

6

**STANDING COMMITTEE
ON WATER RESOURCES
(2006-2007)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES

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

*[Action taken by the Government on the Recommendations/Observations
contained in the Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the
Standing Committee on Water Resources]*

SIXTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 2006 / Agrahayana, 1928 (Saka)

SIXTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
WATER RESOURCES
(2006-2007)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2006-2007)

*[Action taken by the Government on the Recommendations/Observations
contained in the Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the
Standing Committee on Water Resources]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 15.12.2006

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 15.12.2006



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 2006/Agrahayana, 1928 (Saka)

W.R.C. No. 6

Price : Rs. 80.00

© 2006 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

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

CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2006-07)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government	11
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	39
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	44
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited.	48
APPENDICES	
I. Status of pending Utilization Certificates (UCs) from Autonomous Bodies & Institutions from 1986-87 to 2002-03	54
II. The status of funds released, utilized and physical outputs in respect of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme namely, "Improvement of Drainage in the critical areas of the country" ...	56
III. State-wise Status of Ongoing Major and Medium Irrigation Projects which were anticipated to have attained 90% or more of Targetted Potential on 01.04.2004.....	57
IV. Status of Completion of Projects under AIBP....	59
V. Minutes of the Fourth sitting of the Committee held on 06 December, 2006	70
VI. Analysis of action taken by the Government on the Recommendations/Observations contained in the Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee.....	72
	(i)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON WATER RESOURCES (2006-07)

Shri R. Sambasiva Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Bhanwar Singh Dangawas
3. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
4. Shri Rajen Gohain
5. Smt. Preneet Kaur
6. Shri Raghuveer Singh Kaushal
7. Smt. Manorama Madhavraj
8. Smt. Kiran Maheshwari
9. Shri Shankhlal Majhi
10. Shri Mukeem Mohammad
- *11. Shri Subodh Mohite
- **12. Shri Abu Ayes Mondal
13. Shri Lonappan Nambadan
14. Shri Harilal Madhavaji Bhai Patel
- @15. Dr. Arun Kumar Sarma
16. Smt. Minati Sen
- #17. Shri Harihar Swain
- \$18. Vacant
- %19. Vacant
- @@20. Vacant
- +21. Vacant

\$ Nomination of Shri Paras Nath Yadav, MP, changed by the Hon'ble Speaker *w.e.f.* 31.08.2006.

* Nominated *w.e.f.* 31.08.2006.

Nominated *w.e.f.* 08.09.2006.

@ Nominated *w.e.f.* 25.09.2006.

% Nomination of Smt. Kalpana Ramesh Narhire, MP, changed by the Hon'ble Speaker *w.e.f.* 25.09.2006.

@@ Nomination of Shri Sippipari Ravichandran, MP, changed by the Hon'ble Speaker *w.e.f.* 25.09.2006.

+ Shri Jay Prakash Narayan Yadav, MP ceased to be Member of the Committee *w.e.f.* 24.10.2006 on his induction in the Council of Ministers.

** Nominated *w.e.f.* 28.11.2006.

Rajya Sabha

22. Chowdhary Mohammad Aslam
23. Shri Indramoni Bora
24. Shri Ajay Singh Chautala
25. Smt. Sushree Devi
26. Shri K.E. Ismail
- *27. Shri K.P.K. Kumaran
28. Prof. P. J. Kurien
29. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia
30. Shri Sharad Yadav
31. Shri Nandi Yellaiah

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri A.S. Chera — *Director*
4. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy — *Under Secretary*
5. Shri A.K. Yadav — *Committee Officer*

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 01.09.2006.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Water Resources (2006-2007) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Sixth Report on the Action Taken by Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Water Resources (2005-2006) on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Ministry of Water Resources.

2. The Fifth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May 2006. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 18 September 2006.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 06 December, 2006.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix-VI.

NEW DELHI;
13 December, 2006
22 Agrahayana, 1928 (Saka)

R. SAMBASIVA RAO,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Water Resources.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Water Resources deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations/ observations contained in their Fifth Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Ministry of Water Resources which was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May 2006.

2. Action taken notes were received from the Government in respect of all the 26 recommendations/observations of the Committee which have been categorised as follows:—

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

Para Nos. 1.19, 1.26, 1.30, 2.8, 2.15, 2.19, 3.17, 3.24, 4.8, 4.18, 4.19, 5.34, 5.48, 6.8, 7.16, 7.21 and 7.27

(Total—17)

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

Para Nos. 1.20, 3.12, 4.10 and 5.39

(Total—4)

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

Para Nos. 2.12, 5.15 and 5.24

(Total—3)

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

Para Nos. 3.9 and 7.26

(Total—2)

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

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

A. Outcome Budget—Improvement of Drainage in Critical Areas of the Country

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

5. The Committee noted that an important programme included in the 'Outcome Budget' of the Ministry relates to improvement of Drainage in Critical Areas of the country estimated to cost Rs. 54.57 crore comprising Central share of Rs. 49.62 crore sanctioned in February 2004 which intended to take up works with the objective of improvement of drainage in critical areas affected by floods in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. The Plan outlay for the Scheme had been increased to Rs. 22.11 crore in 2006-2007 as against Rs. 18 crore in 2005-2006. The Committee were disconcerted to note that the quantifiable durables/physical outputs in respect of this Scheme had been very vaguely described. The Plan outlay had also been restricted to Rs. 22.11 crore in spite of the availability of Rs. 26.87 crore due to poor performance by the States of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The Committee desired the Ministry to impress upon the State Governments to address the problems like land acquisition in right earnest so that the works of these projects commence at the earliest and also define the physical outputs in more realistic terms.

6. The Ministry has, in its action taken reply, stated that it has requested the concerned State Governments to expedite the execution of the works under this scheme. Zonal offices of Central Water Commission monitor the schemes regularly by making field visits and submit monitoring report. State Governments are constantly reminded to complete the scheme by the stipulated time, *i.e.* by the end of 10th Five Year Plan. The status of funds released, utilized and physical outputs are given at **Appendix-II**.

7. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Ministry that State Governments are being constantly reminded to expedite completion of the works under this Scheme by the stipulated time,

i.e. by the end of the Tenth Plan. A perusal of the Statement (Appendix-II) showing status of funds released, utilized and physical outputs under the Scheme reveals that the State Governments treat the reminders of the Ministry as a routine ritual since no penal or other actions are initiated for non-performance of States by the Ministry. The Committee note that Uttar Pradesh which was given Rs. 150 lakh during 2004-2006 has not utilized even a single rupee under this Scheme. States of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh have also not been able to utilize the allocated funds completely. Further, no reasons were given by the State Governments for the under-utilization/non-utilisation of the funds. This shows the impunity with which the State Governments treat the reminders of Ministry of Water Resources. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and desire the Ministry to impress upon the State Governments to address the problems of land acquisition in right earnest so that work on these projects gets completed at the earliest. The Committee also desire the Ministry to give complete replies to their recommendations in future. The Committee further desire that physical output should be defined in more realistic terms keeping in view the preparedness of the State Governments for utilization of the funds in order to put a check on the tendency of non-utilization/under-utilization of funds.

B. Major and Medium Irrigation—Expeditious completion of projects to create additional irrigation potential and utilization of potential created

Recommendation (Para No. 3.9)

8. The Committee were dismayed to note that there were 471 (169 major, 219 medium and 83 ERM) ongoing projects in the country, which had spilled over from Ninth Plan with a balance cost of about Rs. One Lakh Crore. Out of all these ongoing irrigation projects, only 11 Major and 7 Medium Irrigation projects were reported as completed during the first four years of the Tenth Plan. The Ministry had attributed the reasons for delay in completion of projects to lack of budgetary provision in the State Government Budgets, frequent changes in the scope of project, land acquisition problems, resettlement and rehabilitation of project oustees, legal problems, delay in compliance by the State Governments to the observations of Central appraising agencies and inter-State issues. The Committee had also observed that 300 new projects (78 major, 136 medium and 86 ERM) were taken up for implementation during the Tenth Plan for creation of 6.5 mha additional irrigation potential to be created during the Tenth Plan.

While 8.12 lakh hectare irrigation potential was created during 2002-2003, irrigation potential of 9.20 and 15.51 lakh hectare was expected to be created during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, respectively. On the other hand the utilization of the potential created was about 86%. The Committee opined that though the Government is making huge investments year after year to complete the pending projects, the desired results are far from being achieved. The Committee recommended the Government to take urgent steps to resolve all the problems as identified by the Ministry for delay in completion of projects expeditiously and strengthen the monitoring mechanism under each project in order to complete these projects as per their present revised stipulated dates of completion. The Committee also desired the Ministry to take urgent steps to increase the utilization of irrigation potential already created as well as to achieve the targets set for creation of additional potential during the Tenth Plan.

9. The Ministry has, in its action taken reply, stated that as on 31.03.2006 total number of projects completed upto 9th Plan were 1270 (244 major, 936 medium and 90 ERM) and projects not yet completed are 452 (157 major, 212 medium and 83 ERM). The ongoing projects include both approved as well as unapproved projects. Implementation of irrigation projects comes under the purview of the State Governments. However, the Union Government has been providing Central loan assistance under AIBP to the ongoing approved projects to facilitate their early completion for early creation of irrigation potential.

The average potential creation per year was around 4.4 lakh ha. in 8th plan, which increased to 8.24 lakh ha. in 9th plan. The annual potential creation in the year 2002-03 was 8.12 lakh ha., which has further increased to 10.04 lakh ha. in 2003-04 against the expected creation of 9.2 lakh ha. Though, complete details of potential creation for the year 2004-05 are yet to be received from States, the potential creation through the projects under AIBP alone is around 5 lakh ha. in the year 2004-05. Pace of potential creation will be further accelerated during the Bharat Nirman period. It may, however, be noted that the increase in creation of irrigation potential is mainly contributed by the approved projects and not through the projects which are still unapproved. The State Governments have been advised to get these projects duly approved by the Planning Commission. The problems being faced on account of these unapproved projects are being discussed in the meetings of the Working Group for 11th Plan constituted by Planning Commission and further action would be taken as per their recommendations. It is pertinent to note that most of the

projects out of 300 new projects included in 10th Plan are also unapproved and not much help can be provided by the Ministry of Water Resources for these projects till they are approved by Planning Commission.

10. The Committee note that Ministry has provided the data in support of their comments that substantial progress has been made in potential creation which was 4.4 lakh ha. in 8th Plan and increased to 8.24 lakh ha. in 9th Plan. The potential created in the year 2002-2003 was 8.12 lakh ha. and 10.24 lakh ha. in 2003-2004 against the expected creation of 9.2 lakh ha. The figures of potential created during 2004-2005 are not available with the Ministry. However, pace of potential creation will be further accelerated during the Bharat Nirman period. The Ministry has stated that the creation of potential is mainly contributed by the approved projects and they are advising State Gvoernments to get the projects approved by the Planning Commission. However, the Ministry has not provided any information with regard to the steps taken by them to resolve all the problems as identified for delay in compeltion of projects as also the steps taken to increase the utilization of irrigation potential already created. The Ministry has also stated that Working Group of 11th Plan constituted by the Planning Commission is discussing the issue of problems faced on account of unapproved projects. The Ministry will take action after the recommendations of the Working Group are received. The committee hope that the Working Group would give their recommendations before the 11th Plan commences. The Committee desire to be informed of the recommendations of the Working Group alongwith the steps taken for the completion of the projects within revised stipulated timeframe. They would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the Houses of Parliament. The Comittee, would also advise the Ministry to desist from tendency of providing incomplete replies to their recommendations lest a serious view should be taken by them in this regard.

**C. Command Area Development and Water Management Scheme—
National Level Workshop on PIM**

Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)

11. The Committee noted that according to the Ministry it could not organise a National Level Workshop on PIM which was proposed in early 2005-06. The Ministry had further informed the Committee that before organizing National Level Workshop on PIM there is a

need to get feedback from the regional level workshops on PIM. The Ministry was, however, able to organize only one regional level workshop on PIM for North Eastern States during January, 2006. One such regional level Workshop was proposed to be organized shortly for Northern States. The Committee had, therefore, desired that the regional level workshop on PIM for Northern States be organized at the earliest so that a National Level Workshop on PIM can also be organized timely which will help the remaining State Governments to enact PIM legislation for implementing the Scheme.

12. The Ministry has in its action taken reply stated that the matter relating to holding of Regional Workshop on PIM for Northern States is under consideration and the same will be organized as soon as the dates are finalized, following which National Level Workshop on PIM shall be organized for all the States.

13. The Committee are anguished to note that despite passage of more than nine months from the holding of the regional workshop for North Eastern States in January 2006, the Ministry has not been able to decide on the dates for organising Regional Workshop on Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) for Northern States. The Committee are unable to comprehend the reasons for such an inordinate delay in this regard and wonder as to when the National Level Workshop on PIM could be organized by the Ministry given the pace with which such important Workshops are required to be organised. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to take urgent steps for early organization of Regional as well as National Level Workshops on PIM so that remaining State Governments may be benefited by it in enacting PIM legislation for implementation of the Scheme.

D. Flood Control—Critical Anti-Erosion Works in Ganga Basin States

Recommendations (Para Nos. 5.15 and 5.24)

14. The Committee had noted that Plan allocation for flood control had been earmarked at Rs. 248.22 crore for 2006-2007 with an increase of Rs. 16.59 crore as against an allocation of Rs. 231.63 for 2005-2006..... They had noted that out of Rs. 1,403.22 crore plan outlay for flood control Rs. 557.39 crore remained unallocated..... The Committee were of the firm view that more emphasis needed to be laid on utilizing the funds allocated for expeditious completion of on-going projects rather than thin spreading of the available scarce funds on too many projects. The Committee further noted that the modified EFC memo for Ganga Basin States that included the Schemes recommended by

the Task Force had not been cleared by the appraising agencies and desired the Ministry to take effective and urgent steps to get the EFC memo cleared at the earliest to facilitate the works on projects under the Scheme.....

The committee had also observed that the total cost of the Schemes "Critical Anti-erosion and Flood Management" in Ganga Basin States was revised to Rs. 242.17 crore with Central share of Rs. 195.63 crore. The Plan allocation for the year 2006-2007 for the Scheme had been increased to Rs. 111.20 crore, representing an enhancement of Rs. 11.20 crore over the BE for the year 2005-2006..... EFC memo for the Scheme recommended by the Task Force was prepared and circulated to appraising agencies for their comments. The meeting of Expenditure Finance Committee was yet to take place and the Ministry of Water Resources had reminded the Ministry of Finance in this regard. The Committee had recommended the Ministry to get the comments of the appraising agencies urgently and arrange a meeting with the Expenditure Finance Committee to get its concurrence for the Scheme at the earliest. The Committee noted that the number of new Schemes which were to be taken up during the year 2006-2007 was contingent on the approval by the EFC/Competent Authority on the expanded Scheme and the Schemes were to be prioritised by an Empowered Committee which was proposed to be set up for the purpose. The Committee, therefore, recommended the Government to get approval for the expanded Schemes from the EFC/Competent Authority first before setting up the Empowered Committee to prioritize the Scheme at the earliest. The Committee had also recommended the Government to take all appropriate steps to implement the recommendations of the Expert Committee which submitted its Report on 15 February 2006 in the current financial year itself to fulfil the objective of setting up such an Expert Committee.

15. The Ministry has, in its action taken reply, stated that EFC meeting regarding the revised scheme on Critical anti-erosion works in Ganga Basin States, was held on 12 May 2006 under Chairmanship of Secretary, Ministry of Finance. This scheme cleared by EFC is under process for obtaining approval of Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs. The schemes recommended by Task Force under Immediate and Short Term-I category which are linked with the ongoing works *i.e.*, works which are required to be executed to ensure full benefit from the works under implementation/completed or are very critical in nature, have been considered under the scheme for implementation during the last year of 10th Plan. Other schemes as recommended by Task Force under Immediate and Short Term-I will be implemented

during 11th Plan after the performance evaluation of works carried out during 10th Plan. Out of eleven schemes considered by EFC in May 2006 for 10th Plan, nine schemes have already been cleared by GFCC and remaining two are under process.

Most of the new works will spill over to 11th Plan, since the working season was over by 15 June 2006. The next working season will start after flood of 2006 and the works will be completed before flood of 2007. Accordingly provisions have been made under the EFC to the extent the work is possible in each case by 31 March 2007. The concept of Empowered Committee will be applicable for the schemes of 11th Plan, as ongoing schemes and other works required to ensure full benefits in the vicinity of ongoing schemes/very critical works are only included in 10th Plan proposal.

16. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Ministry. The Committee had recommended the Ministry to take effective and urgent steps to get the EFC memo cleared at the earliest to facilitate the works on projects under the Scheme 'Critical Anti-erosion work on Ganga Basin States' as the same were likely to be implemented during the current financial year in consonance with the recommendation of the Task Force. The Committee had also desired the Ministry to take all appropriate steps to implement the recommendation of Expert Committee which submitted its Report on 15 February 2006 in the current financial year itself to fulfil the objective of setting up such an Expert Committee. However, the Committee are dismayed to note that by their own admission most of the new works will spill over to 11th Plan, since the working season was over by 15 June 2006. The next working season will start after flood of 2006 and the work will be completed before flood of 2007. Accordingly, provision has been made under the EFC to the extent the work is possible in each case by 31 March 2007. The Committee are unable to comprehend the fact that when the works were likely to spill over to 11th Plan due to culmination of working season by 15 June 2006, why so many new Schemes were taken up for implementation in the current year when the working season is restricted to the period between November 2006 and March 2007. As observed elsewhere in this Report, the reply to this recommendation too is incomplete. The reply is silent on the action taken by Government on the Report/Recommendations of the Expert Committee which had submitted its Report on 15 February 2006. The reply is also silent as to when the EFC memo cleared on 12 May 2006 would be put upto the CCEA for final clearance. The Committee disapprove the manner in which matters are being

conducted by the Ministry. They cannot but express their anguish over the matter and hope that Ministry would take appropriate steps to implement the recommendations of Expert Committee with sincerity as also get the final clearance for the EFC Memo from CCEA at an early date so that progress of works under the Scheme are not adversely affected in the 11th Plan. The Committee also desire to be apprised of the action taken in the above matters within three months of presentation of this Report to the Parliament.

E. Performance review of AIBP by C&AG

Recommendation (Para No. 7.26)

17. The Committee were unhappy to note that 15 States, *viz.*, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal were reported to have diverted/mis-utilized the Central Loan Assistance (CLA) under AIBP, according to the Report of C&AG. The Committee in their Third Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) had recommended the Government to enquire into the matter and apprise the outcome of the same to the Committee within three months from the presentation of that Report to the Houses of Parliament. However, the Ministry could not submit the requisite information to the Committee. The Committee in their Action Taken Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) had again recommended the Ministry to set a definite time frame to obtain the requisite information from the above States. The Ministry could obtain the requisite information from only five State, *viz.* Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh. The revised Guidelines stipulate mandatory submission of audited statement of expenditure on projects receiving CLA within a month of closure of the financial year..... The Committee opined that the progress of projects under AIBP was not commensurate to the quantum of CLA being released by the Government. The Committee recommended the Ministry to speed up the enquiry procedures in order to obtain the requisite information from the remaining 10 States without any further delay.

The Committee had also observed that Five of the States which had sent compliance report on audit paras to the Ministry had not tendered the details of diversion and mis-utilization of CLA under AIBP. The Committee had desired the Government to obtain the detailed replies from these States in this regard at the earliest. Further, taking strong exception to the state of affairs in this matter, the Committee recommend that if these defaulter States do not submit the

requisite information within three months of the presentation of the present Report to the Houses, further release of CLA funds under AIBP to these States should be stopped immediately so that in future the diversion/mis-utilization of CLA funds under AIBP dose not take place.

18. The Ministry, in its action taken reply, stated that the issue of diversion of funds made available by Central Government to the States under AIBP has been taken up with the State Governments concerned but most of the State Governments are yet to respond to the observations raised by the CAG in its report. The issue is being pursued by the Ministry of Water Resources with the concerned State Governments. The performance of the AIBP has in fact been very good keeping in view the figures of expenditure incurred and potential created under AIBP. No doubt that number of projects completed are not in accordance with the targets, but the completion of projects may be delayed due to various reasons. During 1996 to 2005, total expenditure incurred on AIBP is of Rs. 27,813 crore and the potential created under AIBP is 32,60,260 ha. The expenditure incurred for a hectare of creation of irrigation potential works out to Rs. 85,300 which is quite reasonable. In fact, the CAG itself has stated that cost of creation of irrigation potential should be in the limit of Rs. 1.00 lakh per ha. Accordingly, the expenditure incurred per unit of irrigation potential creation is well within limit. Further, development of irrigation potential of 32,60,260 ha. in a period of 8 years is a big achievement under AIBP.

19. The Committee note that while the reply is more than forthcoming in delving on points which deal with the performance of AIBP Scheme and release/non-release of instalments of Government share in different situations under the AIBP guidelines, the Ministry has ostensibly failed to obtain the reply of the defaulting State Governments with regard to diversion/mis-utilisation of CLA under AIBP. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to pursue the State Governments to submit relevant information within a period of three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the Houses of Parliament. The Committee also desire to be apprised of the outcome of the efforts made by the Ministry in this regard at the earliest.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Shortfall in Utilization of funds allocated to the Ministry

Recommendation (Para No. 1.19)

The scrutiny of Demands for Grants 2006-2007 of Ministry of Water Resources reveals an outlay of Rs. 987.31 crore which precludes funds for AIBP and other Water Resources Programmes. The outlay shows an increase of 9.74% over the Budget Estimates of the previous year. It also shows an overall hike of Rs. 79.00 crore (12.48%) in the Plan outlay of Rs. 712.00 crore for 2006-2007 in comparison to Rs. 633.00 crore in 2005-2006. Whereas there is an increase of Rs. 81.25 crore (13.82%) on the Revenue Section (Plan), the Capital Section (Plan) shows a reduction of Rs. 2.25 crore (-4.89%). On the other hand, the Non-Plan allocation for Revenue Section shows an increase of Rs. 8.65 crore (3.49%) while the Capital Section shows no change over the year 2005-2006. The Committee further observe that though the Ministry had proposed Rs. 1168.23 crore as Plan allocation for the year 2006-2007, the Planning Commission allocated Rs. 987.31 crore, representing a scaling down in Plan allocation to the tune of Rs. 180.92 crore for the Ministry by the Planning Commission. The Budget Estimates (Plan) for the years 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 for the Ministry of Water Resources were earmarked at Rs. 562.00 crore, Rs. 566.00 crore and Rs. 592.00 crore respectively. However, the Ministry could utilize only Rs. 393.66 crore, Rs. 400.20 crore and Rs. 410.16 crore during the period in question. The amounts remaining unutilised at Rs. 168.34 crore, Rs. 165.80 crore and Rs. 181.84 crore amount to about 30% of the plan allocation over the years. The Committee fail to understand the specious argument of the Ministry that due to paucity of funds certain important new projects could not be undertaken and some on-going projects could not be completed in time, given the fact that the Ministry could not even fully utilize the funds allocated to it well within the stipulated time. The Committee are of the firm view that the continuous under-utilization of allocated funds by the Ministry forecloses its options to seek more funds from the Planning Commission and the blame for the same wholly lies on the part of the Ministry. This sorry state of affairs speaks volumes of the manner in which its

case is being put before the Planning Commission. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should give more emphasis on putting the allocated funds to good use and demand additional allocation from the Planning Commission only when it is certain that the allocated funds would be fully utilized.

The Committee also observe that the Plan allocation for CAD&WM, Critical Anti-Erosion Works in Ganga Basin States, new schemes for Majuli Island, Feasibility Study of Inter-basin transfer of Waters, Ground Water Survey, Explorations and Investigations, Extension of Embankments on Lalbakeya, Kamla, Bagmati and Khando rivers had been reduced considerably at the RE stage for the year 2005-2006. Apparently, the Ministry's less than impressive performance in utilization of Plan allocation for the year 2005-2006 stems mainly from non-awarding of work relating to DPR of Ken-Betwa Line Project under NWDA and the delay in execution of the New Scheme for Majuli Island in Assam, Dihang Project, etc. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to impress upon the State Governments to award the works related to DPR of Ken-Betwa Link Project and complete the new scheme for Majuli Island in Assam, Dihang Project without any further delay. The Committee would like to be apprised of the status of the action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

It is a fact that Ministry of Water Resources could not fully utilize the plan funds for the years 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05. The detailed reasons for the same were submitted to the Committee from time to time. The major reasons are summarized as under:

- (i) During 2002-03, the progress of Plan expenditure in respect of "Pagladia Dam Project" was slow due to delay in land acquisition process, non-completion of Zirut Survey etc. by the Government of Assam affecting the R&R work and revision of the cost due to change in the design of structure etc. The scheme for Flood Control in Brahmaputra Valley could not be approved in time.
- (ii) During 2003-04, Ministry of Finance did not agree with continuation of the scheme "Command Area Development Programme" as per the old pattern of funding which in turn implied lesser availability of time for release of funds to States after obtaining necessary clearance. The Cabinet approval for re-structured CAD & WM Programme was, however, received subsequently only during February 2004.

- (iii) During 2004-05, the progress of Plan expenditure in respect of "Pagladia Dam Project" was slow due to delay in land acquisition process, non-completion of Zirut Survey etc. by the Government of Assam affecting the R&R work and revision of the cost due to change in the design of structure etc. The scheme for Flood control in Brahmaputra Valley (Provision of Rs. 20 crore in BE 2004-05) and Artificial Recharge of Ground water (Provision of Rs. 40 crores in BE 2004-05) could not be approved in time. Therefore, the allocation at RE stage was reduced to avoid unnecessary surrender.

During 2005-06, a Budget Allocation of Rs. 25 crore was made for NWDA, which includes a provision of Rs. 6 crore for preparation of DPR of Ken-Betwa link. The MOU for Ken-Betwa link could be signed only in August 2005. Immediately after this, NWDA stated finalizing consultancies, mobilizing manpower for doing field surveys, applying for environmental clearance to Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) for doing field activities. The clearance from MoEF is still awaited. Due to this only Rs. 50 lakh could be spent on DPR of Ken-Betwa link which resulted a saving of Rs. 5.50 crore. Similarly, for preparation of FRs of 5 Himalayan links which involves international dimensions permission from other countries was not available and as such the Budget Estimate was reduced to Rs. 17 crore at the RE stage, which was spent during the year. The plan allocation was also reduced at the R.E. stage due to delay in execution of the new schemes for Majuli island in Assam, Dibang project etc. and non awarding of work relating to DPR of Ken Betwa Link Canal Project. There were some savings under the scheme "Critical anti erosion works in Ganga Basin States" also. The allocation for the scheme "CAD&WM" during 2005-06 was also reduced at RE stage because of insufficient proposals received from the State Governments despite every effort in this direction. However, allocation was again increased at Final Estimate stage based on the proposals received.

A memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed on 25.08.2005 between the States of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh and Union Government for preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) of Ken-Betwa link. The Ministry of Water Resources subsequently decided that DPR for Ken-Betwa link shall be prepared by NWDA. NWDA has initiated the works for preparation of its DPR. NWDA has prepared a detailed Bar Chart of different activities involved in this DPR and as per this planning, DPR is likely to be completed by June, 2008.

The total approved estimated cost under the scheme "New Scheme for Majuli Island in Assam, Dibang project etc." is Rs. 76.56 crore. Out of this the works of Rs. 20.57 crore have already been completed. The work orders for the works costing Rs. 36.00 crore have been issued. As per the agreement with contractor, these are to be completed by March 2007. The work orders for works costing Rs. 15.60 crore are planned to be tendered and awarded by October 2006. Out of the balance Rs. 4.40 crore, Rs 1.60 crore is saving of cost mainly from the construction of hangar and works amounting to Rs. 2.80 crore are not likely to be taken up as designs etc. are to take more time.

Single Administrative Ministry for Water

Recommendation (Para No. 1.26)

The Committee are distressed to note that no progress has been made by the Government even after a lapse of one year towards the constitution of "Single Administrative Ministry for Water" despite their repeated recommendations for the same in their earlier Reports. The Ministry now states that the National Water Resource Programme Coordination Committee (NWRPCC) under the Chairmanship of Member (Agri & WR), Planning Commission is yet to be set up and the onus of forming the Committee lies with the Planning Commission. The Committee is of the opinion that although speedy constitution of the NWRPCC is the prerogative of the Planning Commission, the Ministry cannot shirk its responsibility of getting the committee constituted at the earliest by constantly prodding the Planning Commission till its constitution. The Committee, therefore, observe that if constant dithering and endless dilly-dallying continue to rule roost in regard to the constitution of NWRPCC for the "Single Administrative Ministry for Water", the time is not far when the entire idea of taking a comprehensive and integrated approach for water resource development through one administrative unit will attain a slow death. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry of Water Resources to urge the Planning Commission to take urgent steps towards implementing their recommendation in this regard in the right earnest.

Reply of the Government

As desired by the Committee, the recommendation of the Committee regarding "Single Administrative Ministry for Water" has been forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission has been requested to take necessary action in this regard.

C&AG's Reports for the years 2004 & 2005

Recommendation (Para No. 1.30)

The Committee observe that the C&AG Reports of the years 2004 and 2005 contain observations in regard to various schemes and programmes of the Ministry including its subordinate offices, autonomous bodies and public undertakings. The C&AG Reports indicate incidence of serious malpractices in release and utilization of funds on various schemes and programmes of the Ministry, financial irregularities and blatant misappropriation of funds in respect of some of the schemes/projects undertaken by the Ministry of Water Resources. In Para. Nos. 8.27-8.39 of 1/2004, the C&AG reviewed the Grant No. 86 of Ministry of Water Resources and observed that Command Area Development Programme and Sutlej Yamuna Link Canal Project were affected by unspent provision. Again, the C&AG remarked that the Ministry released excess over budget provision and surrendered the unspent provision on the last day of the respective financial years. The Ministry of Water Resources also re-appropriated funds injudiciously and compulsively expended a large portion of funds in March, 2004 to meet the deadline for the financial year. In Para No. 1.2 of Report No. 4 of 2005, 144 Utilisation Certificates amounting to Rs. 725.54 lakh are outstanding in respect of grants released unto March 2003 (as on 31.03.2004) have not been received from the State Governments. The Committee take a serious note of the fact that the non-receipt of Utilisation Certificates dates back to 1986-1987 since when not even a single year is left in which the Ministry has received all the Utilisation Certificates that were due. The Committee are of the opinion that the observations made in the C&AG Reports are a matter of grave concern. The Committee are of the view that had the Ministry monitored the schemes properly, the situation as mentioned in C&AG Reports would not have come to such a pass. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to enquire into the matter in right earnest and apprise the outcome of the same along with the action taken by the Central Government to the Committee within three months of presentation of their Report to the Houses of Parliament.

Reply of the Government

As regards unspent provision affecting Command Area Development Programme (CADP) mentioned in Para No. 8.27-8.39 of Report No. 1/2004 of C&AG for the Grant No. 86 of Ministry of Water Resources it is mentioned that central assistance is provided to states under this programme in the ratio of 50:50 (centre/state) on the basis of their performance/requirement. After appraising their performance during the preceding year, state governments work out their requirement for the current financial year and forward their

proposals for central assistance after knowing the quantum of funds provided by their own states as per the budget passed by the respective states. In view of this it is difficult to assess the exact requirement of funds by the individual states and also the total funds required in a year by states in advance. Due to overall reduction in allocation of matching funds by state governments at the fag end of the financial year, there was saving in the earmarked budget allocation for CAD Programme. Further, it is added that stages execute most of the physical works only after the kharif season usually in the months of November to March. CAD works commence only after kharif as farmers are reluctant to spare land in cropping season. As such the on farm development works could be taken up only during the last quarters. Due to downward revision in targets, demand for release of funds also came down resulting in savings. These factors contributed for remaining of unspent balance during the years of CAG reports.

In regard to Sutlaj Yamuna Link Canal Project (SYL Project) being affected by unspent provisions, it is pointed out that the entire allocated amount remained unutilised due to non-resumption of construction works on the canal by Punjab Govt. This is still a *sub-judice* case. Though, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed the Punjab Government to complete the balance works and make it functional by 14.01.2003, Punjab Government filed a suit praying for dissolving its liability for undertaking the works. The suit was admitted and finally dismissed by Hon'ble Supreme Court. Provisions were accordingly kept in the budget to meet emergent requirement of funds by Punjab Government. However, the Punjab Government enacted the Punjab Termination of Agreements Act, 2004 on 12.7.2004 terminating the 1981 agreement and all other agreements related to Ravi-Beas Waters. The State Government also informed that any step taken in furtherance of the 1981 agreement would be against the legislative mandate of the Act. In view of these developments, a Presidential Reference regarding the validity of this enactment and its effect on the earlier Court judgments was made to the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2004. This is yet to be disposed of by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Thus, despite of action taken by the Central Government to initiate work, the works of the canal could not be undertaken under above circumstances. This has resulted in entire provision being surrendered at final stage.

As for CAG's observations on release of excess amount over budget provision and surrender of unspent budget provision on the last day of financial years, it is stated that on some occasions funds under different units of heads/schemes were required to be augmented by way of re-appropriation due to actual requirements. These re-

appropriations were made with the approval of competent authority, and in consultation with Ministry of Finance, wherever required. After reviewing the progress of different schemes and assessing fund requirements, excess funds are surrendered at the fag end of the financial year. It is also pointed out that the statement detailing reasons of savings under different schemes in a financial year are got vetted from Office of DGACR and furnished to Ministry of Finance.

As regards injudicious re-appropriation of funds reported by CAG, it is mentioned that recourse to re-appropriation is taken in view of the actual requirement of funds for a particular scheme and also expected saving in other head. During the period of CAG report all the re-appropriation orders were issued due to functional requirement and with the approval of competent authority. As most of the grants-in-aid releases are made to the state governments under various schemes, these releases are made on fulfilling of requisite conditions by them and as per their demand. Delay in receipt of proposals from State Governments invariably led to increase of releases in last quarter of the financial year 2003-04.

With a view to obviate the shortcomings mentioned in CAG report in question, system of monthly review of plan expenditure has been introduced. State Governments have also been repeatedly requested to furnish their proposals for releases and utilization certificates of earlier installment in time so that releases could be made in a phased and planned manner. One of the major reasons of unspent balance is late supply of machinery and equipments by firms. In such cases the concerned firms have been impressed upon to stick to the conditions of the supply order.

As per para No. 1.2 of CAG Report No. 4 of 2005 and Appendix VI, 144 utilization certificates amounting to Rs. 725.54 lakh were shown outstanding against the grants released up to 2002-03 in respect of Ministry of Water Resources. At present out of above outstanding utilization certificates, only 30 utilisation certificates amounting to Rs. 104.952 lakh are outstanding. The year-wise and wing-wise break up of outstanding utilisation certificates as on date is at Annexure-I.

Outcome Budget—Accelerated Irrigation Benefits Programme (AIBP)

Recommendation (Para No. 2.8)

The Committee observed that the Finance Minister through his Budget speech (2005-2006) put in place a yardstick to measure the magnitude of development of all major programmes of the Government

with the introduction of the concept of 'Outcome Budget' which is expected to reflect the Annual Budget of the Ministry in terms of intended outcomes over a period of time which will help in realizing public scrutiny of the schemes/projects for which funds are allocated out of the public exchequer. AIBP is one such major programme of the Ministry of Water Resources where huge amounts are allocated to the State Governments year after year by the Government. A perusal of the targets as against the financial outlay outlined in the Outcome Budget reveals that very little has been achieved during the year (2005-06) under AIBP. The creation of irrigation potential of 1,041.03 thousand hectares against a target of 0.925 million hectare, to say the least, is awfully short. Apparently, the quantum of irrigation potential during 2005-2006 was achieved with the completion of 25 of the 29 major/medium irrigation projects targeted to be completed during the year. The Committee cannot but conclude from the above that the Ministry's decision to shift focus from 'completion of project' to 'creation of irrigation potential' has failed to achieve the desired result. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to take up only such projects for implementation which are capable of creating the magnitude of irrigation potential envisaged for the particular year. The Committee further recommend that this aspect be incorporated in the MoUs that are provided by the State Governments at the time of setting up targets for creation of potential as well as completion of irrigation projects. The Committee would like to be acquainted of the status of action taken on this recommendation within 3 months of the presentation of the Report to the Parliament.

Reply of the Government

The pace of creation of irrigation potential has gained momentum due to AIBP since the start of 9th Plan. In the 9th plan, out of the total potential of 42.40 lakh ha, 16.50 lakh ha, (nearly 40%) was through AIBP schemes. In the 10th plan period, during the first three years of the 10th plan period, the potential created under AIBP is 4.56 lakh ha in 2002-03, 4.47 lakh ha in 2003-04 and 4.96 lakh ha in 2004-05. For the year 2005-06, the targeted irrigation potential was 9.25 lakh ha against which MoUs have been signed under AIBP for creation of potential of 14.26 lakh ha. The figures of potential creation for 2005-06 are yet to be received from the States. The figures of irrigation potential during the year are generally available after about a years time.

The delay in achieving targeted irrigation potential is due to various reasons which could not be foreseen, prominent among them are land acquisition problems and contractual problems. However, for achieving

the intended objective, efforts will be made to select only those projects under AIBP which are having least possible bottlenecks in their completion. Monitoring of the project is also being intensified for timely intervention to remove bottlenecks in completion of the project.

MoU are being obtained for new projects to be included in AIBP from State Government *inter-alia* indicating balance cost, balance potential and targeted date of completion. Since 2004-05, only grant component of Central Assistance is being released by the Government of India and loan component is to be raised by State from market borrowing (except in case of fiscally weak states). MoU provides for conversion of Grant component into loan in case there is unjustifiable delay in completion of project beyond target date of completion indicated in MoU. It is expected that these safeguards introduced in AIBP will result in expeditious creation of irrigation potential and completion of projects included under AIBP.

Outcome Budget—Command area Development and Water Management

Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)

A perusal of the statements of outcomes/targets for CAD & WM for the year 2005-2006 shows targets of quantifiable works in respect of construction of field channels, correction of system deficiencies and renovation of minor irrigation tanks. In respect of construction of field channels 0.279 million hectare was achieved upto December 2005 against the target of 0.23 million hectare. The Committee, however, are unhappy to note that no progress has been made in respect of correction of system deficiencies and renovation of MI tanks under the restructured CAD&WM for the year 2005-2006. The Ministry's specious plea that in case of correction of system deficiency, the formation of WUAs under PIM Act/Amended Irrigation Acts and the signing of MoUs between the State Governments and WUAs would take some time and in case of renovation of MI tanks, the extent pattern of funding (50:50) and the failure to legislate PIM Act/Amended Irrigation Acts by State Governments, were mainly responsible for delay in taking up the Scheme is untenable. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to pursue with respective State Governments to expedite the process of constitution of WUAs so that the MoUs between them and the concerned WUAs could be signed without any further delay. The Committee recommend the Ministry to revisit the existing policy of funding pattern for determining renovation of MI tanks and impress upon the State Governments to legislate PIM Act/amend Irrigation Acts expeditiously. The Committee desire to be informed of the action taken in the matter at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

The matter relating to enactment of participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) Acts is being regularly pursued with the State Governments. The matter is also proposed to be discussed in the Review Meeting with the State Governments to be held during the current financial year. The enactment of PIM Act will automatically facilitate the process of formation of Water Users Associations (WUAs) and signing of the MoUs between State Governments and the WUAs. As far as the review of the existing policy of funding pattern for renovation of minor irrigation tanks is concerned, it may be mentioned that all aspects of CADWM programme including the funding pattern are under discussion in the Working Group on Water Resources Sector set up by the Planning Commission for the 11th Plan. Once the recommendations of the Working Group are received, further follow up action shall be initiated by the Ministry.

Outcome Budget—Flood Control in Brahmaputra Valley

Recommendation (Para No. 2.19)

The Committee observe that 45,600 hectares of flood prone area are proposed to be provided protection under the scheme Flood Control in Brahmaputra Valley with an outlay of Rs. 80 crore for 2005-2006 against an outlay of Rs. 20 crore for 2004-2005. An amount of Rs. 11.40 crore only could be spent due to late receipt of investment clearance for the Scheme. The Committee further observe that a revised EFC Memo incorporating Schemes of medium and short term-I category recommended by the Task Force for Rs. 966.40 crore was circulated in September 2005. The modified EFC recommended an amount of Rs. 225 crore whereupon the outlay for flood control in Brahmaputra Valley for 2006-2007 stands re-allocated at Rs. 125 crore. The Ministry has indicated that the targets are subject to timely submission of schemes by the State Governments, execution as per time schedule and utilization of funds properly in time. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to draw a time frame for submission of schemes by the State Governments, for their clearance by the Ministry so that their execution as per time schedule is feasible which will also improve the utilization of funds properly. The Committee also desire the Government to monitor the physical outputs as also quantify the results in relation thereto. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

The list of projects State-wise in respect of the approved scheme has already been drawn up in consultation with State Governments. The total funds released under the scheme during 10th Plan is Rs. 60 crore till date.

The programme towards release of funds is that submission of Utilization Certificates in respect of the already released fund by the State Governments be made by December 2006. Accordingly the balance amount can be released in March 2007.

The revised scheme of Rs. 225 crore, approved by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs, includes Rs. 205 crore for schemes to be executed by States and Rs. 20 crore by Brahmaputra Board. On approval of the modified scheme, additional projects are to be taken up following the same procedure. Preparatory action in consultation with the States to prioritise the projects to be executed by States from the additional amount allocated as per the revised scheme has been finalized in a meeting held in August 2006. The first instalment can be released after necessary coordination with States by Brahmaputra Board in November 2006. It is also planned that, on similar basis, the second instalment can be released by March 2007 on receipt of Utilisation Certificates from the State Governments.

As regards the schemes to be executed by Brahmaputra Board with the provision of Rs. 20 crore, the schemes to be taken up in States have already been identified by the Standing Committee in consultation with the States. The execution of the identified schemes will be taken up by Brahmaputra Board to complete the targeted works utilizing the next working season.

To monitor the implementation of the scheme and its physical outputs, a Monitoring Team has been constituted under the Chief Engineer, Brahmaputra Board, which visits the sites and inspects the physical works executed and on the basis of its reports, the Board recommends further release of funds on satisfactory progress/physical outputs. The team has so far visited 36 projects and checked physical and financial progress achieved.

The quantification of the results from individual projects is proposed to be carried out by Brahmaputra Board through impact evaluation for some representative projects on completion and performance evaluation.

National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee

Recommendation (Para No. 3.17)

The Committee note that the Budget allocation (Plan) for National Institute of Hydrology was earmarked at Rs. 9.27 crore during the year 2005-2006. However, at the Revised Estimates stage 2005-2006, it was reduced to Rs. 5.20 crore. According to the Ministry, during the year 2005-2006, a sum of Rs. 4.41 crore was provided for taking up activities related to Hydrology Project-II, however, the activities could not be taken up as the agreement with World Bank was not signed in time. The Budget allocation for 2006-2008 for National Institute of Hydrology stands at Rs. 17.48 crore which is Rs. 8.21 crore more than the previous financial year. The Ministry informed the Committee that the enhancement in Budget allocation is mainly on account of Hydrology Project-II. The Committee, therefore, desire that the agreement with World Bank be signed at an early date. The Committee hope that Government will take up all the activities under Hydrology Project-II earnestly and that the task entrusted for development of Decision Support Systems assigned to National Institute of Hydrology would be completed as scheduled for creating a comprehensive DSS.

Reply of the Government

It is submitted that the agreement with World Bank in respect of Hydrology Project-II has already been signed on 19th January, 2006. Administrative approval and expenditure sanction of Government of India for Hydrology Project-II have also been issued on 8th May, 2006 and project has become fully operational. The Decision Support system (DSS) is expected to be developed under Hydrology Project-II by NIH as per schedule.

Research and Development (R&D Programme)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)

The Committee note that though the Budget allocation for Research and Development Programme during the years 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 were Rs. 6.00 crore and Rs. 8.00 crore respectively. The Ministry, however, could utilize only Rs. 2.09 crore (34.83%) and Rs. 4.20 crore (52.5%) respectively. It is further disconcerting to note that despite huge under utilization of funds, the Budget allocation for the above Scheme during the year 2006-2007 has been enhanced by Rs. 5.06 crore which is 63.25% more allocation than the previous financial year 2005-2006. The reasons for under-utilization of funds as

stated by the Ministry are non-submission of sufficient schemes and non-clearance of all the received schemes from various organizations. The Committee are much concerned about the under utilization of funds and are of the considered opinion that the factors stated by the Ministry are not that complicated which cannot be resolved. The Committee feel that the Ministry has proposed for higher allocations without examining the Scheme properly. The Committee observe that the Government have initiated various important Research and Development Programmes in Water Resources Sector under various Organization/Institutions but due to under utilization of funds, all the ongoing Research and Development Programmes are getting adversely affected, resulting in non-completion of works under the Schemes. The Committee strongly recommend that adequate and necessary steps be taken by the Ministry to ensure justifiable allocations and effective utilization under the Schemes so that the completion of work under various ongoing Research and Development Programmes may not be hampered. The Committee also desire that utilization of allocated funds be stepped up to obviate adverse remarks by C&AG or other authorities in this respect.

Reply of the Government

The suggestions of the Parliamentary Standing Committee have been noted and with a view to increasing the utilisation of funds proactive approach is being adopted by the Ministry of Water Resources for submission of new schemes as well as for submission of proposals for further release of funds. The procedure for processing of research schemes is being reviewed and simplified.

It is submitted that due care has been taken while keeping higher allocation for R&D schemes for the year 2006-07. The allocation for the year 2006-07 has been increased mainly in view of a number of studies related to water use efficiencies of irrigation system. In addition, it is also proposed to carry out evaluation studies of the existing plan schemes under flood control sector.

Command Area Development and Water Management Scheme— Utilization of X plan allocation and improvement of physical performance

Recommendation (Para No. 4.8)

The Committee are dismayed to note that out of the Budget allocation of Rs. 1,208 crore for Tenth Plan for CAD & WM, only 49% allocation could be utilized in the first four years of the Tenth Plan.

An amount of Rs. 204.30 crore has been allocated for the Scheme for 2006-2007, while the allocation of Rs. 199 crore in BE 2005-2006 was reduced to Rs. 157.50 crore at RE stage. The Committee observe that at present there are 133 Projects under implementation spread over 27 States. The Committee also note that the physical targets set under Field Channels, Warabandi and Field Drains during the year 2005-2006 were 0.607 m.ha., 0.117 m.ha., and 0.099 m.ha. respectively, while, the achievements have been of the order of only 46%, 57% and 72% respectively. The Committee are of the opinion that the continuous under utilization of funds under Command Area Development & Water Management Scheme would adversely affect the completion of above projects. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to make all out efforts to sort out all the problems relating to utilization of funds under Command Area Development & Water Management to ensure that funds allocated under the Scheme are utilised during the year 2006-2007. The Committee also desire the Ministry to make all possible efforts to improve the performance on the above components of Command Area Development & Water Management. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken in the matter.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry has been regularly emphasizing upon the State Governments to enhance the allocation of State share for the Programme, however the State Governments, because of competing priorities for funds for various sectors, could not provide adequate matching share for the scheme and hence there has been under-utilization of Central share during the first three years of the Tenth Plan. However, during the year 2005-06 the entire allocated Central share of Rs. 199 crore was utilized as the reduced RE of 157.50 crore was fully restored by the Government subsequently. As far as physical achievements are concerned, there was further improvement in the progress in respect of field channels and warabandi which increased from 46% to 61% and from 57% to 64% respectively. The observation of the Committee that the Ministry should make all possible efforts to utilize the allocated funds under the scheme during 2006-07 has been noted and accordingly all efforts shall be made for fully utilizing the allocated amount during 2006-07.

Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM)

Recommendation (Para No. 4.18)

The Committee note that under the restructured Command Area Development and Water Management Programme, the thrust is on

Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) and the Central assistance to State Governments has been linked to enactment of PIM legislation. The Committee in their Third Report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) had stressed the need for early enactment of necessary legislation on PIM to all the State Governments. However, only one State, *viz.* Maharashtra has enacted the same in addition to the nine States, *viz.* Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa and Kerala, which had taken action in this regard earlier. The Ministry informed that they have been persuading the State Governments to enact PIM Act/Amend Irrigation Act from time to time. The action in this regard is required to be taken by the respective State Governments. The State Governments are required to submit detailed proposals for correction of system deficiency and rehabilitation of tanks to the Ministry for approval along with a copy of the MoU signed with the WUAs/Distributary Committees in order to facilitate the simultaneous transfer of the system. The Committee further note that the Ministry propose to discuss the revamping of CAD & WM Programme to allow PIM through WUAs during the Working Group Meetings of the Ministry of Water Resources for the Eleventh Plan and duly revamp the CAD&WM w.e.f. the Eleventh Plan as the response of the State Governments in enacting PIM Legislation has been very poor. The Committee, therefore, urge the Ministry to direct the State Governments to submit detailed proposals for correction of system deficiency and rehabilitation of tanks to the Ministry for expeditious approval along with other formalities as required for the same so that all the remaining State Governments may also enact the necessary legislation on PIM. The Committee also desire that more Water User Associations (WUAs) with representation of women in Managing Committee's be formed so that beneficiaries are involved in the implementation of Programme activities. The Committee further recommend the Government to complete all discussions and deliberations required for revamping CAD & WM before the start of the Eleventh Plan so that CAD & WM is revamped well in time. The Committee also desire that the issue of revamping of CAD & WM may also be discussed with the State Governments which have to ultimately implement the revamped CAD & WM from the Eleventh Plan. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

As mentioned under reply to Para No. 2.15, the matter relating to enactment of Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) acts is being periodically followed up with the State Governments. The matter is also proposed to be discussed in the review meetings with the State Governments to be held during the current financial year. As far as

the revamping of CAD & WM Programme to allow PIM through WUAs is concerned, the matter is already under discussion in the Sub-Group II of the Working Group of the Planning Commission for XI Plan. Once the recommendations of the Working Group are received, the issue of revamping of CAD & WM Programme shall be discussed with the State Governments and based on the consultations with the State Governments further follow up action shall be taken to revamp the programme.

**Command Area Development & Water Management Scheme—
Workshop on PIM**

Recommendation (Para No. 4.19)

The Committee also note that the Ministry during the examination of Demands for Grants (2005-06) informed the Committee that a National Level Workshop on PIM was proposed in the early 2005-06. However, the Ministry could not organize the same. The Ministry has now informed the Committee that before organizing National Level Workshop on PIM there is a need to get feedback from the regional level workshops on PIM. The Ministry has so far been able to organize only one regional level workshop on PIM for North Eastern States. One such regional level Workshop is proposed to be organized shortly for Northern States. The Committee, therefore, desire that the regional level workshop on PIM for Northern States be organized at the earliest so that a National Level Workshop on PIM can also be organized timely which will help the remaining State Governments to enact PIM legislation for implementing the Scheme.

Reply of the Government

The matter relating to holding of Regional Workshop on PIM for Northern States is under consideration and the same will be organized as soon as the dates are finalized, following which National Level Workshop on PIM shall be organized for all the States.

Comments of the Committee

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

**Flood Control—Extension of Embankments on Lalbakeya, Kamla,
Bagmati and Khando Rivers**

Recommendation (Para No. 5.34)

The Committee observe that the plan allocation for the project Raising, Strengthening and Extension of Embankments on Lalbakeya,

Bagmati and Khando rivers has been increased to Rs. 32.25 crore in BE 2006-2007 from Rs. 14.00 crore in BE 2005-2006. The increased allocation is to implement the works related to raising and strengthening of embankments on Bagmati river for a length of 17.5 km. from Dheng Railway Bridge during the year 2006-2007. The Scheme was originally approved during 2000-2001 with an estimated cost of Rs. 503 lakh for works related to the left embankment on the river and two new tagging embankments. Work to the tune of Rs. 1.50 lakh was carried out for the Scheme. The work on the Scheme was stopped after Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar had pointed out certain shortcomings in the Scheme. Subsequently, a Scheme of Rs. 4.53 crore was approved before the floods of 2005 but only work to the tune of Rs. 90 lakh could be executed. The Scheme was revised after the flood of 2005 and the new Scheme has been approved by GFCC for a length of 17.5 km. with an estimated cost of Rs. 4.33 crore. The Committee are constrained to note that the implementation of the Scheme has been held hostage to non-submission of DPR and failure to complete works in critical reaches on the river before the onset of flood season by the State Government. This has resulted in inordinate delay in completion of project and cost overrun to the extent of Rs. 1.73 crore. From the pace of implementation of the Scheme started during Ninth Five Year Plan, it is apprehended that it would spill over beyond the Tenth Plan. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Ministry to impress upon the State Government to avoid further delay in executing the works related to the Scheme and to take urgent steps to complete the project during the current financial year. The Committee desire to be apprised of the progress made in this regard.

Reply of the Government

A scheme of Rs. 5.03 crore was approved during 2000 with the provision for raising and strengthening of Bagmati left embankment below Dheng bridge and construction of the two tagging embankments upstream of Dheng bridge. Work to the tune of Rs. 1.5 crore was carried out on the scheme. Subsequently, some shortcomings were detected in the scheme and the implementation of the scheme was stopped. Following the submission of another scheme covering reach of 54 km (upto Runnisaidpur) d/s of Dheng Bridge (Estimated Cost Rs. 279.35 crore) by Government of Bihar, Ministry of Water Resources referred the Bagmati flood control issue to Central Water Commission for holistic study in April 2005. In the meanwhile a scheme of Rs. 4.53 crore for raising and strengthening of Bagmati embankment in critical reaches as included in the approved EFC for 10th Plan was

approved for execution before flood of 2005. However, work only to the extent of Rs. 0.9 crore could be carried out before flood of 2005. Subsequently, CWC constituted a team led by Member (RM), CWC to visit the Bagmati river in India as well as in Nepal and suggest the measures for flood control of Bagmati river in the light of minutes of Senior Officers meeting of Ministry of Water Resources held during September 2005. The team submitted its interim report to Ministry of Water Resources in January 2006 which was sent to Ganga Flood Control Commission and Government of Bihar for necessary action. Water Resources Development, Government of Bihar submitted to GFCC the revised scheme for raising and strengthening in the critical reaches up to 17.5 km from Dheng bridge and the anti erosion works in the upstream of Dheng bridge after flood of 2005 for execution before flood of 2006 in the light of CWC report of January 2006. The scheme was cleared by GFCC and the first installment of Central assistance has been released and work is under progress. The scheme submitted by Water Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, as a follow up of the decision taken in the meeting taken by Secretary (WR) on 13.3.06, for raising and strengthening of entire 17.5 km of Bagmati embankment from Dheng bridge has been examined in GFCC and observations on the issues of fixation of formation level of the embankment by CWC on the basis of model result, details of Belwa gap and Dheng railway track/bridge have been conveyed to Water Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar.

In the meantime, Government of Bihar has intimated regarding a meeting chaired by Hon'ble Chief Minister, Government of Bihar in February 2006 to discuss flood problem in North Bihar, wherein it was decided that Bagmati Multipurpose Project (having irrigation, drainage and flood control components) which was approved by Planning Commission in 1984-85 be revised in the light of present ground conditions and morphology of the river regime.

Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar has assigned the work for updating the DPR of Bagmati Multipurpose Project to HSCL. Government of Bihar has now submitted feasibility report of Bagmati Multipurpose Project in June 2006. In the approved EFC of X Plan only 17.5 km length of Bagmati river is under Central funding whereas the river has a length of over 250 km in North Bihar. Task Force 2004 has also recommended a fund provision of Rs. 12 crore for reasonable degree of flood protection to entire Bagmati basin in XI Plan. The work is proposed to be carried out simultaneously with the work of extension of embankment up to high ground in Nepal to make the flood embankments on Bagmati in North Bihar effective. It is targeted to complete the works in XI Plan.

Farakka Barrage Project has executed the schemes as per the recommendations of Expert Committee before the flood of 2006 at Panchandpur.

New schemes for Majuli Island in Assam, Dihang Project

Recommendation (Para No. 5.48)

The Committee note that the total plan outlay for the Scheme, "New Scheme for Majuli Island in Assam, Dihang Project" for Tenth Plan has been increased to Rs. 76.56 crore. Out of Rs. 76.56 crore, Rs. 35.28 crore for the scheme for protection of Majuli Island from flood and erosion phase-I was earlier approved for the Tenth Plan. The SFC for the remaining amount of Rs. 41.28 crore was approved later on for implementation of the Scheme, Protection of Majuli Island from Flood and Erosion, phase-I, alongwith other Schemes. Further, additional funds of Rs. 14.45 crore have been proposed to be allocated for protection of Majuli Island phase-I. The Committee also observe that the physical performance for the year 2005-2006 in respect of 12 works related to protection of Majuli Island from flood and erosion is far from satisfactory. Although, ostensibly the works related to the construction of nose portion of check dam, RCC porcupine works raising and strengthening of embankment and starting of construction of hanger for Majuli Model and physical model studies had to be completed during 2005-2006, barring the works like Porcupine work along river Brahmaputra (upstream of Aphalamukh towards Sonowal Kachari), construction of RCC porcupine works along Malual Malapindha dyke on Luit Suti and Topographic & Hydrographic survey of Majuli Island all other works have fallen awfully short of the target date of completion, *i.e.* March 2006. Again, the works like Operation and maintenance of Model, Construction of Hanger, RCC Porcupine works at Major Chapari and RCC Porcupine works at Sonowal Kachari have even failed to get started. The Committee, therefore, recommend that all the works under the above scheme must be completed within the Tenth Plan period as the erosion problems of Majuli Island are unique and distinct from flood and erosion problems in other parts of the country. The Committee would like to be apprised of the progress of works under the schemes.

Reply of the Government

Rs. 14.45 crore is the BE 2006-07 against the scheme "New scheme of Majuli Island in Assam, Dibang Project, etc."

Some of the works related to protection of Majuli Island have got delayed due to poor performance by contractor and the non-availability

of construction materials (at Majuli) and communication bottlenecks. The contract related to raising and strengthening of embankment (Rs. 8.00 crore) has been rescinded and tendered for awarding afresh so that it can be completed within 2006-07. All other works have also been expedited and are planned to be completed by March, 2007.

The laying of physical model of the river reach of Brahmaputra involving Majuli Island is in progress at North Eastern Hydraulic and Allied Research Institute (NEHARI) at Guwahati which is scheduled for completion by November 2006 and the study is scheduled to be completed by December 2006. The RCC porcupine works at Major Chapori and at Sonowal Kachari are in progress and 52% and 19% progress has been achieved by June 2006.

All the works under the scheme protection of Majuli Island Phase-I are targeted to be completed within Tenth Plan period. The work orders for all major works have already been issued for Rs. 31 crore. The work orders for works costing Rs. 5 crore are under process and to be issued by the end of September 2006. The rest of the works will be taken up after expert visit in September 2006. Overall 52% of the works under Phase-I are already completed.

Farakka Barrage Project (FBP)

Recommendation (Para No. 6.8)

The Committee observe that Farakka Barrage Project started in 1962 at an estimated cost of Rs. 65.59 crore with the objective of preventing the silting of Calcutta Port by improving the flow and navigability of Bhagirathi-Hoogly river system. The Tenth Plan outlay for FBP was kept at Rs. 140.00 crore while EFC memos for Rs. 145.53 crore and Rs. 3.37 crore have been approved by the Ministry for completion of residual works of Ninth Plan during the Tenth Plan. It is disconcerting to observe that while giving details of the residual works of Ninth Plan that spilled over to Tenth Plan, the Ministry contends that these are continuing features to be taken on yearly basis and cannot be avoided. The Committee cannot buy the Ministry's specious argument that the spillover of projects from IX Plan to 10th Plan in Farakka Barrage Project is a continuing feature and thus, cannot be avoided. The Committee believe that in the first place, no scope for any residual works be left in a plan period for any project and even if some spillover occurs due to certain emergent and unforeseen circumstances, the effort of Ministry to gloss it over as continuing happenstance is indeed an attempt to find an escape route for itself. Further, the Committee note that the work orders for

execution of special repair/rectification of spill way gate, under service/river sluice gates, etc. were awarded to M/s Jessop & Co. and M/s NPCC Ltd. in April 1996 on 50:50 basis. The Committee note that even though the work commenced at the site in the year 1997/1998, the actual work attained momentum only at the end of 2002. However, it was later observed that the magnitude of work to be carried out had varied greatly from the original quantum of work. Further, it was also found that the site of the work was situated at a difficult and inaccessible zone and that one work could only be carried out for one gate, the original time assessed for the repair and completion of the total work turned out to be quite inadequate. This has resulted in time and cost overrun. The estimated cost as per the recommendation of TAX in 2006 now stands at Rs. 8.72 crore, representing an escalation of 0.96 crore from the original cost of the Scheme at Rs. 7.76 crore. The Committee cannot but conclude that the companies entrusted with the work related to special repair/rectification of spillway gates, under service/river gates, etc. have failed in properly assessing the time and the funds required for completion of the work. This smacks of the cavalier manner in which the executing agencies have approached the works related to the project. It shows the agencies' lack of professionalism and also presents the Ministry in poor light for awarding the work order for the Project to the agencies without investigating their credentials. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to review and reassess the amount of funds and time required to complete repair/rectification of spill-way gates under the project in more realistic terms and if practicable, may also re-consider the decision of awarding work orders to these agencies *vis-à-vis* the efficiency shown by these agencies while executing the works related to the projects assigned to them so far. The Committee would like to be apprised of the progress made under the schemes from time to time.

Reply of the Government

Plan scheme for Rs. 140.00 crore for work and expenditure accordingly for X Plan has been done as per the target in each year in X Plan. There is no surplus and surrender of funds during X plan.

The work for repair of 110 Nos. of Gates of FBP at cost + contract was divided equally i.e. 55 Gates each between M/s NPCC Ltd., and M/s. Jessops and Co., Kolkata, with the initial cost of repairs for each agency being estimated at Rs. 3.88 crore. As per the agreement, the entire work was to be completed by October, 2000. However, there is time as well as cost overrun in this case. The cost has now increased to Rs. 4.38 crore from Rs. 3.88 crore and may possibly go up further.

In the meantime, M/s. Jessops and Co., Kolkata to whom repair of 55 Nos. of Gates had been awarded could complete only 39 Gates and hence GM, FBP had rescinded the contract with M/s. Jessop and Co., Kolkata to the extent of 8 Gates out of the balance 16 Gates pending for completion by them and awarded the repair work of these 8 Gates to M/s. NPCC Ltd., in addition to their own share of 55 Gates in the interest of early completion of the work. In other words, NPCC is now having repair work of about 63 Gates while M/s. Jessops & Co., is having 47 Gates at present.

The cost overrun is due to the fact that the estimate for repair work of the Gates was prepared on the basis of the condition of the Gates exposed above the water level at the time of conclusion of the contract and not on the repairs that might be needed for the portion of the Gates submerged in the water. When the submerged portion of the Gates to be repaired was brought out above the water level for repair, it was found that the submerged portions had deteriorated beyond expectation on account of chemical reaction with water etc. The cost overrun is also attributed to change in the methodology for metalising of the Gates as per the decision taken in the 100th meeting of the TAC in 2003.

Accelerated Irrigation Benefits Programme (AIBP)

Recommendation (Para No. 7.16)

The Committee note that for expeditious completion of irrigation projects under AIBP which are in an advanced stage of completion, the Government of India launched Accelerated Irrigation Benefit Programme (AIBP) during 1996-1997 with the objective of accelerating completion of on-going projects and to realize bulk benefits from completed irrigation projects. A total of 189 Major/Medium Irrigation Projects and 4,472 Minor Irrigation Schemes have been included under AIBP and an amount of Rs. 18,156.98 crore has been released as CLA/grant under the programme as on 16 January 2006. The projects under AIBP were to be completed within 2 years under normal funding. However, the Government modified the guidelines in March 2005 whereby the projects now are to be completed within 4 financial years. The Committee are, however, dismayed to note that out of these only 50 Major/Medium Projects and 3,179 Minor Irrigation Schemes have been completed so far. The reasons for delay in completion of AIBP projects have been attributed to resettlement and rehabilitation problems, land acquisition problem, contractual and legal issues, delay in transfer of funds by the State Finance Departments, inadequate

outlay by the State Governments and change in the scope of the programmes. Even the Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources admitted during the evidence that out of 160 projects under AIBP half of the projects are progressing according to the schedule and the other half are delayed. The Committee are of the considered opinion that though the Government has launched AIBP with the laudable objective of accelerating the completion of ongoing projects which are in an advanced stage of completion and achieve the desired results in the shortest possible time, the implementation of AIBP has not attained its desired results when viewed in the context of the volume of funds pumped into the programme *vis-à-vis* the pace of completion. Further, the Committee are of the view that the relaxation of time limit for completion of projects under normal funding from 2 to 4 years has defeated the very purpose with which the AIBP was launched which will stretch the completion time of projects beyond one Plan period given the pace of implementation by the State Governments. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to make an all out efforts to sort out all the problems and speed up implementation and tone up the monitoring mechanism under each project in order to complete all the projects as per their schedule time. The Committee desire to be apprised of the action taken in the matter.

Reply of the Government

The position is as under:

- (1) During the VIII plan period, irrigation potential of 22.20 lakh ha. was created under major and medium irrigation sector at an annual rate of 4.4 lakh ha.
- (2) During IX plan, irrigation potential created in the major & medium irrigation sector was 42.2 lakh ha. out of which 16.5 lakh ha. (nearly 40%) was through AIBP schemes. Thus, average annual potential created during the IX plan was of the order of 8.24 lakh ha. per annum out of which 3.3 lakh ha. per annum was contributed by AIBP.
- (3) During the first three years of X plan, the potential creation with major and medium sector and AIBP contribution is as shown below:

Year	Potential created (lakh ha.)	Contribution of AIBP (lakh ha.)	Percentage contribution of AIBP
2002-03	8.12	4.56	56
2003-04	10.04	4.47	45
2004-05	10.00*	4.96	50

*Tentative

For the year 2005-06, irrigation potential of 9.25 ha. was targeted against which, MoU under AIBP was signed with the States for 10.41 lakh ha. However, figures of potential created for the year 2005-06 are yet to be received from State Governments and are under compilation. The figures of irrigation potential creation during the year are generally available after about a year's time.

- (4) As seen from the above, there is enhancement in the annual rate of irrigation potential creation in the country from VIII plan to IX plan from an annual rate of 4.4 lakh ha./annum to 8 lakh ha./annum i.e. nearly increase of 3.6 lakh ha./annum, mostly contributed by AIBP. In the X plan, the rate of potential creation has increased nearly to 10 lakh ha./annum out of which about 50% is contributed by AIBP.
- (5) Assistance under AIBP has been provided to 200 projects in 23 States since the inception of the programme. The number of projects declared as completed so far is 50. There are 11 projects which were deferred or withdrawn by the State Governments due to various reasons. Hence, 139 major/medium irrigation projects are under execution.
- (6) The contribution of AIBP in completion of projects is quite significant and it has progressively helped in accelerating the completion of projects. During IX Plan, out of 96 major/medium irrigation projects completed in the country, 17 were those which received AIBP assistance. However, during X Plan, out of 38 major/medium irrigation projects completed in the country, 29 were those which received AIBP assistance.
- (7) The normal completion period for major projects is about 10-15 years, and for medium projects about 5-7 years and accordingly the normal completion schedule for the projects in advanced stage has been kept four years. The relaxation in AIBP guidelines regarding the time for completion of projects has been mainly done in view of concerns raised by some of the State Governments on this issue.
- (8) A number of projects were completed on schedule both under Normal and Fast Track category. The status of delay of each of AIBP projects is given in Annexure-IV. It appears that the completion target of projects for the year 2005-06 as reported in MoU submitted by the State Governments is not likely to be achieved. However, based on the general monitoring reports, it appears that most of the targeted

projects will be completed in the current year or in the next financial year.

- (9) Therefore, the intended objective of increased rate of potential creation has been, by and large, achieved and contribution of AIBP in completion of projects has now significantly increased.
- (10) It is further emphasized that while considering new projects, it is tried to ensure that projects do not suffer from problems of land acquisition, contract management and R&R problems. Detailed information in this regard is collected in advance from the proponent States.
- (11) Even for the ongoing projects, the positions on these aspects are specifically collected for releasing further CLA/grant to the projects. The monitoring organizations have also been geared up to gather information related to such bottlenecks faced and advice the State Governments for timely attention to sort out the impediments to the project.

Accelerated Irrigation Benefits Programme (AIBP)—Fast Track Programme

Recommendation (Para No. 7.21)

The Committee note that the Government has launched a Fast Track Programme under AIBP in February 2002 to complete those projects which are nearing completion and can be completed in one year (two working seasons). Since inception of the Scheme, the Ministry has included 38 projects, out of which, only 13 projects have been completed so far. The Ministry, during the examination of Demands for Grants (2005-2006), informed the Committee that 8 projects have already been completed and 24 projects are likely to be completed during 2005-2006. However, only 5 Major and Medium Projects have been completed in 2005-2006. The Ministry has now informed the Committee that during the last year 2006-2007 of Tenth Plan only 6 projects are likely to be completed. Thus, only 19 Major and Medium Projects are likely to be completed out of 38 Projects included under Fast Track Programme. The Ministry also informed that as per the modified Guidelines issued in March 2005, Projects under the Fast Track Programme under AIBP have to be completed in two years instead of one year hitherto. The Committee fail to understand the logic of the Ministry for relaxing the time limit for completion of the Fast Track Projects from one year to two years. The Committee are of the firm opinion that this relaxation defeats the very purpose of

completing the Projects under Fast Track Programme expeditiously. The Committee are dissatisfied with the poor performance of the Fast Track Programme. The Committee desire the Ministry to complete the Projects in time under Fast Track Programme. The Committee, therefore, also desire the Ministry to strictly monitor the completion of remaining 19 Projects included under the Fast Track Programme so that these projects are completed as per their stipulated dates of completion.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry constituted a committee to review the status of Fast Track Programme under AIBP in January 2005. The Committee concluded that the cost of irrigation development during two years period (2002-04) under Fast Track Programme works out to about Rs. 48,000 per ha. which is quite reasonable. For the balance irrigation potential yet to be created under Fast Track Programme the cost per ha. is likely to be still lower.

However, the aim of speedy completion of the projects which was the intended objective of the Fast Track Programme was seen to be not achieved. The Committee therefore recommended that the Fast Track Programme can be continued for present subject to review after one year but with more stringent conditions such as:

- Projects to be included under FTP should be ensured to be free from the constraints of land acquisition, R&R problem, litigation problem, contractual problem or any other major bottleneck which could impede the execution of the project in a time bound manner.
- Balance cost to be indicated should be realistic and updated.
- Balance irrigation potential to be created should be properly assessed and then indicated.
- Half yearly programme for expenditure to be incurred and creation of irrigation potential needs to be indicated in the FTP proposal.
- Release of 2nd instalment of 50% of the balance cost needs to be linked with the achievement of targeted potential rather than linking it with the expenditure progress.

In view of the concerns raised by the State Governments and also as observed by the above Committee that the projects could be completed with a delay ranging from 10 to 24 months, the completion

schedule of the Fast Track Programme was further rationalized to two financial years w.e.f. 1.4.2005. The Monitoring Units have also been advised to ensure that any new proposal submitted under Fast Track is free from constraints of land acquisition, R&R problems, contractual problems etc.

As per the MoUs received from the State Governments, the present status of the projects under Fast Track are as under:

- Total number of projects/project components as on 31.3.2005—30.
- Projects dropped from Fast Track—3
- Balance—27
- Projects already completed—16
- Projects in advance stage of completion but completion reports are yet to be received—10
- Projects included in the year 2004-05 and scheduled for completion in 2006-07—1

In addition to above, 12 more projects have been included under Fast Track in the year 2005-06, most of which are scheduled for completion in 2007-08.

Performance review of AIBP by C&AG

Recommendation (Para No. 7.27)

The Committee observe that Para No. 15 of the C&AG Report of 2004 also highlights the poor performance of AIBP indicating the failure to achieve its intended objectives inspite of spending Rs. 13,823.05 crore (including States' share). The reasons attributed by the C&AG regarding the poor performance of AIBP projects are inadequate planning, lack of coordination with the State Governments, ineffective execution, insufficient utilization of resources, etc. The Committee are of considered opinion that the observations made in the C&AG Report is of serious nature and a matter of grave concern. The Committee believe that had the Ministry monitored the scheme properly the objectives of AIBP would have been fully achieved. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to enquire into the matter in right earnest and apprise the outcome of the same to the Committee within three months of presentation of the Report to the Houses of Parliament.

Reply of the Government

The execution of works in the projects is within the jurisdiction of the State Governments. Ministry of Water Resources/Central Water Commission do not intervene in the process of execution, such as award of contract, contract management, mode of construction, quality control etc. However, the central monitoring teams by visiting the projects suggest some measures to the State Governments, which are advisory in nature to improve the pace of construction. In addition, the bottlenecks and suggestions are also communicated in writing to the various authorities including State Governments for compliance and taking remedial measures. The bottlenecks and progress of each project is reviewed in the review meetings taken by Senior officers of Central Water Commission.

However, as mentioned under para 7.16, the contribution of AIBP has been quite significant if we look into the overall potential creation from irrigation projects in the country and the number of projects completed in the country after AIBP was launched.

CHAPTER III

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

Gender Budgeting

Recommendation (Para No. 1.20)

The Committee note that the Ministry has set up a Gender Budgeting Cell but would like to add in the same breath that the Ministry has evaded to provide specific information sought by the Committee regarding creation of gender profile in its budgeting provisions. The Committee are of the opinion that merely stating that the Irrigation Schemes benefit all sections of society including women amply demonstrates the degree of importance which the Ministry attaches to the concept of "Gender Budgeting" in real terms. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to avoid giving evasive replies to them in future and take more concrete steps to make the idea of Gender Budgeting 'Project specific'. The Committee, therefore, recommend to apportion a certain amount in each project to benefit women wherever practicable. The Committee also desire to be informed of the action taken in the matter within a stipulated time frame. A quarterly report may be furnished to the Committee in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The schemes of the Ministry of Water Resources primarily relate to planning, design, research & development and data collection issues. In addition, Centrally Sponsored or State Sector Schemes related to flood control measures, improvement in Command Area Development etc. are also operated. It is again submitted that the schemes of the Ministry address all sections of the society including women.

Major and medium irrigation—Projects where 90% or more of targeted irrigation potential has been achieved

Recommendation (Para No. 3.12)

The Committee observe that pursuant to their recommendation for identification of completed projects not declared as completed by the

State Governments, 41 projects (16 major and 25 medium) in 10 States were identified by Government which attained 90% or more of targeted irrigation potential. The Committee are unhappy to observe further that despite their recommendations in successive Reports on Demands for Grants 2004-05 and 2005-06 to the effect that the Working Group recommendation on major and medium irrigation projects of Tenth Plan to stop further flow of funds to projects which attained 90% or more of ultimate potential be treated as completed remains to be implemented completely as yet by the Government. Further, the specious plea of the Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources during the evidence that Central assistance is being given to only 6 of the projects and that the remaining are entirely funded by the State Governments is untenable as the purport of the Working Group recommendation and the observations/recommendations of the Committee was to put an end to wastage of public funds which could be better utilized for other projects. The Committee, therefore, desire that all the 6 projects which are still getting Central assistance should be completed and declared as completed as per the recommendations of the Working Group of the Tenth Plan during the currency of the Tenth Plan itself. The Committee also urge the Planning Commission to stop allocating funds to those State Governments where the remaining 21 projects which have attained 90% or more potential as identified by the Ministry of Water Resources are located. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

In regard to the Committee's observation on 41 projects (16 major & 25 medium), the position is brought out as under:

1. Projects which have actually not attained 90% of the targeted potential	:	6 Nos.
2. Projects solely funded by the States	:	20 Nos.
3. No. of projects completed so far	:	14 Nos.
4. No. of projects for which no demand for CLA has been received in last 2 years	:	1 No.
5. Balance projects for which CLA has been recommended	:	Nil

State-wise status is given in **Appendix-III**.

It can therefore be noted from the above that the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Water Resources regarding projects which have attained 90% or more of the targeted potential has been duly implemented for projects receiving CLA under AIBP.

In respect of observation of the Committee to declare those irrigation projects as completed in which 90% or more irrigation potential has been created, the Planning Commission has been consulted who are of the view that cost/benefit of the project at appraisal stage are worked out for full irrigation potential proposed from the project at the time of appraisal. Hence, every effort is to be made to create full design potential from the project.

**Command Area Development & Water Management Scheme—
submission of fresh DPRs by State Governments**

Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)

The Committee are unhappy to note that despite the repeated recommendations of the Committee for submission of fresh Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) of all the 133 ongoing Projects by the State Governments, the Ministry could receive the same for 101 DPRs of 125 Projects. The Ministry informed the Committee that out of remaining 32 DPRs, the matter relating to submission of the 27 DPRs from the concerned State Governments is being pursued. Of the other 5 DPRs, the Programme being new in the States of Jharkhand, Tripura and Sikkim, these State Governments are taking their own time to submit the DPRs. The Committee view the non-submission of DPRs of the remaining 32 projects very seriously. The Committee, therefore, desire that the matter be pursued with the concerned State Governments vigorously for early submission of DPRs so that all these Projects could be completed as per their completion date and its benefits could reach the people at large. This is all the more an urgent matter as the fresh DPRs were sought with the objective of assessing the quantum of work completed CAD & WM as on 31 March 2004 on the direction of the CCEA as reported by the Ministry at the time of examination of Demands of Grants for the year 2005-06. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to secure the remaining DPRs from the concerned State Governments and also assess the quantum of work completed as on 31 March 2004 within six months of the presentation of this Report. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

As a result of further follow up with the State Governments, the DPRs of 112 projects have now been received. Another 5 projects have been completed in the mean time. Thus, DPRs of only 16 projects are awaited. The matter is being followed up with the concerned States for early submission of remaining DPRs.

Brahmaputra Board

Recommendation (Para No. 5.39)

The Committee observe that in order to address the problems of floods, erosion and drainage congestion in North-Eastern region of the country as well as for creation of hydropower, navigation and other benefits for the people of Brahmaputra and Barak Valleys, the Brahmaputra Board was set up by the Government of India under an Act of Parliament (Brahmaputra Board Act 1980). The total plan outlay for the Board is earmarked Rs. 102.00 crore for the Tenth Plan period. The Plan allocation in BE 2006-07 was increased to Rs. 28.12 crore over Rs. 21.00 crore earmarked in BE 2005-2006. The increased allocation is for implementing some new Drainage Development Schemes, viz. Kailasahar, Joyasagar, East of Barpeta, Singla, Jenrai, Jakaichuk and some emergent flood management works during the year 2006-2007. The Committee note that in projects like Lohit, Kulsi, Kynshi, Noa-Dehing in which the survey, investigation and preparation of DPRs are being taken up by Brahmaputra Board, the projects design and EIA&EMP study have not progressed much. Infact, in all the cases the achievements are less than 40 percent and have already cast doubts on the timely preparation of DPRs of the projects. The work has been held up due to non-receipt of forest clearance in Kameng project. The Committee, therefore, desire that the project design and EIA&EMP study should be taken up by the Brahmaputra Board, NHPC and NEC at the earliest so that the DPRs for the respective projects could be taken up expeditiously. The Committee further recommend that the clearance from Forest Department be obtained urgently to complete the held-up works in Kameng Project. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in the matter.

Reply of the Government

An amount of Rs. 28.12 crore has been kept for the year 2006-07 against Continuing Scheme of Brahmaputra Board. Out of this, an amount of Rs. 7.65 crore is provided for seven new Drainage Development Schemes having estimated cost of Rs. 16.64 crore. The allocated fund amounting to Rs. 7.65 crore is expected to be utilized during the year 2006-07.

The EIA&EMP study of the projects Lohit and Kynshi Stage-I has got delayed due to non-finalization of project parameters because the dam sites had to be changed due to unsuitable geological conditions observed during investigations which has necessitated additional survey and investigations. In case of Kulsi and Noa-Dehing some adverse

geological features were encountered and additional survey and investigations had to be taken up to ascertain their extent. The acute insurgency problem in interior areas has also contributed in delay of Kulsi Dam investigations.

On Kameng River, the North-Eastern Electric Power Corporation (NEEPCO) has started the Bishom Hydel Project upstream of the proposed Kameng Multipurpose Project and the Powerhouse of this project is in the reservoir area of the proposed Kameng Multipurpose Project. There is also no positive response from Forest Dept. of Arunachal Government towards clearance for investigation of the project. For these reasons, the investigation of Kameng Multipurpose Project has now been discontinued.

The project design for Lohit, Kynshi and Noa-Dehang Dam Projects have been taken up by Brahmaputra Board in consultation with Central Water Commission. The EIA&EMP study is targeted for completion by December 2006. The DPRs of all these projects are scheduled for completion by Brahmaputra Board by March 2007 subject to completion of design etc.

CHAPTER IV

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

Outcome Budget—Improvement of drainage in critical areas of the country

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

The Committee note that another important programme included in the 'Outcome Budget' of the Ministry relates to improvement of Drainage in Critical Areas of the country estimated to cost Rs. 54.57 crore comprising Central share of Rs. 49.62 crore sanctioned in February 2004 which intends to take up works with the objective of improvement of drainage in critical areas affected by floods in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. The Plan outlay for the Scheme had been increased to Rs. 22.11 crore in 2006-2007 as against Rs. 18 crore in 2005-2006. The Committee, however, are disconcerted to note that the quantifiable durables/physical outputs in respect of this Scheme had been very vaguely described. Further, the Plan outlay has also been restricted to Rs. 22.11 crore in spite of the availability of Rs. 26.87 crore due to poor performance by the States of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The Committee desire the Ministry to impress upon the State Governments to address the problems like land acquisition in right earnest so that the works of these projects commence at the earliest. The Committee also desire that the physical outputs be defined in a more realistic terms. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Ministry of Water Resources has requested to the concerned State Governments to expedite the execution of the works under this scheme. Zonal offices of Central Water Commission monitor the schemes regularly by making field visits and submit monitoring report. State Governments are constantly reminded to complete the scheme by the stipulated time, *i.e.* by the end of X Five Year Plan. The status of funds released, utilized and physical outputs are given at **Annexure-II**.

Comments of the Committee

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

Flood Control

Recommendation (Para No. 5.15)

The Plan allocation for flood control had been earmarked at Rs. 248.22 crore for 2006-2007 an increase of Rs. 16.59 crore as against an allocation of Rs. 231.63 for 2005-2006. It is, however, disturbing to observe the reduction of allocation by Rs. 50.42 crore at RE stage 2005-2006 which is attributed to non-taking up of some of the intended works. It is further disconcerting to observe that additional works are projected at the time of seeking higher allocations even though the Ministry fails to keep up the tempo of expenditure for a major part of the year resulting in reduction in allocations at RE stage. It is appalling to observe that out of Rs. 1,403.22 crore plan outlay for flood control Rs. 557.39 crore remained unallocated. This speaks volumes of the existing state of affairs not only with regard to utilization of the allocated funds but also of the shoddy nature of projecting outlays and proposing estimates of expenditure by the Ministry. The Ministry's contention that if additional funds were made available, some new Schemes mainly under Critical Anti-erosion works and flood management Schemes in Ganga Basin States as well as North-Eastern region would have been taken up does not cut much ice with the Committee. The Committee are of the firm view that more emphasis needs to be laid on utilizing the funds allocated for expeditious completion of on-going projects rather than thin spreading of the available scarce funds on too many projects. The Committee further note that the modified EFC memo for Ganga Basin States that includes the Schemes recommended by the Task Force has not yet been cleared by the appraising agencies. The Committee desire the Ministry to take effective and urgent steps to get the EFC memo cleared at the earliest to facilitate the works on projects under the Scheme, 'Critical Anti-erosion works in Ganga Basin States' as the projects are likely to be taken up for implementation during the current financial year in consonance with the recommendations of the Task Force. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

Flood Control—Critical anti-erosion works in Ganga Basin States

Recommendation (Para No. 5.24)

The Committee observe that the total cost of the Scheme, "Critical Anti-erosion and Flood Management" in Ganga Basin States was revised to Rs. 242.17 crore with Central share of Rs. 195.63 crore. The Plan allocation for the year 2006-2007 for the Scheme has been increased to Rs. 111.20 crore, representing an enhancement of Rs. 11.20 crore over

the BE for the year 2005-2006. The enhancement is required to ensure completion of on-going projects and new projects to be taken up under the Scheme as well as for works to be taken up in the extended jurisdiction of Farakka Barrage Project during 2006-2007 based on the recommendations of the Task Force. EFC memo for the Scheme recommended by the Task Force has been prepared and was circulated to appraising agencies for their comments. The meeting of Expenditure Finance Committee is yet to take place and the Ministry of Water Resources had reminded the Ministry of Finance in this regard. The Committee recommend the Ministry to get the comments of the appraising agencies urgently and arrange a meeting with the Expenditure Finance Committee to get its concurrence for the Scheme at the earliest so that the anti-erosion works under the Scheme could commence. The Committee note that the number of new Schemes to be taken up during the year 2006-2007 is contingent on the approval by the EFC/Competent authority on the expanded Scheme and the Schemes are to be prioritised by an Empowered Committee was proposed to be set up for the purpose. The Committee, therefore, recommended the Government to get approval for the expanded Schemes from the EFC/Competent Authority first before setting up the Empowered Committee to prioritize the Scheme at the earliest. The Committee also recommended the Government to take all appropriate steps to implement the recommendations of the Expert Committee which submitted its Report on 15 February 2006 in the current financial year itself to fulfil the objective of setting up such an Expert Committee. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken in the matter.

Reply of the Government (Para Nos. 5.15 & 5.24)

EFC meeting regarding the revised scheme on Critical anti-erosion works in Ganga Basin States, was held on 12 May 2006 under Chairmanship of Secretary, Ministry of Finance. This scheme cleared by ERC is under process for obtaining approval of Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs. The schemes recommended by Task Force under Immediate and Short Term-I category which are linked with the ongoing works *i.e.*, works which are required to be executed to ensure full benefit from the works under implementation/completed or are very critical in nature, have been considered under the scheme for implementation during the last year of X Plan. Other schemes as recommended by Task Force under Immediate and Short Term-I will be implemented during XI Plan after the performance evaluation of works carried out during X Plan. Out of eleven schemes considered by EFC in May 2006 for X Plan, nine schemes have already been cleared by GFCC and remaining two are under process.

Most of the new works will spill over to XI Plan, since the working season was over by 15 June 2006. The next working season will start after flood of 2006 and the works will be completed before flood of 2007. Accordingly provision have been made under the EFC to the extent the work is possible in each case by 31 March 2007. The concept of Empowered Committee will be applicable for the schemes of XI Plan, as ongoing schemes and other works required to ensure full benefits in the vicinity of ongoing schemes/very critical works are only included in X Plan proposal.

Comments of the Committee

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

CHAPTER V

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

Major and Medium Irrigation—Expeditions completion of projects to create additional irrigation potential and utilizations of potential created.

Recommendation (Para No. 3.9)

The Committee observe that as on 31 March, 2004 a total of 1248 Major, Medium and ERM Projects have been completed since Independence. The Committee are however, dismayed to note that there are 471 (169 Major, 219 Medium and 83 ERM) ongoing projects in the country, which have spilled over from Ninth Plan with a balance cost of about Rs. One Lakh Crore. Out of all these ongoing irrigation projects, only 11 Major and 7 Medium Irrigation projects have been reported as completed during the first four years of the Tenth Plan. According to the Ministry, the reasons for delay in completion of projects are attributable to lack of budgetary provision in the State Government Budgets, frequent changes in the scope of project, land acquisition problems, resettlement and rehabilitation of project oustees, legal problems, delay in compliance by the State Governments to the observations of Central appraising agencies and inter-State issues. Furthermore, the Committee are perturbed to note that Kanupur Medium Irrigation project in Andhra Pradesh and Gurgaon Canal Major Irrigation project in Rajasthan which were started during the Third Plan period are still pending and their likely completion as informed by the Ministry goes beyond the Tenth Plan. The Committee also observe that 300 new projects (78 major, 136 medium and 86 ERM) were taken up for implementation during the Tenth Plan for creation of 6.5 mha additional irrigation potential to be created during the Tenth Plan. While 8.12 lakh hectare irrigation potential has been created during 2002-2003, irrigation potential of 9.20 and 15.51 lakh hectare was expected to be created during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, respectively. On the other hand the utilization of the potential created is about 86%. The Committee are of the firm opinion that though the Government is making huge investments year after year to complete the pending projects, the desired results are far from being achieved. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend the Government to take

urgent steps to resolve all the problems as identified by the Ministry for delay in completion of projects expeditiously and strengthen the monitoring mechanism under each project in order to complete these projects as per their present revised stipulated dates of completion. The Committee also desire the Ministry to take urgent steps to increase the utilization of irrigation potential already created as well as to achieve the targets set for creation of additional potential during the Tenth Plan.

Reply of the Government

The current status (as on 31.3.06) of projects taken upto IX Plan is as under:

Total number of projects completed	: 1270 (244 Major, 936 Medium and 90 ERM)
Projects not yet completed	: 452 (157 Major, 212 Medium and 83 ERM)

The ongoing projects include both approved as well as unapproved projects with breakup as under:

Category	Approved Projects (Nos.)	Unapproved Projects (Nos.)
Major	93	64
Medium	112	100
ERM	19	64
Total	224	228

Implementation of irrigation projects comes under the purview of the State Governments. However, the Union Government has been providing central loan assistance under AIBP to the ongoing approved projects to facilitate their early completion for early creation of irrigation potential. For AIBP funded projects, a monitoring mechanism is in place through field formation of Central Water Commission and a substantial progress has been achieved as could be noted through the reported potential creation for the year 2002-03 and 2003-04.

The average potential creation per year was around 4.4 lakh ha. in VIII plan, which increased to 8.24 lakh ha. in IX plan. The annual potential creation in the year 2002-03 was 8.12 lakh ha., which has further increased to 10.04 lakh ha. in 2003-04 against the expected

creation of 9.2 lakh ha. Though, complete details of potential creation for the year 2004-05 are yet to be received from States, the potential creation through the projects under AIBP alone is around 5 lakh ha. in the year 2004-05. Pace of potential creation will be further accelerated during the Bharat Nirman period. It may, however, be noted that the increase in creation of irrigation potential is mainly contributed by the approved projects and not through the projects which are still unapproved. The State Governments have been advised to get these projects duly approved by the Planning Commission. The problems being faced on account of these unapproved projects are being discussed in the meetings of the Working Group for XI Plan constituted by Planning Commission and further action would be taken as per their recommendations. It is pertinent to note that most of the projects out of 300 new projects included in X Plan are also unapproved and not much help can be provided by the Ministry of Water Resources for these projects till they are approved by Planning Commission.

As regards Kanupur project of Andhra Pradesh, more than 90% of its ultimate potential has already been achieved. The AIBP component with net potential of 561 ha. only (about 7%) is also in advanced stage of completion. The balance works have been held up due to litigation with contractor. The case is now *sub judice* under Supreme Court.

As regards Gurgaon canal reservoir, out of ultimate potential of 28000 ha., about 82% had already been achieved by the end of IX Plan. The State Govt. has now proposed to declare the project as completed and formulate a new scheme including balance components of the Gurgaon canal along with some new components. No further fund has been released under AIBP for this project.

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 10 of Chapter 1 of the Report)

Performance review of AIBP by C&AG

Recommendation (Para No. 7.26)

The Committee are unhappy to note that 15 States, *viz.*, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal were reported to have diverted/mis-utilized the Central Loan Assistance (CLA) under AIBP, according to the Report of C&AG. The Committee in their Third Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) had recommended the Government

to enquire into the matter and apprise the outcome of the same to the Committee within three months from the presentation of that Report to the Houses of Parliament. However, the Ministry could not submit the requisite information to the Committee. The Committee in their Action Taken Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) had again recommended the Ministry to set a definite time frame to obtain the requisite information from the above States. So far, the Ministry could obtain the requisite information from only five States, *viz.* Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh. The revised Guidelines stipulate mandatory submission of audited statement of expenditure on projects receiving CLA within a month of closure of the financial year. The Committee are dismayed to note that the Ministry had not taken the matter very seriously despite the repeated recommendations of the Committee to obtain the requisite information from the above States as one year has elapsed since the presentation of the Third Report to the Houses. The Committee are of the opinion that the progress of projects under AIBP is not commensurate to the quantum of CLA being released by the Government. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommended the Ministry to speed up the enquiry procedures in order to obtain the requisite information from the remaining 10 States without any further delay.

The Committee observe that Five of the States which had sent compliance report on audit paras to the Ministry have not been tendered the details of diversion and mis-utilization of CLA under AIBP. The Committee desire the Government to obtain the detailed replies from these States in this regard at the earliest. Further, taking strong exception to the state of affairs in this matter, the Committee recommend that if these defaulter States do not submit the requisite information within three months of the presentation of the present Report to the Houses, further release of CLA funds under AIBP to these States should be stopped immediately so that in future the diversion/mis-utilization of CLA funds under AIBP does not take place. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this matter within three months of the presentation of this Report to the House.

Reply of the Government

The issue of diversion of funds made available by Central Government to the States under AIBP has been taken up with the State Governments concerned but most of the States are yet to respond to observations raised by the CAG in its report. The issue is being

pursued by the Ministry of Water Resources with the concerned State Governments. In this connection, the following points are mentioned:

- (i) The Ministry of Water Resources has kept a built in check in AIBP guidelines for release of subsequent instalment of CLA according to which, subsequent instalment of CLA could be released only when utilization certificate of CLA released earlier along with appropriate State share is furnished by the State Government. Even if the said funds have been misutilized in 1st instance by the State Government, the subsequent releases of CLA to States is not possible till utilization certificate of earlier instalment of CLA is furnished by the State Government.
- (ii) Since 2004-05, only Grant component of Central Assistance is being released by the Government of India and Loan component is to be raised by the State Government themselves except for in cases of fiscally weak States.
- (iii) Provision has been made in AIBP guidelines that Grant component of the Central Assistance along with Loan component and State share is required to be transferred to project authorities within 15 days by the State Government.
- (iv) As per AIBP guidelines, if the project components included in AIBP are not completed in time indicated in MOU, the Grant component could be converted in Loan component recoverable from State along with interest thereon.
- (v) Utilization Certificate is required to be countersigned by atleast Secretary of concerned Water Resources Department.
- (vi) The AIBP guidelines further stipulate that the States would be required to submit audited statement of expenditure on project within 9 months of completion of financial year.
- (vii) The Field Units of the CWC are to pay atleast two monitoring visits to the projects included in AIBP during the year to monitor physical and financial achievements and submit the Status Report within a month of visit to the project.
- (viii) As a result of stringent measures being taken from time to time by the Ministry of Water Resources, States have started reallocating Central Assistance directly to the project authorities more or less in time limit prescribed by the Ministry of water Resources. Particularly to be mentioned

here is State of Maharashtra which has passed a Government resolution to reallocate Central Assistance under AIBP directly to project authorities within stipulated time and the Central Assistance is actually being reallocated.

The performance of the AIBP has in fact been very good keeping in view the figures of expenditure incurred and potential created under AIBP. No doubt that number of projects completed are not in accordance with the targets, but the completion of projects may be delayed due to various reasons. During 1996 to 2005, total expenditure incurred on AIBP is of Rs. 27,813 crore and the potential created under AIBP is 3260260 ha. The expenditure incurred for a hectare of creation of irrigation potential works out to Rs. 85,300/- which is quite reasonable. In fact, the CAG itself has stated that cost of creation of irrigation potential should be in the limit of Rs. 1.00 lakh per ha. Accordingly, the expenditure incurred per unit of irrigation potential creation is well within limit. Further, development of irrigation potential of 32,60,260 ha. in a period of 8 years is a big achievement under AIBP.

Comments of the Committee

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

NEW DELHI;
13 December, 2006
22 Agrahayana, 1928 (Saka)

R. SAMBASIVA RAO,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Water Resources.

APPENDIX I*(Mentioned in Reply of Recommendation Para No. 1.30)*

**STATUS OF PENDING UTILIZATION CERTIFICATES (UCs)
FROM AUTONOMOUS BODIES & INSTITUTIONS
FROM 1986-87 TO 2002-03
(Position as on 14.7.2006)**

(Rupees in lakh)

Sl.No.	Year	No. of UCs	Subject Matter Division	Sanction No.	Amount	Total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.	86-87	3	PP-1	24/5/86-Estt. II dt. 31.3.87	4.80	12.50	
			Ganga-2	37/8/81-FC Vol. IV dt. 30.3.87	4.00		
				37/8/81-FC Vol. V dt. 5.1.87	3.70		
2.	87-88	1	Ganga-1	37/8/81-FC Vol. V dt. 23.3.88	5.29	5.29	
3.	88-89	3	Ganga-3	37/8/81-FC Vol. VI dt. 30.3.89	0.10	8.80	
					37/8/81-FC Vol. VI dt. 30.3.89		8.60
					37/8/81-FC Vol. VI dt. 30.3.89		0.10
4.	89-90	2	PP-6	24/27/89 E-II dt. 30.3.90	2.35	2.85	
					24/27/89 E-II dt. 30.3.90		0.50
5.	90-91	3	Projects-1	37/35/39-BM dt. 19.2.91	0.15	7.17	
			PP-2	17/6/90-FA 2EA dt. 29.10.90	1.87		
				17/6/90-FA 2EA dt. 29.10.90	5.15		
6.	91-92	4	PP-2	24/13/90/Estt.-II dt. 30.12.91	0.51	8.91	
			Projects-1	17/6/90-FA II dt. 13.2.92 (3.90+1.75)	5.65		
			Ganga-1	37/33/91-BM dt. 17.12.91	2.35		
				37/33/91-ER-495 dt. 17.3.92	0.40		
7.	94-95	1	PP-1	CWC/17/1/95/R & D/670 dt. 21.2.95	0.36	0.36	
8.	00-01	2	Ganga-1	12/1/2000/ER/3803 dt. 18.12.00	3.34	6.192	
			PP-1	16/39/2000-R&D/263-275 dt. 28.3.01	2.852		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	01-02	4	PP-2	12/03/J-1/99-WM/2819-2020 dt. 27.9.01	4.40	
			WM-2	R&D/INCH/01/34/343-355 dt. 6.3.02	2.06	46.46
				12/63/J-1/99-WM/2819-2820 dt. 29.10.01	20.00	
				12/63/J-2/99-WM/2828-2836 dt. 29.10.01	20.00	
10.	02-03	7		11/12/2002 E-II dt. 4.10.02	1.00	
				11/12/2002 E-II dt. 4.10.02	1.00	
			PP-7	11/12/2002 E-II dt. 4.10.02	1.25	6.25
				31/71/2002-PP dt. 5.9.02	1.00	
				R&D/INCID/2002/105/225-37 dt. 13.3.03	1.00	
				31/71/2002-PP dt. 5.9.02	0.05	
				R&D/INCID/02/105/225-37 dt. 13.3.03		
		30	Total			104.782

APPENDIX II

(Mentioned in Reply to Recommendation Para No. 2.12)

**THE STATUS OF FUNDS RELEASED, UTILISED AND PHYSICAL
OUTPUTS IN RESPECT OF THE CENTRALLY SPONSORED
SCHEME NAMEDLY, "IMPROVEMENT OF DRAINAGE IN
THE CRITICAL AREAS OF THE COUNTRY"**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Name of the scheme	Estimated cost excluding cost of land & establishment (As Central share)	Cost of land & establishment (As State share)	Total Cost	Funds released in 2004-06	Funds utilised till 3/2006	Total area likely to be benefited in 3/2006	Area likely to be benefited in 3/2006
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Improvement to the major drainage problematic areas in the State (Krishna Delta System of Guntur & Prakasham Districts)	545.00	0.00	545.00	450.00	391.91	9032	5000
2.	Bihar	Raising & strengthening of 73 Zamindar bunds & residual work of Pynes (Improvement of drainage in Mokama Group of Tal)	2738.44	78.24	2816.68	1200.00	12.00.00	18000	10000
3.	Orissa	Improvement of Drainage system & improvement of Orissa Coast Canal (Range-III) in Bhograi and Jaleswar Blocks of Balasore District of Orissa	1312.74	165.29	1478.03	475.00	400.00	11600	5020
4.	Uttar Pradesh	Construction of new drains in Ghaghara & Kalyani Basins of Bara Banki District.	365.31	251.56	616.87	150.00	0.00	3504	Not reported by the State Government
Total			4961.49	495.09	5456.58	2275.00	1991.91	42136	20020

(Say Rs. 49.62 crore) (Rs. 54.57 crore)

APPENDIX III
(Para 3.12)

STATEWISE STATUS OF ONGOING MAJOR AND MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECTS WHICH WERE ANTICIPATED TO HAVE ATTAINED 90% OR MORE OF TARGETTED POTENTIAL ON 1.4.2004

States	Major			Medium				
	Completed	Project Deferred	Total	Completed	Project Deferred	Non-AIBP	Total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Andhra Pradesh	1. Nagarjuna Sagar	—	1. Bamsabhara St. I	4	1. Madduvalasa			1
	2. Sriram Sagar		2. Changanadu (LIS)					
Assam	3. Bordikarai			1				
Bihar						1. Omi Res. Projects		1
Jharkhand							1. Katri	1
Karnataka			3. Yagachi	2			2. Chulkinala	2
			4. Tungabhadra HLC (IS)				3. Votahole	
Maharashtra	4. Khadagwasla		5. Dudhganga (IS)	6	2. Jawalgaon		4. Anjanapalsi	13
	5. Upper Tapi		6. Upper Godavari		3. Kadwi		5. Aran (Pimpri)	
	6. Wan		7. Arunavati		4. Kasari		6. Purnaneopur	
					5. Kasarsai		7. Wadiwale	
							8. Mtn	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Orissa							9. Andhalil 10. Sayaki 11. Toma 12. Muktai Nagar (5)	
Rajasthan					6. Panchana 7. Chhapi			2
West Bengal					8. Hanumata		13. Khairabhera	2
Total	6		7	13	8	1	13	22

Projects which have not actually attained 90% potential :

1. Jurala (Major)-Andhra Pradesh
2. Upper Indravati (Major)-Orissa
3. Mahi Bajaj Sagar (Major)-Rajasthan
4. Phahumara (Medium)-Assam
5. Patgoan (Medium)-Maharashtra
6. Igo-phey (Medium)-Jammu & Kashmir

APPENDIX IV

(Para 7.16)

STATUS OF COMPLETION OF PROJECTS UNDER AIBP

A. Completed Projects

1. Projects Completed on Schedule

Sl.No.	State/Project	Year of Entry	Year of Completion
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh			
1.	Cheyyeru (Annamaya) (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
Bihar			
2.	Bilasi Reservoir	1997-98	2001-02
Gujarat			
3.	Jhuj	1996-97	2000-01
4.	Sipu	1996-97	2000-01
5.	Damanganga	1997-98	2001-02
6.	Karjan	1997-98	2001-02
7.	Sukhi	1997-98	2001-02
8.	Deo	1997-98	2001-02
9.	Watrak	1997-98	2001-02
10.	Harnav-II	1996-97	2000-01
11.	Umaria	1996-97	2000-01
Karnataka			
12.	Maskinallah	2002-03	2003-04
Madhya Pradesh			
13.	Urmil RBC	2000-01	2004-05
14.	Banjar	2000-01	2004-05

1	2	3	4
	Maharashtra		
15.	Jayakwadi Stage-II	2000-01	2004-05
16.	Kadvi (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
17.	Kasari (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
18.	Kasarsai (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
19.	Jawalgaon (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
20.	Khadakwasla (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Orissa		
21.	Improvement to Sason Canal System (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
22.	Improvement to Salki Irrigation (FTP)	2003-04	2004-05
	Punjab		
23.	Ranjit Sagar Dam	1996-97	2000-01
	Rajasthan		
24.	Jaisamand (Modernisation)	1996-97	2000-01
25.	Gambhiri (Modernisation)	1998-99	2002-03
26.	Chhapi (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
27.	Panchana (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Uttar Pradesh		
28.	Sarda Sahayak	1996-97	2000-01
29.	Gyanpur Pump Canal	1999-2000	2003-04
30.	Rajghat Dam	1996-97	2000-01
31.	Gunta Nala Dam	1996-97	2000-01
32.	Upper Ganga Canal including Madhya Ganga Canal (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
	West Bengal		
33.	Kangsabati	1997-98	2001-02

2. Projects completed after due date

Sl.No.	State/Project	Year of Entry	Scheduled year of Completion	Year of Completion
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh				
34.	Sriramsagar St. I (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04	2005-06
35.	Madduvalasa (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04	2005-06
36.	Nagarjunasagar (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04	2005-06
Assam				
37.	Rupahi	1996-97	2000-01	2001-02
38.	Boradikarai	1997-98	2001-02	2004-05
Chhattisgarh				
39.	Sivnath Diversion	1997-98	2001-02	2002-03
Haryana				
40.	Gurgaon Canal	1996-97	2000-01	2003-04
Jharkhand				
41.	Latratu	1997-98	2001-02	2002-03
42.	Tapkara Reservoir	1997-98	2001-02	2002-03
Kerala				
43.	Kallada	1996-97	2000-01	2004-05
Madhya Pradesh				
44.	Upper Wainganga	1996-97	2000-01	2002-03
Maharashtra				
45.	Upper Tapi	1997-98	2001-02	2004-05
46.	Wan	1998-99	2002-03	2005-06
47.	Vishnupuri	2000-01	2004-05	2005-06
Orissa				
48.	Upper Kolab (KBK)	1997-98	2001-02	2004-05
49.	Potteru (KBK) (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04	2004-05
Uttar Pradesh				
50.	Providing Kharif Channel in H.K. Doab	1996-97	2000-01	2004-05

B. Ongoing Projects

1. Projects on Schedule

Sl.No.	State/Project	Year of Entry	Scheduled Year of Completion
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh			
51.	Vamsdhara St.-II Ph I	2003-04	2007-08
52.	FFC of SRSP	2005-06	2009-10
53.	SRSP St. II	2005-06	2009-10
54.	Gundlakdamma (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
55.	Tarakarama Thirtha Sagaram (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
56.	Swarnamukhi (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
57.	Palemvagu (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
58.	Thotapally Barrage (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
Chhattisgarh			
59.	Kosarteda	2002-03	2006-07
60.	Mahanadi Res. Pr.	2005-06	2009-10
Gujarat			
61.	Bhadar-II	2002-03	2006-07
Jharkhand			
62.	Upper Sankh	2004-05	2008-09
63.	Panchkhero	2004-05	2008-09
Madhya Pradesh			
64.	Bawanthadi (IS)	2003-04	2007-08
65.	Mahan	2003-04	2007-08
66.	Omkareshwar	2003-04	2007-08
Maharashtra			
	Bawanthadi (IS)	2004-05	2008-09
67.	Krishna	2005-06	2009-10
68.	Kukadi	2005-06	2009-10
69.	Upper Manar	2002-03	2006-07
70.	Hatwane	2002-03	2006-07
71.	Chaskaman	2002-03	2006-07
72.	Upper Pen Ganga	2004-05	2008-09

1	2	3	4
73.	Lower Dudhna	2005-06	2009-10
74.	Warna	2005-06	2009-10
	Tillari (IS)	2005-06	2009-10
75.	Patgaon (FTP)	2004-05	2006-07
76.	Shivna Takli (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
77.	Madan Tank (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
78.	Dongargaon (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
79.	Amravati (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
80.	Gul (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
	Manipur		
81.	Dolaithabi Barrage	2002-03	2006-07
	Orissa		
82.	Telengiri (KBK)	2003-04	2007-08
83.	RET Irrigation (KBK)	2003-04	2007-08
84.	Kanupur	2003-04	2007-08
85.	Chheligada Dam	2003-04	2007-08
	Punjab		
86.	Remodelling of UBDC (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
87.	Kandi Canal Extension (Ph. II) (FTP)	2005-06	2007-08
	Uttar Pradesh		
88.	Mod. Agra Canal	2002-03	2006-07
89.	Jarauli Pump Canal	2003-04	2007-08
90.	Mod. of Lachhura Dam	2005-06	2009-10
2.	Projects likely to be delayed by One Year		
	Assam		
91.	Mod. of Jamuna Irr.	2001-02	2005-06
	Jammu & Kashmir		
92.	Mod. of Zaingir Canal	2001-02	2005-06
93.	Rafiabad High Lift Irr.	2001-02	2005-06
	Karnataka		
94.	Upper Krishna St. II	2001-02	2005-06
95.	Gandori Nala	2001-02	2005-06
	Punjab		
96.	Shahpur Kandi	2001-02	2005-06

1	2	3	4
	Rajasthan		
97.	Mod. of Gang Canal	2003-04	2005-06
	West Bengal		
98.	Subernrekha Barrage	2001-02	2005-06
3.	Projects likely to be delayed by Two Years		
	Andhra Pradesh		
99.	Gundalavagu	2000-01	2004-05
100.	Maddigedda	2000-01	2004-05
101.	Kanupur Canal*	2000-01	2004-05
102.	Yerrakalva Res.	2000-01	2004-05
	Bihar		
103.	Batane	2000-01	2004-05
	Chhattisgarh		
104.	Hasdeo Bango (Ph.-III) (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
105.	Barnai (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Goa		
106.	Tillari	2000-01	2004-05
	Gujarat		
107.	Aji-IV	2000-01	2004-05
108.	Ozat-II	2000-01	2004-05
109.	Brahmini-II	2000-01	2004-05
	Himachal Pradesh		
110.	Sidhata	2000-01	2004-05
111.	Changer Lift Irr. Project	2000-01	2004-05
	Jammu & Kashmir		
112.	Rajpora Lift	2000-01	2004-05
113.	Tral Lift	2000-01	2004-05
114.	Igophey Irr. Pr.	2000-01	2004-05
	Karnataka		
115.	Hirehalla (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
116.	Karanja (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Kerala		
117.	Muvattupuzha	2000-01	2004-05

1	2	3	4
	Madhya Pradesh		
118.	Mahi	2000-01	2004-05
119.	Barairpur LBC	2000-01	2004-05
	Maharashtra		
120.	Bahula	2000-01	2004-05
121.	Kumbhi (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Meghalaya		
122.	Rangai Valley	2000-01	2004-05
	Orissa		
123.	Salandi Left Main Canal-Ambahata (FTP)	2002-03	2004-05
	Punjab		
124.	Irrigation to H.P. below Talwara	2000-01	2004-05
	Uttar Pradesh		
125.	Rajghat Canal	2000-01	2004-05
	West Bengal		
126.	Tatko	2000-01	2004-05
127.	Patloi	2000-01	2004-05
128.	Hanumata	2000-01	2004-05
4.	Projects likely to be delayed by Three Years		
	Andhra Pradesh		
129.	Somasila (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
	Chhattisgarh		
130.	Jonk Diversion	1999-2000	2003-04
	Gujarat		
131.	Sardar Sarovar (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
	Jammu & Kashmir		
132.	Mod. of Ranbir Canal	1999-2000	2003-04
133.	Mod. of New Pratap Canal	1999-2000	2003-04
134.	Mod. of Kathua Canal	1999-2000	2003-04
	Madhya Pradesh		
135.	Sindh Phase I	1999-2000	2003-04
136.	Bargi Diversion (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
	Orissa		
137.	Lower Indra (KBK)	1999-2000	2003-04

1	2	3	4
138.	Lower Suktel (KBK)	1999-2000	2003-04
139.	Rengali ((FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
140.	Subernarekha (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
141.	Naraj Barrage (FTP)	2001-02	2003-04
	Rajasthan		
142.	Mahi Bajaj Sagar	1999-2000	2003-04
	Uttar Pradesh		
143.	Tehri	1999-2000	2003-04
144.	Eastern Ganga Canal	1999-2000	2003-04
5.	Projects likely to be delayed by Four Years		
	Bihar		
145.	Sone Modernisation	1998-99	2002-03
	Madhya Pradesh		
	Rajghat dam	1998-99	2002-03
146.	Sindh Phase II	1998-99	2002-03
	Orissa		
147.	Titlagarh St-II (KBK)	1998-99	2002-03
	Rajasthan		
148.	Bilaspur*	1998-99	2002-03
149.	Narmada Canal	1998-99	2002-03
150.	Chauli	1998-99	2002-03
6.	Projects likely to be delayed by Five Years		
	Andhra Pradesh		
151.	Jurala	1997-98	2001-02
	Assam		
152.	Burhi Dihing	1997-98	2001-02
153.	Intg. Irr. Scheme in Kallong Basin	1997-98	2001-02
	Bihar		
	Bansagar	1997-98	2001-02
154.	Orni Reservoir	1997-98	2001-02
	Jharkhand		
155.	Gumani	1997-98	2001-02
156.	Toraj*	1997-98	2001-02
157.	Kansjore	1997-98	2001-02

1	2	3	4
158.	Sonua	1997-98	2001-02
159.	Surangi	1997-98	2001-02
	Goa		
160.	Salauli	1997-98	2001-02
	Haryana		
161.	J.L.N. Lift Irrigation*	1997-98	2001-02
	Himachal Pradesh		
162.	Shahnehar Irr. Project	1997-98	2001-02
	Karnataka		
163.	Ghataprabha	1997-98	2001-02
	Maharashtra		
164.	Bhima*	1997-98	2001-02
165.	Upper Wardha	1997-98	2001-02
	Manipur		
166.	Thoubal	1997-98	2001-02
	Rajasthan		
167.	IGNP Stage-II	1997-98	2001-02
	Uttar Pradesh		
168.	Bansagar Canal	1997-98	2001-02
169.	Lakhwar Vyasi*	1997-98	2001-02
	West Bengal		
170.	Mod. Barrage and Irrigation System of DVC	1997-98	2001-02
7.	Projects likely to be delayed by Six Years		
	Assam		
171.	Pahumara	1996-97	2000-01
172.	Hawaiipur lift	1996-97	2000-01
173.	Dhansiri	1996-97	2000-01
174.	Champamati	1996-97	2000-01
175.	Borolia	1996-97	2000-01
176.	Kallonga*	1996-97	2000-01

1	2	3	4
	Bihar		
177.	Western Kosi	1996-97	2000-01
178.	Upper Kiul	1996-97	2000-01
179.	Durgawati	1996-97	2000-01
	Gujarat		
180.	Mukteshwar	1996-97	2000-01
	Haryana		
181.	WRCP	1996-97	2000-01
	Jammu & Kashmir		
182.	Marwal Lift*	1996-97	2000-01
183.	Lethpora Lift	1996-97	2000-01
184.	Koil Lift*	1996-97	2000-01
	Karnataka		
185.	Upper Krishna St. I	1996-97	2000-01
186.	Malaprabha	1996-97	2000-01
	Madhya Pradesh		
187.	Indira Sagar	1996-97	2000-01
188.	Bansagar	1996-97	2000-01
	Maharashtra		
189.	Gosikhurd	1996-97	2000-01
190.	Surya*	1996-97	2000-01
191.	Waghur	1996-97	2000-01
	Manipur		
192.	Khuga	1996-97	2000-01
	Orissa		
193.	Upper Indravati (KBK)	1996-97	2000-01
194.	Anandpur Barr.	1996-97	2000-01
	Tamil Nadu		
195.	WRCP*	1996-97	2000-01

1	2	3	4
	Tripura		
196.	Manu	1996-97	2000-01
197.	Gumti	1996-97	2000-01
198.	Khowai	1996-97	2000-01
	Uttar Pradesh		
199.	Saryu Nahar	1996-97	2000-01
	West Bengal		
200.	Teesta Barrage	1996-97	2000-01

IS-Inter State.

FTP-Fast Track Programme.

*-11 Projects deferred by the States.

APPENDIX V

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES (2006-2007) HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 6 DECEMBER 2006

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1545 hours in Committee Room No. '139', First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri R. Sambasiva Rao — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Rajen Gohain
3. Smt. Preneet Kaur
4. Shri Raghuveer Singh Kaushal
5. Shri Shankhlal Majhi
6. Shri Mukeem Mohammad
7. Shri Abu Ayes Mondal
8. Shri Lonappan Nambadan
9. Dr. Arun Kumar Sarma

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Indramoni Bora
11. Shri K.E. Ismail
12. Shri K.P.K. Kumaran
13. Prof. P.J. Kurien
14. Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilonia

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.S. Chera — *Director*
2. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy — *Under Secretary*

APPENDIX VI

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FIFTH REPORT (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA) OF THE COMMITTEE

(i)	Total number of Recommendations/Observations	26
(ii)	Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government Para Nos. 1.19, 1.26, 1.30, 2.8, 2.15, 2.19, 3.17, 3.24, 4.8, 4.18, 4.19, 5.34, 5.48, 6.8, 7.16, 7.21 and 7.27	
	Total	17
	Percentage	65.38%
(iii)	Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies Para Nos. 1.20, 3.12, 4.10 and 5.39	
	Total	4
	Percentage	15.38%
(iv)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee Para Nos. 2.12, 5.15 and 5.24	
	Total	3
	Percentage	11.53%
(v)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited Para Nos. 3.9 and 7.26	
	Total	2
	Percentage	7.69%