North Eastern States since no such districts were considered as such areas as per the Hanumantha Rao Committee constituted for identification of DDP and DPAP Projects in the country. The Committee find that even then the allocation for these two area specific programmes is being made to the North Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had raised this issue and they find from the reply furnished by the Department that if the DDP and DPAP allocation is excluded, North Eastern States allocation for watershed projects will be considerably reduce. The Committee appreciate the considerable attention and allocation made to North Eastern States. Further, they would also like that the resources allocated for the development of wastelands should be meaningfully utilized. To appreciate the releases made to North Eastern States, the Committee would like to be apprised about the task being handled in each of the areas of North Eastern States and would like to be apprised about the information in this regard.

Reply of the Government

State-wise information on number of watershed projects sanctioned under IWDP in the North Eastern Region since 1995-96 till 30.11.2004, total cost of these projects and funds released towards implementation of these projects is as follows:

Name of State	No. of Districts Covered	No. of Projects Sanctioned	Total Project Area (in ha.)	Total Project Cost	Total Central Share (Rs. in lakh)	Total Central Releases (Rs. in lakh)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Aruanchal Pradesh	14	20	95971	5728.26	5255.91	905.280
Assam	23	74	473688	27735.7	25538.66	6904.878

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Manipur	9	19	148968	7608.72	7169.22	2368.650
Meghalaya	7	14	62725	3543.28	3284.71	763.000
Mizoram	8	22	193803	11628.18	10659.17	2769.580
Nagaland	9	34	315930	17435.8	16236.15	7185.980
Sikkim	4	12	96006	4649.78	4450.40	1505.950
Tripura	4	4	19423	1165.38	1068.27	322.440
Total	78	199	1406514	79495.10	73689.47	22725.758

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.70)

The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that there are certain problems resulting in lesser utilization of funds in North Eastern region, like difficult weather conditions, delay in release of State's share etc. The Committee would like that the specific problems from each of the North Eastern States, should be ascertained expeditiously after interacting with them and proper strategy to take the desired steps in this regard, should be chalked out.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted for compliance. In this regard it may be informed that the Minister, Rural Development had reviewed the implementation of IWDP in the NE States with the respective State Ministers at Guwahati on 30.11.2004. He also had another review meeting with the MPs from the NE Region on 8.12.2004 at New Delhi. In order that the programme be implemented effectively, it was emphasized that the States should come up with a Perspective Plan for Wasteland Development, which could form the basis for the implementation of IWDP in a time-bound manner. All the States were also requested to expedite submission of Priority List of IWDP projects to be taken up.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.71)

The Committee note that out of 78.52 lakh hectares, the Department could cover only 6.87 lakh hectares during 9th Plan under IWDP Scheme in North Eastern States. Similarly, during the first two years of 10th Plan, 5.59 lakh hectares could be developed. Keeping in view the slow pace of coverage, the Committee feel that effective steps need to be taken to cover the total wastelands in North Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had recommended to chalk out an Action Plan to cover the total wastelands in North Eastern States. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the desired action in this regard should be taken expeditiously.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted for compliance. In this regard it may be informed that the Minister, Rural Development had reviewed the implementation of IWDP in the NE States with the respective State Ministers at Guwahati on 30.11.2004. He also had another review meeting with the MPs from the NE Region on 8.12.2004 at New Delhi. In order that the programmes be implemented effectively, it was emphasized that the States should come up with a Perspective Plan for Wasteland Development, which could form the basis for the implementation of IWDP in a time-bound manner. All the States were also requested to expedite submission of Priority List of IWDP projects to be taken up.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.14)

The Committee conclude from the position of allocation made under IWDP that in North-Eastern States, there is huge underspending. The Committee have dealt with, in detail, the position of wastelands in North-Eastern States and the issue of under utilization in the proceeding para of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight that with regard to implementation of IWDP, efforts should be made by interacting with various State Governments so that more and more projects from these States are proposed which could result in full utilization of scarce resources.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted for compliance. In this regard it may be informed that the Minister, Rural Development had reviewed the implementation of IWDP in the NE States with the respective State Ministers at Guwahati on 30.11.2004. He also had another review meeting with the MPs from the NE Region on 8.12.2004 at New Delhi. In order that the programme be implemented effectively, it was emphasized that the States should come up with a Perspective Plan for Wasteland Development, which could form the basis for the implementation of IWDP in a time-bound manner. All the States were also requested to expedite submission of Priority List of IWDP projects to be taken up.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)

As regards the physical achievement under IWDP, the Committee note that during 9th Plan, there was shortfall of 1,148 hectares. They also note that most of the funds available under IWDP are being released to meet the committed liabilities of projects under IWDP thereby resulting in sanctioning of lesser new projects. The Committee are concerned to note that on an average 65 to 70 per cent of allocated funds are utilized towards committed liabilities. To understand the problem of committed liabilities, the Committee would like that the detailed position with regard to committed liabilities for ongoing projects should be analysed and data placed before the Committee. The Committee find that if the existing position with regard to committed liabilities stands, the Department would not be able to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. As such the Committee would like the Department to analyse the matter critically and inform the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

Since the project period is for 5 years and funds are released in 7 instalments for projects sanctioned prior to 31.3.2003 and 5 instalments for projects sanctioned after 1.4.2003, first instalment amounting to 15% is released along with Sanction Order of each project. Every subsequent instalment is released on receipt of Utilization Certificate showing utilization of more than 50% of previous instalment and full amount of earlier instalments released. Since projects are demand driven

and based on participatory approach, next installment is released as and when demanded by implementing agency (ZP/DRDA) fulfilling requirements of UC and other documents. Therefore, funds are required each year to account for projects of earlier four or more years (in case not completed in time due to the reasons stated above). The committed liability worked out for next five years is as given below:

Instalments for Sanctioned projects 1995-2004

(Rs. in Crore)

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

*From the above table, it is evident that on-going liability is on actual based on timely further release of instalment under ongoing projects. New Projects to be sanctioned have been worked out for treatment of 10.00 lakh Ha. area each year, and instalments due for this has been indicated above.

If more than 30-35% of the annual outlay is utilized for new projects, it may lead to parking of funds and manifold increase in subsequent liability.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.36)

The Committee find that a laudable Programme i.e. Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) was started in 1973-74 to tackle special problems in the districts which are constantly affected by severe drought conditions. The objective of the Programme was to provide long term solution through watershed projects for land development, water resources development and afforestation, pasture development, besides promoting overall economic development and improving the socio-economic conditions of the covered areas. From the data indicated above, the Committee note that the Department has tried to project a very bright picture about the releases of the money, accordingly to

which there was 100 per cent expenditure of the allocated amount during the first two years of the 10th Plan, but the analysis of the implementation of the projects indicates another scenario.

Reply of the Government

The implementation of DPAP and DDP is by and large underway as per the goals set within the available resources. Impact assessment studies have also shown that these programmes have had a positive impact in the project areas.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.37)

The Committee are constrained to note that during 1995-96 to 1997-98 as much as 1637 projects were foreclosed. Further, the Department targets to close non-performing projects during 1998-99. The Committee, while expressing their concern over the closure of non-performing projects where huge investments are being made, would like to be informed about the status of the closure of the projects since the Scheme was started to comprehend the position in a better way. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised of the reasons for poor performance of the projects along with the corrective steps taken by the Department so far. They would also like to recommend here that before sanctioning the projects, the viability of the projects should be ascertained so as to avoid foreclosing of such a great number of projects.

Reply of the Government

From 1973-74 to 1994-95, the DPAP was being implemented on sectoral basis where major activities like soil-moisture conservation, water resource development, afforestation, pasture development etc. were taken up in sectoral manner by different line departments. Isolated implementation of wide ranging sectoral activities over widely disjointed areas of very small size failed to bring about any noticeable impact and programme objectives were not achieved. It is only since the adoption of the watershed approach in 1995-96, when the implementation of DPAP was revamped in project mode that these activities are taken up together in the selected micro-watershed of about 500 hectare i.e. the project area. The project is to be completed over a period of 5 years. The central funds are released in

7 instalments. Out of the total 5209 such projects sanctioned in 1995-96, 1996-97 & 1997-98, *i.e.* 4523, 280 & 406 respectively, 1637 projects did not claim the entire central share during the project period. The slow implementation of projects sanctioned in the initial 2-3 years may be understandable as time is required for the programme States & DRDAs/ZPs to get acquainted with the newly introduced scientific watershed approach and for identification and selection of micro-watersheds for project implementation. Thereafter, the implementation picked up as out of the total 880 projects of IV batch sanctioned in 1998-99 only 25-30 projects are slow in implementation. Sometimes, the slow implementation may not be due to any technicality but due to village level conflicts. The selection of village(s) for watershed treatment is done by ZP/DRDA. As per the guidelines only such villages should be chosen by them for project implementation that have a known history of coming together for common causes and have shown concern for resource conservation.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.38)

The Committee find that the Department has taken a positive step of mid-term evaluation which has been entrusted to the State Governments. The Committee, would like to apprise of the status of the survey along with the findings where the survey has been completed.

Reply of the Government

The programme States for projects sanctioned in a particular Batch to a district, before claiming the 4th instalment of central funds, conduct the Mid-Term Evaluation. These evaluation studies are carried out as and when the batch reaches the stage of claiming the 4th instalment and evaluation reports are submitted to DoLR along with the proposal for release of funds. Only if the reports are satisfactory funds released otherwise they are withheld till the action taken reports are received on the recommendations/observations of the evaluator to plug the deficiencies in project implementation. The Mid Term Evaluation Reports, by and large indicate positive impact in rejuvenating the natural resource base of the project areas and socio-economic upliftment of the project villages.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.40)

The Committee note that DPAP is being implemented in districts identified by High-Level Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao, Ex-Member, Planning Commission. The said Committee submitted its Report in 1994. The Committee note that as per the said Report, the Programme is being implemented in all the identified 972 DPAP Blocks in the country. The Committee find that identification of DPAP Blocks was done a decade back and since then more and more areas would have become drought prone areas. Further, they also note the State Governments are demanding the Programme for additional districts. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to identify additional DPAP Blocks that would have converted into drought prone areas after 1994. As such, they would like that further identification of DPAP Projects should be undertaken by the Department. Not only that, a comprehensive Plan indicating the outlay desired for coverage should be drawn.

Reply of the Government

DPAP was launched during 1973-74 to cover 54 districts together with parts of another 18 districts contiguous with these. In 1994, a high level Technical Committee reviewed the extent of drought prone areas, through an exhaustive countrywide exercise by adopting scientific criteria such as moisture index, evapo-transpiration, precipitation, irrigation facility etc. It identified 746 lakh hectares of such area for treatment spread over 182 districts in 16 States. Since 1995-96, only about 94.02 lakh hectares of this area, *i.e.* 12-13% of the total targeted coverage, has so far been sanctioned for treatment with the available budgetary resources. That more areas may have become drought prone in the interregnum can not be ruled out. However, in view of the achievement against the already enormous target and limited financial resource, it may not be a rational step to further enlarge the extent of DPAP coverage at this stage.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.41)

The Committee, note that DPAP is being extended in 972 blocks, since 1994. The Committee, would like to be apprised about the number of blocks which could be provided a permanent solution and which

need no further Central Assistance under the Programme so as to enable the Committee to analyse the performance of the Programme in real terms.

Reply of the Government

The performance of DPAP may not be visualized in terms of number of blocks totally covered and for which a permanent solution has been provided. Every year, DoLR has been sanctioning projects to almost every block corresponding to the DPAP area and for ongoing projects subject to the available budget. The new watershed projects sanctioned to the blocks may be selected by the District Agencies in contiguity to another watershed that has already been developed for a composite impact on the area. The Department has laid emphasis to adopting a cluster approach in choosing and treating the watersheds. A total of 18803 projects for treating an area of 94.02 lakh hectares have been sanctioned to these identified blocks.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.54)

The Committee find that in spite of their recommending strongly to enhance outlay, the *status-quo* with regard to Budget Estimates during 2004-05 has been maintained as compared to the previous year. The Committee, feel that there is an urgent need to provide adequate allocation to DDP areas and as such would like that their concerns in this regard should be brought before the Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry has pursued this issue with the Planning Commission and the Commission is well aware of the need to enhance the investment/funding under DDP. However, the States also need to ensure timely utilization of the funds released by the Centre.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.56)

The Committee also feel that viability of the projects is not being ascertained by Implementing Agencies. The Committee, would also

like the Department to have a detailed analysis of the position and explain the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

Following the approach of community empowerment and peoples' participation in planning, implementation and benefit sharing, Department of Land Resources (DoLR) sanctions the projects, each of 500 hectares which is to be planned and implemented in the watershed village by the peoples' elected bodies. The location/village for implementation of the project is approved by ZP/DRDA, which is the administering agency. Guidelines of Watershed Development have provided the criteria for selection of such villages, which have the social requisites and commitment to ensure the viability and timely implementation of the projects. The department has been persistently pursuing with the States to follow the guideline in letter and spirit.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.65)

The Committee in their Report on Demands for Grants of the year 2003-04 had recommended for enhanced outlay keeping in view the objectives of the programme i.e., technology development, extension and training to farmers, extension officials of the State Departments, etc. The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that they are satisfied with the existing allocations. To enable the Committee to appreciate the position of the Department, the Committee would like the Department to furnish the information with regard to the work done under the scheme indicating *inter-alia*, the number of farmers or extension officials trained so far, demonstration of the technologies undertaken in the field, etc. The Committee would like to know categorically the achievements made with regard to the objectives enshrined under this programme in the Performance Budget 2004-2005 (P. 28) so as to assess the viability and effectiveness of the scheme in future and to forestall the reasons for closure of the projects.

Reply of the Government

Technological support is recognized to be one of the critical inputs for the development of wastelands. In order to fill this gap, the TDET Scheme was launched in 1993-94 with the objective of supporting

extension of cost effective and proven technological interventions that improve the productive capacity of the wastelands of various categories that are otherwise lying fallow and unutilized. This is done through taking up of small pilot projects to test, validate and demonstrate the efficacy of relevant technologies on community/Government wastelands as well as on privately owned wastelands. These pilot projects are sanctioned to research and training organizations of proven track record such as ICAR Institutes, Agricultural Universities and such other agencies. On completion of the project, it is expected that successful technologies/practices will be adopted by the neighbouring farmers. It is expected that the State's Extension machinery would also take up the task of extending these interventions on a large scale in wasteland development projects. In the process of executing the pilot project, emphasis is also placed on proper training of the project functionaries as well as the beneficiary farmers for effective implementation of the project and its post-project management by the users. It may be pointed out that such training is imparted only to those officers and farmers who are directly concerned with the TDET pilot project, but not to all the staff of the State's extension machinery and all farmers. No separate training projects are sanctioned under TDET and so, information on number of personnel trained is not available separately. Since training is a compulsory component of a TDET project, it can be said with certainty that all concerned extension officers and farmer beneficiaries are being trained with respect to that particular project.

So far 148 projects have been sanctioned under TDET since its inception. Details on the technology models tested/being tested, projects completed and foreclosed are given below.

Sl.No.	Technology Model/Project	Projects sanctioned	Ongoing	Completed	Foreclosed
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Agro-forestry/Plantation Models	59	27	16	16
2.	Fishery/Duckry based AF Models	2	0	2	0
3.	Watershed Models	16	7	7	2
4.	Wastelands development through Hydrams	7	7	0	0
5.	Fertility regeneration model using bio-fertilisers (vermicompost/mycorrhiza/bio-pesticides/feed stock)	8	4	4	0

1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Plantation of medicinal/aromatic species	5	2	2	1
7.	Surface/sub-surface/bio-drainage for waterlogged/saline wastelands	19	18	1	0
8.	Development of mine spoil wastelands	4	2	1	1
9.	Development of shifting cultivation areas through AF/SALT Model	6	5	0	1
10.	Propagation of Jojoba cultivation	5	2	3	0
11.	Propagation of Jatropha cultivation	3	2	0	1
12.	Database generation on wastelands using RS and GIS	6	3	3	0
13.	Preparation of Action Plan (Land and Water Resource Development) using RS and GIS	7	5	2	0
14.	Landslide and Land Erosion Control	1	1	0	0
Total		148	85	41	22

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.79)

The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the under utilization of outlay under the Computerization of Land Records (CLR). They find that no progress seems to have been made in the under performing States as has been admitted by the Department. The Committee are constrained to note that the underspending is a recurrent feature as noticed year after year. They find from the data furnished by the Department that since inception of the Scheme, only 68 percent of the funds could be utilized. Similar is the position in the North-Eastern States, where out of Rs. 17.19 crore, Rs. 10.88 crore could be utilized. The Committee, further note that the Evaluation Study Report in case of Karnataka has revealed the positive impact of the Programme, whereby it has resulted in

accountability in the revenue administration, checking corruption and reducing harassment to the extent possible. In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee would like the Department to analyze the position State-wise and find the difficulties being experienced by them in the implementation of the Programme and apprise the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

The Scheme of Computerization of Land Records is being reviewed from time to time through Conferences of Revenue Ministers/Revenue Secretaries of States and feedback received during the field visits of Programme Division officers & Area Officers. The following difficulties were experienced by some of the States in the implementation of the Scheme:

- (i) Lack of political and administrative will to take up this scheme at State & District level.
- (ii) Lack of guidance from State level authority to implementing authorities because of instability of tenure of Head of the Department.
- (iii) Not fixing interim milestones for different activities under the Scheme to complete it in a time bound manner.
- (iv) Lack of awareness at District level on how to implement the Scheme.
- (v) Wherever data entry work has been completed, there is resistance from Revenue officials to take up the task of verification & validation of computerized data entry due to fear of losing their importance because the effective implementation of the Scheme will bring transparency & fix accountability.
- (vi) Lack of motivation and training to Revenue officials who are involved in this project.
- (vii) Lack of effective monitoring & review of the Scheme at State as well as District level.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.80)

The Committee further note that Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussourie has been entrusted with the evaluation of the Scheme in the States of Karnataka, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Haryana and Tamil Nadu. They also note that in the case of Karnataka, the Evaluation Study Report has been received. The Committee, would like that similar evaluation in the remaining States should be undertaken and they should be apprised about the findings of the Study, when completed.

Reply of the Government

The Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussourie has recently completed the Evaluation Study in the State of West Bengal and submitted the Report to this Department. The main findings of the Study Report are given below:

- The Study Report indicates that 79% of the respondents were aware of the computerization of land records through interaction with Revenue Officials. Therefore, report suggests the need to raise the awareness on computerization of land records amongst the users.
- 70.3% respondents knew that the Block has one computer kiosk at which they can apply for computerized Record of Rights (RoR) and plot information.
- 44% respondents stated that RoR was available without delay whereas 49.1% respondents could not definitely say whether the availability of RoR was easier after the computerization of land records.
- Many respondents stated that regular updation of mutation is not being done through computer centers. Distribution of copies of RoR are being done manually and through block level computer centers. This parallel system of distribution of RoR should be stopped and all mutations should be carried out through mutation/updation software at block level computer centers which will reflect the correct picture of land transactions.
- The software does not have in-built work flow automation, where transactions can move from one revenue official to another on the system itself. However, recently the State

introduced on line mutation which has also not been adopted by revenue staff.

- Presently, data backup is taken weekly, fortnightly and monthly from the Block usually in a floppy. Recently in some cases CD ROM's have been used for storing backup data but this is not sufficient for security of data. Therefore, it is necessary to take daily backup data in DAT or in CD-ROM when changes to the data base are being made on a daily basis.
- Security is provided by traditional password system, which is prone to hacking. Moreover, computer provided for CLR work is being used for other purposes. Therefore, there is a real danger of compromising security of data and system and also the possibility that the system will be infected with virus.
- The lack of computer literacy among land and Land Reforms Revenue Office staff has been a major challenge. Till the time of study only 350 Revenue Officers have been trained. Since only one Revenue Officer from each Block had received computer training if the concerned officer is away then it delays issue of computerized copy to the farmers. Therefore, it was suggested that every Revenue Official should be trained for computerized system in phases.
- The problem of erratic power is prevalent in West Bengal, which causes problems in issuing RoR to farmers. Presently UPS with 10 minutes power backup only is available and this is not sufficient to deal with the problems of power failure. Therefore, it is suggested that this UPS system be replaced or generator provided.
- Study Report also reveals that site preparation is not good in some of the blocks and in a few blocks computer rooms are damp.

The evaluation study in the remaining States is being entrusted to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD).

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.81)

The Committee also note that the Department is in the process of revising the guidelines of Computerization of Land Records. The Committee, would like that their recommendations made in the respective Reports should be considered while revising the aforesaid guidelines.

Reply of the Government

The revised Guidelines on the implementation of the scheme of CLR has not yet been finalized and the recommendations of the Committee will be considered while finalizing the revised guidelines of CLR.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.92)

The Committee note that although during the years 2002-2003, 2003-2004, the allocation available at RE stage could be fully utilized, there was huge cut at RE stage. The Committee, further note that out of the allocation of Rs. 265.97 crore, so far under the Scheme Rs. 174.58 crore *i.e.* 66 per cent could be utilized. The Committee, feel that under spending is a recurrent feature for which the allocation has been reduced at RE stage. The Committee, would like that the Department should find out the reasons for under spending from each of the States/Union Territories and take the corrective action in this regard. The Committee should be intimated about this.

Reply of the Government

The Scheme of SRA & ULR is being reviewed from time to time during the Conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries of States and field visits of Programme Division Officers. Recently the progress of the scheme was reviewed in the Conference of Revenue Ministers of States held on 22.11.2004. The main reason for under-spending by the States is that some States are finding it difficult to provide their matching share due to financial constraints and some activities like construction work of survey & settlement training institutes, patwar ghars, record rooms, undertaking survey & settlement operations take

a lot of time to complete. The spillover of work is carried over to the next financial year. Therefore, the funds released are not utilized fully and remain unutilized with the State Govt.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.93)

The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the sorry state of affairs of land records in North-Eastern States, where even the cadastral survey has not been done so far. They are constrained to note that in North-Eastern States, no land records exist. Further alarming is the situation that there is no legislation regarding land and land related matters. In spite of repeatedly recommending, the North Eastern States have yet to come forward to maintain the land records. The Committee feel that the Union Government has to play a pro-active role in this regard after consultation with the North Eastern States. They should be impressed upon the urgency of having land records.

Reply of the Government

North-Eastern States have once again been requested to chalk out an action plan for carrying out survey & settlement work for proper maintenance of updated land records and forward the Action Taken Report to this Department at the earliest.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.94)

The Committee note that the Government had a proposal to revise the existing funding ratio of 50 : 50 to 75 : 25 between the Centre and the States and 90 : 10 for the North-Eastern States. They also find that Planning Commission has not agreed to the said proposal. The Committee feel that the States which could not come forward for the Programme may have the main problem of providing 50 per cent of the State's share. In view of this, the Committee would like the Department to interact with the under performing States and accordingly place the position before the Planning Commission so as to enable them to appreciate the proposals of the Department in this regard. The Committee should also be apprised about the final decision taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

It has been apprised to the Planning Commission that the States of Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and most of the North-Eastern States are finding it difficult to provide matching share due to financial constraints which has adversely affected the implementation of the scheme of SRA & ULR. The Planning Commission has once again been requested to re-consider the proposal of the D/o Land Resources for enhancement of funding pattern from 50 : 50 to 75 : 25 between the Centre and the States and 90 : 10 for North-Eastern States under the scheme of SRA & ULR.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 21 of Chapter I of the Report).

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.52)

The Committee also like that the similar in-built provision in other schemes of the Department meant for updation of Land Records be made and the Committee informed accordingly.

Reply of the Government

Land Reforms Division is implementing two centrally sponsored schemes *viz.*, (i) Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). Under these schemes, funds are released to the Revenue Department of the State for implementation in various districts and not to the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). Moreover, these Schemes are not directly linked to capacity building of Panchayats as in the case of IWDP, DDP & DPAP. These Schemes are being monitored by the State Level Steering Committee under the chairmanship of Secretary, Revenue Department and at District level by District Level Monitoring & Implementing Committee under the chairmanship of District Collector/DM/Deputy Commissioner of concerned Districts. At National Level, the progress of these Schemes is being reviewed by this Ministry through Quarterly Progress Reports and organizing Conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries of States from time to time.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.20)

The Committee in their earlier Reports had drawn the attention of the Department towards the committed liability for the EAS Watershed projects being implemented earlier by the Department of Rural Development and transferred to the Department of Land Resources during 1999-2000. The Committee in their 53rd Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) had recommended to critically assess the

implementation of EAS Watershed Projects and urged the Government to tighten monitoring mechanism in the States where the implementation of projects was slow. The Committee are dismayed to note that instead of taking the earnest steps in the right direction, the Department has decided to terminate the above scheme. The Committee find that funds required for completion of EAS watershed projects were Rs. 1,485.26 crore, out of that from 1999-2000 to 2003-2004, Rs. 900.68 crore could be released by the Department. They are further alarmed to note the reply of the Department that the committed liability has been filled in those cases in which claims were made within stipulated and extended period. The Committee are unable to comprehend from the replies the fate of the projects, which were ongoing and for which the State Governments could not come forward to demand for the outlay. The Committee are anguished to note how the different schemes are transferred from one Department to another and the various ongoing projects are being handled by them. The Committee deplore the lackadaisical approach of the Department and would like to know the fate of the incomplete EAS projects so as to enable them to analyse the position further.

Reply of the Government

In August/September 1999, an assessment of the requirement of fund for completion of EAS watershed projects was made for each State. Accordingly, Central share of funds were released in the next three years, *i.e.* 1999-2000, 2000-01 and 2001-02. The status of completion of these projects was again reviewed in 2001-02. As some districts could not complete these projects in the stipulated period, the period was extended by one more year (2002-03). In July 2004, all State Governments were requested to submit the relevant completion reports and in cases where some works were incomplete for want of more funds, these were required to be completed expeditiously from the sources of the concerned State Governments. Subsequently, unutilized funds/savings were also returned to the DoLR by some States like Madhya Pradesh.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.32)

The Committee find that there is no clarity with regard to objectives of launching Investment Promotional Schemes. On the one side, the Department states that the scheme was started to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/financial institutions; on the other hand, it has been mentioned that the scheme was meant to help poor land owners who own small wastelands by way of subsidy. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position in this regard so as to enable them to comprehend the position with regard to discontinuation of the scheme by the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

Reply of the Government

Investment Promotional Scheme is a Central Sector Scheme launched in 1994-95 to stimulate involvement of corporate sector, financial institutions and private landowners in the development of wastelands. Under the Scheme, Central promotional subsidy to the extent of 25% project cost subject to ceiling of Rs. 25.00 lakh was available. It was envisaged that private landowners would come up to avail this provision for development of their fallow wastelands while the corporate sector, with such attractive subsidy rate, would also be stimulated to lease in large chunks of government wastelands for commercial cultivation. However, in the 8 years of its operation (upto 2002-03, the Scheme could not generate the expected enthusiasm, which was evident from the poor response it got in terms of proposals received under the scheme. The reasons for this are different for the two categories of target groups *viz.*, land owners and corporate bodies. In case of private land owners, experience has shown that due to the large investments required, substantial loan component and relative attractiveness of other land development schemes like the watershed development programmes which provide more subsidy than the IPS, they had not taken up the scheme in a big way as originally envisaged. On the other hand, though the subsidy under the Scheme was attractive to the corporate sector, interested agencies could not come up with

suitable proposals due to bottlenecks in obtaining long term lease rights from the concerned State Governments and the risk and uncertainty involved in wastelands development involving huge expenditures. In view of these facts, the IPS was discontinued from 2003-04.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report).

Recommendation (Para No. 2.33)

The Committee in their earlier reports had repeatedly been emphasizing to take certain steps to attract private sector/corporate sector in the field of development of wastelands. As regards, the steps taken by the Department in this direction, the Committee feel that these are not sufficient. Only one correspondence was made with the Chairman/Chief Executive of user industries/major corporate houses in the country. In this direction, the Committee further find that as per the Government's own admission, the representatives of Ministry, NABARD, private sector, corporate sector, CII, ASSOCHAM, in the various workshops/seminars had assured that they would submit proposals within a short time. It has also been mentioned that nothing came of it later on. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that some sort of enthusiasm was expressed by the corporate sector during the meetings but the need was to further pursue with them and convince them with the appropriate strategy as given by the Committee in their earlier report as stated above so as to really motivate them to this sector.

Reply of the Government

The IPS, initiated in 1994-95, was implemented for 8 years before its closure from 2003-04. During the 8 years of its operation, only 41 proposals covering an area of 1435 hectares with a total cost of Rs. 16.88 crore including a subsidy component of Rs. 1.09 crore only had been taken up. The poor performance was due to the reasons already explained in Para 2.32 above. Though the corporate sector is interested in availing of the provisions of the Scheme, it is handicapped by the lack of suitable means of obtaining long-term lease rights on Government wastelands. Since land is a State subject, the Central

Government can only provide a policy direction but cannot force the State Governments for allotment of wastelands to the corporate sector. These issues need to be sorted out at the State level before the corporate sector could take up wastelands development in a big way.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated : 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report).

Recommendation (Para No. 2.56)

The Committee for the last six years have been recommending strongly to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands at present being handled by different Ministries of Government of India under one umbrella. By noting the latest position in this regard, the Committee feel that 'in principle' issue of convergence has been agreed to by the concerned Ministries. However, the main reservation expressed by the Ministries is their unwillingness to transfer area of activity being undertaken by them in this regard. The Committee also find that Department of Land Resources, has again submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' under which all the activities related to watershed and soil conversion would be brought. They also note that the matter for the time being has been deferred. The Committee further note that in the absence of convergence, the Government has not been able to make some integrated planning on the huge task of developing wastelands in the country. In view of this scenario, the Committee again emphatically recommend to take this issue seriously and the matter regarding various reservations of respective Ministries should be sorted out by discussing the matter across the table and the issue should be finalised expeditiously. The Committee would also like that their concerns in this regard should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat.

Reply of the Government

Ministry of Rural Development submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' to the Cabinet Secretariat on 1 October, 2003. A decision in this regard is yet to be taken. The concern of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

An inter-Ministerial Task-Group has also been set up by the Planning Commission to examine the convergence of various watershed and other related programmes being implemented by different Ministries.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated: 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.39)

The Committee also find that one aspect suggested by the Department to strengthen the monitoring mechanism is the establishment of State Level and District Level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to critically assess the monitoring of the projects. The Committee, would like to be apprised in how many States/Districts Level Vigilance Committees have so far been constituted. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the work done by such Vigilance Committees.

Reply of the Government

The State level and District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committees are meant to monitor and review all the programmes of Ministry of Rural Development and not specifically DPAP. No reference with regard to implementation of DPAP in any District/State has so far received by Department of Land Resources (DoLR) from any such Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated: 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 15 of Chapter I of the Report.)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.55)

While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee feel that emphasis has to be given in strengthening the monitoring mechanism so as to improve the implementation of the Programme. From the position of implementation as given by the Department, it seems that there are certain problems. Foremost is the issue of foreclosing projects.

They find that during Ninth Plan, full allocation for 217 projects was made. Out of that, 36 projects were foreclosed. To enable the Committee to comprehend the position of foreclosure further, they would like to be apprised about the reasons for such foreclosure. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the number of projects foreclosed during each of the years of Tenth Plan. The Committee feel that there is some serious lacuna in implementation of such a priority scheme due to which after making such heavy investments on projects, some are being foreclosed, thus wasting the valuable resources.

Reply of the Government

As has been clarified earlier only 1st instalment is released to Zila Parishad (ZP)/District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) with the sanctioning of new projects each year and since the programme is demand driven, subsequent instalments are released over the project period only on receipt of proposals from these agencies fulfilling the release criteria. Hence, the total central share of the project cost is not released at one go at the time of their sanction as apprehended by the Committee.

It is stated that implementation of DDP projects is generally satisfactory. During the Ninth Plan i.e. 1997-98 to 2001-02, a total of 4,954 projects were sanctioned to the States. Of these, central funding has been stopped for 36 projects because of excessive delay in implementation. In case of 217 projects, entire central share in 7 instalments has been released. The rest of the projects are at various stages of implementation.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. Z-11014/1/2004-GC, Dated: 28th December 2004]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report.)

CHAPTER V

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

—Nil—

NEW DELHI;
24 February, 2005
5 Phalgun, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT SHOWING 9TH PLAN OUTLAY & EXPENDITURE

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	9th Plan Outlay and Expenditure																			
		1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		9th Plan (1997-2002)									
		BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	115.00	100.75	100.75	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.99	190.00	190.00	190.00	210.00	210.00	210.00	209.52	705.00	668.75	668.26	
2.	Desert Development Programme	70.00	70.00	70.00	85.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	85.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	160.00	160.00	150.00	150.00	540.00	520.00	519.80	
3.	Computerisation of Land Records	20.00	20.00	20.19	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	32.69	50.00	48.00	47.85	45.00	45.00	45.00	44.36	178.00	171.00	169.84	
4.	SRA&ULR	18.80	18.80	18.97	8.80	8.80	8.80	10.00	10.00	10.25	25.00	25.00	24.99	30.00	30.00	25.00	23.94	92.60	87.60	87.20	
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	
6.	I.W.D.P.	74.50	50.00	53.95	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	82.00	83.07	480.00	387.00	386.90	430.00	430.00	405.00	376.35	1148.60	986.10	962.27	
7.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	8.00	7.50	5.60	8.00	8.00	8.05	8.00	8.00	8.70	12.00	10.87	10.98	15.00	15.00	12.00	9.93	51.00	46.37	43.26	
8.	Support to NGOs/Vas Scheme	4.00	4.00	2.60	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	8.40	7.02	
9.	Wasteland Development Task Force	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.98	

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
10.			1.00	0.20	0.00	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.23	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.12	5.60	3.10	0.49
11.			1.00	0.30	0.04	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.26	0.20	5.00	0.20	0.05	9.00	2.01	1.44
12.			4.00	1.50	1.42	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.00	0.92	0.86	0.50	0.50	0.26	12.50	6.67	5.90
13.			1.50	1.50	1.27	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.71	2.50	2.45	2.38	3.00	2.10	1.68	11.00	10.05	8.46
			318.80	275.55	275.79	324.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	323.60	900.00	800.00	799.66	900.00	850.00	816.21	2767.30	2513.05	2476.92
			NON PLAN																	
			0.20	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.84	2.60	2.54	2.19
			319.00	275.74	275.93	324.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	323.77	900.90	800.89	800.50	900.99	850.97	817.05	2769.90	2515.59	2479.11
			TOTAL PLAN & NON PLAN																	

APPENDIX II

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 14TH FEBRUARY, 2005

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1220 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Mohan Jena
4. Shri Hannan Mollah
5. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
6. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
7. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
8. Shri Nikhilaanda Sar
9. Shri Mohan Singh
10. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
11. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

12. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
13. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
14. Shri Penumalli Madhu
15. Shri Kalraj Mishra
16. Dr. Chandan Mitra
17. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

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

2. As the Chairman was stranded on account of delay of train, the Committee chose Shri Mohan Singh, MP to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. He was in the Chair till 1200 hrs., when the Chairman came and presided over the sitting.

3. The Committee then took up for consideration Memorandum No. 2 alongwith the draft action taken report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Land Resources. After deliberations the Committee adopted the report with slight modification as given in *Annexure*.

4. ***

5. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the said draft reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and to present the same to Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

***Relevant portions of the Minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of Minutes dated 14.2.2005)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications/ Additions
1	2	3	4	5
1.	5	9	6 from below	<p><i>For:</i></p> <p>The Committee are concerned to note that the Investment Promotional Scheme launched with the objective of attracting corporate sector/private sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country was discontinued without addressing the various bottlenecks being faced in this regard. The Committee find that although corporate sector is interested in availing of the provision of the scheme, the major hurdle is lack of suitable means for obtaining long term lease rights on Government wastelands.</p> <p>The Committee note that instead of taking the earnest steps to consult and convince the State Governments to come forward in this regard, the Department has tried to justify the position by simply stating that land is a State subject. The Committee in their earlier reports have stressed on the need for involvement of corporate sector due to the inadequate Government funding to take up the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country. In spite of that</p>

1

2

3

4

5

nothing concrete seems to have been done in this regard. The Committee would again like to recommend to the Government to reconsider the matter and after due consultation with the State Governments and corporate sector try to restructure the earlier scheme or launch a new scheme with the objective of involving private sector/corporate sector, so that the task of development of wastelands can be taken up in a stipulated time-frame.

Read:

The Committee are concerned to note that the Investment Promotional Scheme launched with the objective of attracting corporate sector/private sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country was discontinued without addressing the various bottlenecks being faced in this regard. The Committee find that although corporate sector is interested in availing of the provising of the scheme, the major hurdle is lack of suitable means for obtaining long term lease rights on Government wastelands. The Committee would like that the Union Government should find out some solution in consultation with State Governments and corporate/private sector and the Committee should be apprised accordingly so as to enable them to appreciate the decision of the Government to close Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) and comment further in this regard.

APPENDIX III

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

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

I.	Total number of recommendations	41
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government: 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.37, 2.38, 2.41, 2.44, 2.51, 2.58, 2.69, 2.70, 2.71, 3.14, 3.15, 3.36, 3.37, 3.38, 3.40, 3.41, 3.54, 3.56, 3.65, 3.79, 3.80, 3.81, 3.92, 3.93 and 3.94	34
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(82.93%)
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies: Para Nos. 2.52 and 3.20	2
	Percentage to total recommendations	(4.88%)
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Para Nos. 2.32, 2.33, 2.56, 3.39 and 3.55	5
	Percentage to total recommendations	(12.19%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:	Nil