

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(2009-2010)

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2009-2010)

FOURTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

FEBRUARY, 2010 / MAGHA, 1931 (Saka)

FOURTH REPORT

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(2009-2010)**

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2009-2010)

Presented to Speaker, Lok Sabha on	18.02.2010
Presented to Lok Sabha on	03.03.2010
Laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on	03.03.2010



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

FEBRUARY, 2010 / MAGHA, 1931 (Saka)

COA No. 227

Price : Rs.

© 2009 By Lok Sabha Secretariat

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth Edition) and Printed by

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.....	(iv)
INTRODUCTION.....	(vi)
ABBREVIATIONS.....	(vii)
CHAPTER I IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS	
CHAPTER II ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS	
(I) Introductory	
(II) Overview of Demands	
CHAPTER III PLANNING PROCESS	
(I) Budgetary Planning and Zero Based Budgeting	
(II) Budgeting of a Scientific Department	
(III) Approach to XI Plan	
(IV) Budgetary Allocation	
(V) Launching of New Schemes	
(VI) Budget & Cash Management Scheme	
(VII) Annual Plan 2009-10	
(VIII) Flow of Funds in 2009-10	
(IX) Mid- Term Appraisal	
CHAPTER IV SECTORAL PROGRAMMES	
(I) Crop Science	
(II) Horticulture	

- (III) Natural Resource Management
- (IV) Agricultural Engineering
- (V) Animal Sciences
- (VI) Agricultural Extension
- (VII) Agricultural Education
- (VIII) Central Agriculture University, Imphal
- (IX) ICAR Headquarters
- (X) Externally Aided Projects

APPENDICES

- I. Minutes of the 10th Sitting of the Committee held on 5th November, 2009
- II. Minutes of the 12th Sitting of the Committee held on 12th November, 2009
- III. Minutes of the 14th Sitting of the Committee held on 4th January, 2010

Shri Basudeb Acharia - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Narayan Singh Amlabe
3. Shri K.C. Singh 'Baba'
4. Shri Thangso Baite
5. Shri Jayant Chaudhary
6. Smt. Shruti Choudhry
7. Smt. Ashwamedh Devi
8. Shri Biren Singh Engti
9. Smt. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
10. Shri Anant Kumar Hegde
11. Sk. Nurul Islam
12. Shri Naranbhai Kachhadiya
13. Shri Surendra Singh Nagar
14. Shri Prabodh Panda
15. Shri Premdas
16. Shri Vitthalbhai Hansrajbhai Radadiya
17. Shri Nripendra Nath Roy
18. Shri Bhoopendra Singh
19. Shri Uday Singh
20. Shri Jagdish Thakor
21. Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

22. Shri Narendra Budania
23. Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi
24. Shri A. Elavarasan
25. Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi
26. Shri Vinay Katiyar
27. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
28. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy
29. Shri Bharatsinh Prabhatsinh Parmar
30. Prof. M.S. Swaminathan
31. Shri Khekiho Zhimomi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy - Director
3. Shri P. C. Koul - Additional Director

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fourth Report on the Demands for Grants (2009-2010) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education).

2. The Committee considered the Demands for Grants (2009-10) of the Department of Agricultural Research & Education which were laid on the Table of the House on 7 July, 2009. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Agricultural Research & Education at their Sittings held on 5 and 12 November, 2009 respectively. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Department of Agricultural Research & Education for appearing before the Committee and for furnishing the information the Committee desired in connection with the examination of Demands for Grants of the Department.

3. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their Sitting held on 4 January, 2010.

4. For facility of reference, the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold at the end of each Chapter.

**NEW DELHI;
January, 2010**

Magha, 1931 (Saka)

**BASUDEB ACHARIA
*Chairman,***

Committee on Agriculture

ABBREVIATIONS

AU	Agriculture University
AES	Agricultural Education Scheme
BE	Budget Estimate
B&CM	Budget & Cash Management
CCEA	Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
DARE	Department of Agricultural Research and Education
DPR	Detailed Project Report
EFC	Expenditure Finance Committee
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
ICAR	Indian Council of Agricultural Research
IRC	Institute Research Council
IVRI	Indian Veterinary Research Institute
KVK	Krishi Vigyan Kendra
MPKV	Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth
NAAS	National Academy of Agricultural Sciences
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NDC	National Development Council
NDRI	National Dairy Research Institute
NIAB	National Institute of Agriculture Biotechnology
NIASM	National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management
NIBSM	National Institute of Biotic Stress Management
QRT	Quinquennial Review Team
Q-4	Quarter -4

RAC	Research Advisory Committee
RE	Revised Estimate
SAU	State Agriculture University
SFC	Standing Finance Committee
ZBB	Zero Based Budgeting

CHAPTER – I

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Thirty-eighth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of Committee on Agriculture on Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) was presented to Lok Sabha and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on 16 April, 2008. The Report contained 21 Observations / Recommendations.

1.2 On the basis of the Action Taken Replies received from the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) in respect of the above Report, the Committee presented their Forty-third Action Taken Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) to the House on 18 December, 2008. The Committee commented on the Action Taken Replies furnished by the Ministry in respect of Recommendations at S.Nos.1 to 9, 11 to 14, 16 and 18 to 21 in the Original Report.

1.3 The Minister concerned is required to make a Statement under Direction 73-A of Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha about the status of implementation of Recommendations contained in the Original Report of the Committee within six months of the presentation of the Report to the Parliament. However, the Statement under Direction 73-A in the context of Thirty-eighth Report was made by the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution on 4 August, 2009. An analysis of the Statement revealed that satisfactory action has been taken by the

Government in respect of 9 Recommendations while in case of the remaining 12 action was still incomplete / not taken.

1.4 The Committee note that in pursuance of Direction 73-A of Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, the Minister concerned is required to make a Statement on the status of implementation of Recommendations contained in the Original Reports of the Committee within six months of their presentation to the Parliament. The Committee are deeply perturbed to note that the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution made the Statement under Direction 73-A in the context of Thirty-eight Report of the Committee on 4 August, 2009 i.e. more than 15 months after its presentation on 16 April, 2008. The analysis of the Statement also reveals that less than 43 per cent Recommendations have been implemented while 57 per cent Recommendations are either yet to be implemented or are under various stages of implementation. The Committee take strong exception to the failure of the Ministry to adhere to stipulations laid down in Direction 73-A and the inordinate delay in the making of the Statement by the Minister concerned. They expect that there will not be a repeat of such lapses in future.

CHAPTER – II

ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS

(i) Introductory

The Department of Agricultural Research and Education (DARE) under the Ministry of Agriculture, was created in December 1973 on the recommendation of Shri P. V. Gajendragadkar Committee which was appointed to examine the functioning of ICAR to deal with the policy matters and provide the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) with the requisite linkages with the Government of India, the State Governments, foreign governments and international agencies. Before the Department came into being ICAR was functioning as a registered society under the administrative control of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. DARE is headed by a Secretary to the Government of India who is also the ex-officio Director-General of the ICAR.

2.2 The Department provides the necessary governmental linkages for the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. The major functions of DARE are:

- * To look after all aspects of agricultural research and education (including horticulture, natural resource management, agricultural engineering, agricultural extension, animal science, economics statistics and marketing and fisheries) involving coordination between the central and state agencies.
- * To attend all matters relating to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.
- * To attend to all matters concerning the development of new technology in agriculture, horticulture, natural resource management, engineering, extension, animal husbandry, economics statistics and marketing and fisheries including such functions as plant and animal introduction and exploration of soil and land use survey and planning.
- * International co-operation in the field of agricultural research and education including relations with foreign and international agricultural

research, educational institutions and organizations, including participation in international conferences, associations and other bodies dealing with agricultural research and education and follow-up decisions at such international conferences etc.

* Fundamental, applied and operational research and higher education including co-ordination of such research and higher education in agriculture including agroforestry, animal husbandry, dairying, fisheries, agricultural statistics, economics and marketing.

ICAR is the apex body for coordinating guiding and managing research and education in agriculture including horticulture, fisheries and animal sciences in the entire Country. With 97 ICAR Institutes and 45 agricultural universities spread across the Country, this is one of the largest National Agricultural Research System in the world.

2.3 ICAR is organized into eight Subject Matter Divisions (SMDs), each of them having a number of research institutes or Schemes. This network of institutes spread throughout the Country has well-established and time tested institutional linkages with the State Agricultural Universities and other Ministries / Departments of the Central and State Governments. Frontline technologies developed by these research organizations are initially assessed and demonstrated by the multidisciplinary centres called Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs), which are funded by ICAR. These KVKs also provide training to farmers and rural entrepreneurs and also work with the State extension system.

2.4 The ICAR is mandated with the following responsibilities :-

* To plan, undertake, aid, promote and coordinate education, research and its application in agriculture, animal science, fisheries, agroforestry, home science and allied sciences.

* To act as a clearing-house for research and general information relating to agriculture, animal husbandry, fishery, agro-forestry, home

science and allied sciences through its publications and information system and instituting and promoting transfer of technology programmes.

* To provide, undertake and promote consultancy services in the field of research, education, training and dissemination of information in agriculture, animal science, fisheries, agro-forestry, home science and other allied sciences.

* To look into the problems relating to broader areas of rural development concerning agriculture, including post-harvest technology by developing co-operative programmes with other organizations such as the Indian Council of Social Science Research, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Universities, etc.

* To do other things considered necessary to attain the objectives.

2.5 The Committee are given to understand that ICAR has played a pioneering role in ushering in the Green Revolution and subsequent developments in agriculture in India through its research and technology development that has enabled the Country to increase the production of foodgrains by 4 times, horticulture crops by 6 times, fisheries by 9 times, milk by 6 times and eggs by 27 times since 1950-51, thus making a visible impact on the national food and nutritional security.

(ii) Overview of Demands

2.6 Demand No.2 pertaining to the Department of Agricultural Research & Education for the year 2009-10 was presented to the Lok Sabha on 7 July, 2009. Prior to that the Government had taken a Vote on Account for the first four months (April - July, 2009) of the current Fiscal, in view of the General Election in May-June, 2009. The details of allocations proposed in Demand No. 2 are as under :-

DEMAND NO. 2

(Rs. in crore)

	Plan	Non Plan	Total
Revenue (Voted)	1760.00	1481.40	3241.40
Revenue (Charged)	00	00	00
Capital (Voted)	00	00	00
Capital (Charged)	00	00	00
GRAND TOTAL			3241.40

It may be seen that a sum of Rs.3241.40 crore has been allocated to the Department for 2009-10. Out of this Rs. 1760.00 crore is on the Plan side in the Revenue Section and the balance Rs.1481.40 crore is on Non-Plan side under the Revenue Section.

2.7 The details of Revised Estimates for the year 2008-09 and Budget Estimates for 2009-10 are given in the table below:

(Rs. In crore)

	RE 2008-09		BE 2009-10	
	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan
Revenue	1760.00	1200.00	1760.00	1481.40
Capital	00	00	00	00

It may be seen that there is no hike in the BE of Rs.1760.00 crore on the Plan side as compared to RE of 2008-09. However, on the Non-Plan side of Revenue Section in BE 2009-10 there is a pronounced hike of 23% over RE 2008-09 with Rs.1481.40 crore being allocated this year against last year RE of Rs.1200.00 crore.

Enhanced Allocation for Agricultural Research & Education

2.8 The Committee note that agricultural research, education and extension, because of their significant contribution to growth of agriculture sector, economy, food and nutrition security of the Country, are of critical importance for an agrarian economy like ours. They, therefore, are of the considered opinion that keeping in view the national interest, DARE is provided with sufficient funds, so that these activities are carried out unhindered and without any constraints or impediments. With this concern uppermost in their mind, the Committee have been recommending in their successive Reports to the Government to enhance investment for these activities to at least 1 percent of the Agricultural GDP, the latest being their Thirty-eighth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Demands for Grants (2008-09) and the Forty-third Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on the Action Taken by the Government on their Thirty-eighth Report. They are, however, highly disappointed with the response of the Government, as reflected in the Demands of DARE for the ongoing Fiscal. There is no increase in the allocation in the Plan side with the RE of Rs.1760.00 crore for 2008-09 being retained as BE for the current year. The Committee wonder as to how Government expects phenomenal, if not astounding results with such a pittance of an allocation. The meagre allocation for agricultural research and education becomes all the more galling when emerging threats like climate change and global warming, declining natural resources, increasing natural calamities, growing soil infertility, declining water resources, technology fatigue, etc. are taken into consideration which all will require capital intensive solutions. The

Committee, therefore, even at the cost of sounding repetitive exhort the Government to wake up to realities and enhance substantially, allocations for agricultural research and education to ensure that solutions to the above mentioned crippling problems are found before it is too late. They hope this recommendation gets adequately reflected in the Demands for Grants of DARE in the next fiscal, i.e. 2010-11.

CHAPTER – III

PLANNING PROCESS

(i) Budgetary Planning and Zero Based Budgeting

On the question of the procedure being followed while working out the financial requirements for their various activities, both for the Five Year Plan and the Annual Plan and to the extent to which the concept of Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) is resorted to/relied upon by the Department while working out their Plan projections, the Department informed the Committee that the Annual Plan and Five Year Plan requirements are initially projected by the individual schemes (institutes/national research centres/project directorates, etc.) as needed for execution of approved activities (for Annual Plan) and for ongoing/proposed new activities (Five Year Plan). These financial projections are further deliberated/assessed in-house. Also, new programmes are formulated at the ICAR Headquarters based on expert consultations, workshops, conferences, etc. Subsequently, a consolidated proposal for the Department as a whole is put forward to the Planning Commission following prescribed procedures/guidelines.

3.2 To a query as to how the proposed allocations are duly prioritized, rational and realistic so as to not invite drastic cuts at various subsequent stages of reallocation of resources, the Department replied that the lump-sum allocation as communicated by the Planning Commission during 2009-10 was distributed among the various schemes of the Department after in-house intensive assessment of the requirement of funds for individual schemes. Accordingly, the proposed allocations were prioritized and were

rational & realistic in the context of total allocation communicated to the Department by the Planning Commission.

3.3 The Planning Commission had undertaken a ZBB exercise in the context of the Eleventh Plan in the middle of 2007 for all Ministries/Departments. They had suggested several measures to streamline budgetary process, weed out redundant schemes, merge similar schemes into one umbrella scheme, converge schemes, etc. so as to have a holistic view for synergizing the planning process. On the question of the outcome of ZBB exercise carried out by the Planning Commission for DARE and specific action initiated by the Department in pursuance of the broad directions / guidelines, if any, issued by the Planning Commission after the ZBB exercise, the Department in a written submission informed that the concept of ZBB was introduced in Tenth Plan and at that time the Planning Commission had undertaken an intensive exercise in this regard in consultation with the Department with the result that all the earlier on-going schemes were merged / integrated / converged into 71 main schemes along with relevant sub-schemes.

3.4 In so far as various directions/guidelines on ZBB issued by the Planning Commission are concerned, the exercise of ZBB was undertaken during X Plan primarily to reduce the number of SFCs/EFCs so as to have flexibility in operation within a particular scheme and to effect commensurate savings in cost by sharing the major facilities of the institutions located at one place or nearby. However, no specific ZBB guidelines were issued by Planning Commission during XI Plan.

3.5 When asked if apart from the Zero Based Budgeting exercises undertaken by the Planning Commission usually at the start of the Five Year Plan, were the Department also resorting to ZBB while making Five Year Plans or Annual Plans and the views of the Department on the system of ZBB as a tool for better and focused financial planning, the Department stated that before formulating the Five Year Plan proposals, each scheme (Institute / National Research Centre / Project Directorate, etc.) is thoroughly deliberated / assessed at in-house level; subsequently these Five Year Plan proposals are critically examined by the respective SFCs/EFCs which constitute the representatives from Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and other concerned organizations alongwith the field experts/concerned persons of the Department. The SFC/EFC is the most appropriate forum which usually examines/assesses each scheme with reference to its research and technical relevance, alongwith the need for related infrastructure, etc. and commensurate fund provision. This process of considering a scheme for approval/implementation in a Plan period is quite relevant and effective in ensuring that the budgeted amount is utilized judiciously and optimally and in order of priority; thus covering the very important aspects of Zero Base Budgeting. The Annual Plans are only the part of Five Year Plans; hence, in Annual Plans the funds are projected for the already approved activities.

(ii) Budgeting of a Scientific Department

3.6 Asked if they were satisfied with the extant procedure of allocation of resources or they would like their financial requirements to be assessed differently from other general administrative Ministries / Departments. Since DARE is a Scientific Department, whose main area of activity is Research

and Development, the Department stated that DARE being a Department of the Government have to follow various existing procedures / guidelines / instructions and which are issued from time to time by the Government. For scientific Departments, like DARE, wherever felt necessary, the Government issues various guidelines/instructions accordingly. However, looking to the needs of agricultural research to meet existing and emerging challenges such as climate change, soil health, water quality and scarcity a greater thrust and support is considered essential. We in India have 17% population of world with only 4.2% water and 2.3% land. We are having cultivation in only 140.0 ± 2.0 million hectare for the last forty years during which population is doubled. As we are always called upon to produce more and more with less and less, substantially enhanced allocation for agricultural research, technology development and human resource development is considered essential for food, nutrition and environmental security of our Country.

3.7 Asked further to elaborate upon their suggestion as the reply was vague, the Department clarified that the submission in the preceding para explicitly highlighted the fact that in order to meet the emerging challenges of food security of the Country, the activities related to agricultural research, technology development and human resource development needed substantially enhanced allocation, particularly in the background of limited availability of resources like land and water but ever increasing human population. The Department informed that a request for Rs. 2250 crore as RE 2009-10 as against the allocation of Rs 1760 crore was made to carry out the envisaged research programmes during XI Plan.

3.8 The Committee were informed that since the research activities being carried out by the Department are of continuing nature they feel handicapped as the funds at RE stage are received as late as in December. It would be in the interest of research that RE is intimated by September/October each year by the Ministry of Finance so that the funds may be judiciously utilized. This is considered essential as the research activities of the Department are directly concerned with nation's food and nutrition security.

3.9 Incidentally, the Eleventh Plan Document states the following in the context of budgeting aspect of the National Agricultural Research System :-

'The biggest problem with National Agriculture Research System remains that it is strictly governed by the same rules and regulations relating to expenditure and filling up of positions as operative in Government Departments of States and the Centre. This robs the system of flexibility and discretion which are essential for healthy functioning of scientific institutions.'

3.10 On the question of what exactly has been done by the Department in the light of such crucial leverage offered by the Plan Document to them with regard to financial planning, recruitments, etc., the Committee were informed that the Department have earlier also emphasized that there needs to be greater flexibility with regard to financial planning and recruitment procedures, being a Scientific Department. However, this would require major policy decisions on the part of the Government.

APPROACH TO XI PLAN

3.11 The Committee were informed that the Planning Commission had communicated to the Department that Eleventh Plan will have to be delinked from the First Year (2007-08) of the Plan period to ensure that Reports of the Sub-Committee of National Development Council, the Steering Group of Agriculture and Allied Sectors and the Eleventh Plan Working Group on Agricultural Research and Education are taken into account while the overall Eleventh Five Year Plan Document is formulated.

3.12 When queried about the *modus operandi* and the exact import of this delinking, the Department in a written reply stated that in so far as delinking of the Department's Annual Plan 2007-08 proposals are concerned, a communication to this effect was received from Member, Planning Commission. The meetings of the Annual Plan (2007-08) proposals of the Department were held in Planning Commission in December 2006/January 2007. The Planning Commission had to communicate the Annual Plan 2007-08 Outlay of the Department in February 2007. The XI Plan related Report of Steering Group on Agriculture and Allied Sectors, constituted by Planning Commission was finalized in April 2007. Due to this reason, the Planning Commission had intimated in December 2006/January 2007 that they would consider the Department's Annual Plan 2007-08 proposals only and not the XI Plan as a whole.

3.13 Queried further about instances of such delinking in the past it was stated that no such delinking has taken place in the recent past. Asked further, their views about the consequences of such a delinking on the physical and financial performance of the Department in the Eleventh Plan

and suggestions to avoid recurrence of such situations in future, the Department informed that this kind of arrangement was just an administrative technicality on the part of Planning Commission and the Department had to follow the procedures as desired by the concerned agencies like Planning Commission, etc.

3.14 On the question of the impact of delinking of Financial Year 2007-08 from the Eleventh Five Year Plan on the various schemes of DARE, the Department stated that the delinking of the financial year 2007-08 from the XI Five Year Plan was also a factor impacting some delay in the process of clearance of various schemes of XI Plan for implementation.

3.15 The Committee understand that there was a practice of declaring certain years to be Annual Plan years whenever planning process got delayed for some reasons so that subsequently a fresh Five Year Plan could be drawn. This was perhaps done to ensure that the impact of delay in planning, etc. is restricted to the Annual Plan in question and the next Five Year Plan is worked out in a holistic manner. Asked, if the Department suggested anything of this sort to the concerned authorities when this delinking was proposed and the outcome of the efforts made, the Department replied that they did not propose to the Planning Commission or any other authority for not de-linking the financial year 2007-08 from the XI Five Year Plan.

3.16 Asked why the Department had not suggested to the Planning Commission to treat the financial year 2007-08 as 'Annual Plan' when delinking was proposed by them as there were ample instances in the past when certain years were treated as 'Annual Plan' years viz. 1966-67, 1967-

68, 1968-69 and 1989-90 and 1990-91, the Department in a post-evidence reply stated that this was then necessitated due to the general elections in the Country and the Department had little role to play in this regard.

3.17 Asked further as to why delinking of financial year 2007-08 from XI Five Year Plan would cause delay in clearance and implementation of XI Plan schemes when according to the Department themselves, the XI Plan Schemes would have already passed the scrutiny of SFC/EFC consisting amongst others representatives from Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and experts/concerned persons of other organizations connected with the particular scheme / programme to be implemented in a particular Plan, the Department in another post-evidence reply stated that the delay in the process of implementation of XI Plan schemes was mainly due to the fact that the communication by the Planning Commission after the endorsement of the XI Five Year Plan by the NDC was received in the Department only in January, 2008, that resulted in loss of almost an year in this preliminary process. However, the Department could clear all the EFCs and SFCs in a record period of about one year from the date of receiving the communication from the Planning Commission.

BUDGETARY ALLOCATION

3.18 The Department had been allocated Rs.5368.00 crore for the Tenth Plan against proposed allocation of Rs.15000 crore. For the Eleventh Plan, the Department proposed a sum of Rs.12176.40 crore and have been allocated a sum of Rs.12023.00 crore.

The Table below indicates the year-wise BE, RE and Actuals in the Tenth Plan and the three years of the Eleventh Plan:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Actuals
Tenth Plan			
2002-03	775.00	725.00	680.56
2003-04	775.10	775.00	701.78
2004-05	1000.00	900.00	858.98
2005-06	1150.00	1070.00	1048.96
2006-07	1400.00	1430.00	1368.02
TOTAL	5100.10	4900.00	4658.30
Eleventh Plan			
2007-08	1620.00	1434.00	1284.25
2008-09	1760.00	1760.00	1653.80
2009-10	1760.00	--	652.28*
TOTAL	5140.00	3194.00	3590.33

* Upto 30.9.2009

The BE for the ongoing Fiscal has been pegged at Rs. 1760.00 crore against the proposed Outlay of Rs. 4000.00 crore.

3.19 Asked why in spite of price rise and inflationary trends during the last five years, the Department had sought only Rs.12176.40 crore for the Eleventh Plan while a sum of Rs.15000 crore was sought for the Tenth Plan, the Department replied that they had to restrict the XI Plan outlay to Rs. 12176.40 crore as asked for by the Planning Commission through their circular. The Department were asked to formulate three scenarios in respect of the proposals for XI Plan outlay i.e. reflecting an increase of 5% per annum with respect to the terminal year of X Plan; and similarly other two scenarios with an increase of 10% per annum and 15% per annum, respectively. In reality, the XI Plan Working Group constituted by Planning Commission itself

had recommended Rs.31,672.00 crore as XIth Plan outlay for DARE / ICAR but the Planning Commission provided Rs.12,023.00 crore only. The Expert Group constituted by Planning Commission under the chairmanship of DG, ICAR recommended Rs.36,000.00 crore for XIth Plan.

3.20 When asked how could the financial requirements of a scientific department like DARE, be justified within such restrictive mathematical formulae and had the Department brought the constraints in this regard to the notice of the concerned authorities in Planning Commission, the Department stated in a written reply as under:-

“Agreed please. The Expert Group constituted by Planning Commission under the chairmanship of DG-ICAR had recommended Rs 36000.00 crore for the XI Five Year Plan of the Department. Even the XI Plan Working Group on Agricultural Research and Education constituted by Planning Commission had recommended Rs 31672.00 crore. The Planning Commission did not enhance the XI Plan Outlay of the Department, which was kept at Rs.12,023.00 crores.”

3.21 When asked further if they were satisfied with the allocations finally made for each of the schemes/programme/activity and the resultant progress made during the Tenth Plan as well as the first two years of the Eleventh Plan, the Department stated that the allocations as communicated by Planning Commission during Xth Plan and XIth Plan were distributed among various schemes/ programmes after reprioritizing the requirement keeping in view the research priorities. In so far as the performance of fund utilization for each scheme during Xth Plan as well as in the first two years of XIth Plan is concerned, the same are already given in the scheme-wise details contained in the Demands for Grants (2009-10) document on pages 116 to 158.

3.22 On the question of the efforts made by the Department to convince the Planning Commission to allocate funds as projected and if the matter was taken up at the other appropriate levels as well so as to ensure the fructification of allocations sought, the Department stated that the year-wise projections are usually submitted to Planning Commission each year through Annual Plan proposals. The scheme-wise proposed outlays for each year were discussed in Planning Commission under the chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission. The Department had strongly taken up the matter with Planning Commission that the projected outlays be provided to them. As the Annual Plan allocations are communicated each year by the Planning Commission, hence, the matter was taken up with the Planning Commission only.

3.23 About the impact of the pruning down of funds sought, on the activities being pursued, both in short and long term perspective and the steps taken by the Department to ensure that funds sought are actually released, the Department stated that whatever allocation is communicated by the Planning Commission for each year, the same is distributed among the various schemes of the Department after re-prioritizing the fund requirement. This was done to ensure that the schemes/projects of high priority could be funded adequately as far as possible out of the total allocated fund as allocated each year by the Planning Commission. The Department have always taken up the matter strongly at higher levels in the Planning Commission for getting the proposed outlays. The scheme-wise funds are allocated by the Department after reprioritizing the requirement and keeping in view the national priorities.

3.24 Against an allocation of Rs.12023.00 crore for XI Plan, the Actuals have been only Rs.2938.05 crore for the first two Years of the Plan amounting to less than 25% utilisation of the Plan allocation.

3.25 The Committee understand that the trend of allocations being followed in the Eleventh Plan was backloading i.e. allocating maximum funds in the last two years of the Plan. When enquired the reasons behind the backloading of funds for the Eleventh Plan, the Department in a written reply stated that the formulation of XI Plan SFC/EFC proposals is a lengthy procedure and the Department had to follow the various formats/guidelines/instructions/ procedures etc. as prescribed by Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance. This process of getting clearance from XI Plan SFCs/EFCs could be accomplished by the end of 2nd year of XI Plan.

3.26 When asked about views of the Department on the method of fund allocation/release during the last two years of the Plan and the impact of such backloading of allocations on the Schemes of DARE included in the Five Year Plan, the Department clarified that as we have received the approval of EFC/SFC of all the ongoing schemes as well as one new scheme, the funds during the remaining part of the XI Plan could be fully utilized for construction of approved civil works, acquiring of new equipments, strengthening of library etc. so that all the envisaged programmes of the ongoing/new schemes could be implemented as scheduled.

3.27 When asked if in the above scenario, would the Department be able to spend the remaining 75% in the last three years of the Eleventh Plan and the steps being contemplated to step up utilization of the allocations in the remaining Plan period, the Department stated that all the ongoing schemes

were cleared by the XI Plan SFCs/EFCs by the end of second year of XI Plan as it was a very lengthy exercise. Until a scheme is approved for implementation, the process of fund utilization is limited to committed expenditure only (like Pay & Accounts, contingencies, etc.) whereas the items of infrastructure development could be taken up after a scheme is duly approved by SFC/EFC/Competent Authority for implementation. Due to this less funds were utilized during the first two years of XI Plan. Now as all the ongoing schemes have been cleared, the Department have to implement all the approved activities/programmes including related infrastructure development etc., with full vigour, therefore the Department anticipate higher utilization during the current financial year 2009-10 and the remaining two years of XI Plan.

3.28 In the current Fiscal also the Department have been allocated a sum of Rs.1760 crore. Till September, 2009 Rs.652.28 crore only have been spent. This is about 37% of the BE. Assuming full utilization by the Department during the current Fiscal, which is not likely in view of their past record, 60% of the Eleventh Plan allocation would still be left for the last two years of the Plan.

3.29 Asked why the funds allocated have not been spread more evenly to avoid huge accumulation of unallocated funds in the last two years of the Plan and their suggestions to improve the financial planning aspect at all levels so as to ensure that such situations are avoided in future, the Department stated that as the initial period of the XI Plan was used in getting approval of the XI Plan SFCs/EFCs of each Plan scheme, this was the reason that less funds were projected/utilized in the first two years of XI Plan.

3.30 It was further stated that the process of getting clearance of SFC/EFC and financial approval of competent authority for each individual scheme is quite lengthy i.e. first they invite proposals from the individual schemes (institutes/national research centres/project directorates, etc) which are formulated by them after having thorough in-house assessment and following the various formats / guidelines / instructions from Planning Commission / Ministry of Finance. Subsequently these proposals after critical scrutiny at concerned subject matter divisional levels are made available for circulation to appraisal agencies (Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance etc.) for getting their comments. Further, after following laid down procedures, these proposals are considered by the respective SFCs/EFCs. The recommendations of SFCs/EFCs are submitted to the prescribed competent authorities for approval. Hence, this process takes substantial time and the Department has to follow the same. The Department always takes expeditious steps to accomplish this process.

3.31 Elaborating further on this matter the Secretary of the Department stated during the Oral Evidence as under :-

“I would like to mention that the kind of problem which has been faced by us in the Eleventh Five Year Plan is a perpetual problem Plan after Plan. Why does it happen? After NDC meeting is made almost in the second year of any Plan period. So, upto two years, one only goes on the existing basis. Even if marginally little more money is allocated for undertaking new activities, they are not initiated. That is one issue which I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Committee.

Secondly, I would like to mention that in the last three or four or five Plan periods, Eleventh Five Year Plan is one Plan period in which 74 schemes, 71+3 new schemes including the new National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management, has already been sanctioned. Only two or three new schemes such as the University in Bundelkhand which has been talked in the last one or two months are likely to be put in place. We are in the best position to utilise the money if it is allocated.

The Third problem is, although overall Rs.12,000 crore has been allocated, when we are capable of spending based on the programmes already approved by the Government, money is not available. For example, in the ongoing year in 2009-10, 74 schemes have been approved and sanctioned. We wanted an allocation of Rs.4,000 crores and we were kept at Rs.1,760 crore which was the allocation last year. We wrote a letter to this effect at the RE stage and we hope to get the amount. But today, at Rs.4,000 crores, we will not be able to spend because the time available is limited. We have now asked Rs.2,250 crores against an allocation of Rs.1,760 crores which was on the basis of the allocation last year.

The fourth point which I would like to mention and which is coming up time and again is our requirement to provide the much needed fillip to research in agriculture sector.

Regarding the works, since the Plan was on the existing basis, the existing activities have continued. For undertaking new activities, we need funds. Since they were only existing activities, and they are continued, there is no loss of work but acceleration has not been there and new works has not been there. We need some money there.”

3.32 While seeking information for and in connection with the examination of Demands for Grants of the Department, the Committee desired the detailed break up of allocations sought and allocations actually made sector / scheme / programme / activity wise for the each of the years of Xth and so far during the XIth Plan. The Department replied that these details are available in the Demands for Grants (2009-10) document (on page Nos.116 to 158). Since the scheme-wise, year-wise proposed Outlay were not reflected in the material cited by the Department, they were asked to clarify in the matter. In response the Department further stated that during Xth Plan, the scheme-wise proposed outlays are reflected in col. No. 3 from page 116 to 126 for the Xth Plan as a whole. In so far as scheme-wise proposed outlays are concerned they are contained in the Annual Plan proposals of each year. Similarly, for XI Plan, the scheme-wise proposed outlays are reflected in col. 3 from page 140 to 158 and the scheme-wise proposed outlays for each year

of the Annual Plan are contained in the respective Annual Plan documents. The detailed break-up was, however, not made available to the Committee.

LAUNCHING OF NEW SCHEMES

3.33 On the question of the procedure followed by the Department while proposing a new scheme or totally revamping or recasting an old scheme in their Five Year/Annual Plan, the Department stated that after a new scheme to Planning Commission is proposed, first a concept note is sent to Planning Commission for their consideration and seeking in-principle approval. After receiving the in-principle approval, the Department gets the detailed SFC/EFC proposal alongwith Detailed Project Report(DPR) and circulates it to appraisal agencies including Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance for seeking their specific comments. Subsequently, the proposal is considered by the respective SFC/EFC, whose recommendations are submitted to the competent authority for approval (for schemes costing Rs. 150 crore and above the EFC recommendations are submitted to CCEA for ongoing schemes and to the Cabinet for new schemes for their respective consideration/ approval) following the prescribed procedure. In so far as revamping/recasting of an ongoing scheme is concerned, such proposals are deliberated/decided by the respective SFC/EFC of a particular scheme.

The Committee have been further informed that the SFC/EFC of a new scheme thoroughly deliberates the proposal and thereafter accords its Recommendation for implementation of the same.

3.34 As regards new schemes being taken up during the ongoing Fiscal, the Committee have been informed that the Veerappa Moily Oversight Committee on the implementation of new reservation policy in higher education for OBC

had recommended creation of 3 new institutes viz. National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management (NIASM), National Institute of Agriculture Biotechnology (NIAB) and National Institute of Biotic Stress Management (NIBSM). Out of these the NIASM had already been approved by the Government for establishment during 2008-09.

3.35 Asked if these two Schemes were earmarked for implementation during the ongoing Financial Year, when exactly were the proposals for these two new Schemes circulated and with what timelines, the Department replied that both the schemes were to be implemented in the ongoing year. The EFC proposals for these two new schemes were circulated on 25 September, 2009 to the appraisal agencies i.e. Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries, Ministry of Environment and Forest, Department of Biotechnology and Department of Science and Technology.

As per Ministry of Finance guidelines the maximum period for offering comments by the appraisal agencies is six weeks.

3.36 On the present status of these scheme, the Committee were informed further that the comments from Planning Commission, Department of Biotechnology, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries have been received. The Department have already requested the Office of Secretary, Expenditure, Ministry of Finance for a convenient date for convening the EFC for these two new schemes, which is awaited.

BUDGET & CASH MANAGEMENT SCHEME

3.37 The Ministry of Finance had launched a modified Budget and Cash Management (B&CM) Scheme in 2006-07 with the intention to reduce expenditure asymmetry and to plan market borrowings more realistically. The scheme stipulates amongst other things the following:

- Disclosure of monthly expenditure of major Departments.
- Quarterly exchequer control with a limit of maximum 33% funds in Quarter-4 (Q-4).
- March spending control with a maximum ceiling of 15% of funds.

Any breaches in this regard are to be reported to the Ministry of Finance and their permission / approval is required for regularization. When asked to what extent these measures are being implemented by the Department since Financial Year 2006-2007, the Department stated that these orders were circulated to all ICAR institutes as well as to all concerned sections and officials at ICAR Headquarters. In this regard the data furnished by the Department is at Annexures A & B.

3.38 It is noted from the figures provided by the Department the Committee found that in the years 2006-07 and 2008-09, the expenditure in Quarter-IV worked out to 35.79% and 43.64% respectively.

3.39 When asked why Quarter-IV spending norms of maximum 33 percent spending were not adhered to by the Department in these two years, the Department stated that one of the main reasons is due to late receipt of RE. Further in order to clear the financial commitments (like civil constructions, purchase of equipments, purchase of library books/journals etc) the expenditure during the last quarter leads to expenditure being bit higher.

3.40 When enquired whether there would be a repeat of such spending beyond specified limits in Quarter-IV in this year as well, the Department replied that in future, efforts would be made to restrict the expenditure to 33% during the last quarter. In case of any deviation, the Ministry of Finance will be communicated. Copies of instructions of Ministry of Finance have already been circulated to institutes for strict compliance and it is being monitored regularly.

3.41 It is further noted that the Department had spent 20.43 percent of the funds allocated for 2008-09 in March 2009. Thereby, exceeding the March ceiling of 15%. However, the Ministry of Finance was not informed. Asked why this was not reported to the Ministry of Finance and how would this violation be regularised without approaching the Ministry of Finance in the matter, the Department replied that in future, instructions of Ministry of Finance will be kept in view while monitoring the expenditure and any deviation would be reported to the competent authority.

ANNUAL PLAN 2009-10

3.42 There are 74 Schemes of ICAR which could be classified as (a) deemed and Central Universities of ICAR for conducting basic and strategic research and imparting higher education; (b) national institutes for upstream research; (c) bureau for collection, conservation, evaluation, classification and documentation of natural resources and strategic research support for their management and effective utilization; (d) national research centres for basic and strategic mission-oriented research for feeding into the coordinated research system; (e) project directorates to support research through

coordinated programmes for location, situation and system specific technologies; and (f) centres for frontline extension.

3.43 The number and budget outlays for these schemes / institutes by the Subject Matter Divisions are given below :-

S.No.	Name of Subject Matter Division	No. of Schemes / Institutes	Plan outlays for 2009-10 (BE) (Rs. in Crore)
1.	Crop Sciences	15	304.00
2.	Horticulture	9	90.00
3.	Natural Resource Management	13	102.00
4.	Animal Sciences	14	92.00
5.	Fisheries	6	45.00
6.	Agricultural Extension	3	307.00
7.	Agricultural Engineering	5	43.00
8.	Agricultural Education	2	370.00
9.	Economics, Statistics and Marketing	1	4.00
10.	ICAR Headquarters including IPR	6	30.00
11.	Indo US Knowledge Initiative	-	5.00
12.	Externally-funded scheme, NAIP	-	257.00
13.	DARE	-	1.00
14.	National Fund for Basic and Strategic Research	-	20.00
15.	Central Agricultural University, Imphal	-	90.00
	Total	74	1760.00

FLOW OF FUNDS IN 2009-10

3.44 The funds for the first four months of the current Fiscal were met through a Vote on Account and provisions for the remaining eight months have been made through regular Demands for Grants.

3.45 When enquired how did the Department reconcile with the two systems of flow of funds to ensure that ongoing schemes and new schemes of 2009-10 do not suffer resource crunch and to what extent has the funding pattern adversely affected the implementation of schemes and projects during the current Fiscal, the Department stated that they had allocated funds to various

schemes based on the prioritized requirement to see that none of the scheme is adversely affected due to shortage of funds.

3.46 Due to these restrictions some Ministries/Departments had admitted before the Committee that the timelines of several new as well as existing Schemes will be staggered. When enquired on this aspect the Department replied that till now only one new scheme namely “National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management” to address the impact of climate change on agriculture was approved for implementation at the fag end of 2008-09 and the Director has joined just a couple of months back. Hence, its activities did not suffer due to shortage of funds. The prioritized programmes under different existing schemes were not affected due to funding pattern during 2009-10.

MID -TERM APPRAISAL

3.47 As regards mid-term appraisal of the Eleventh Plan, the Committee have been informed that the Department have an in-built system to review the working of its schemes (institutes/national research centres/project directorates etc.) through Quinquennial Review Team (QRT), Research Advisory Committee (RAC) and Institute Research Council (IRC) for monitoring the performance of various plan schemes. In addition, ICAR has also developed mechanisms for evaluation through independent agencies in specific cases. Already independent evaluation has been carried out in respect of 8 institutions by the outside agencies. The Department have already submitted the document to Planning Commission for Mid-Term Appraisal, its first meeting has already been held under the Chairmanship of Member(Science) on 5 November, 2009. The proceedings of the meeting are still awaited.

Budgetary Planning and Zero Based Budgeting

3.48 The Committee observe that as far as Budgetary Planning is concerned, the Annual Plan and Five Year Plan requirements of the Department are initially projected as individual schemes of national research centre / project directorate. These are further considered inhouse. New programmes are formulated at ICAR Headquarters based on expert consultations, workshops, conferences, etc. Thereafter, a consolidated proposal for the Department is submitted to Planning Commission after complying with prescribed procedures / guidelines and a Five Year Plan or the Annual Plan is thus finalized after a process of consultation between the Department and the Planning Commission. In the Tenth Plan, for instance, after extensive discussions the number of schemes was brought down to 71 by merging / subsuming various schemes and sub schemes to introduce a more focused and efficient approach in the implementation process. With the addition of three new / upgraded schemes, the number has gone up to 74 in the XI Plan.

The Committee find that Zero Based Budgeting is resorted to in the budgetary planning process but only at the time of finalization of a Five Year Plan by the Planning Commission. The Committee are of the considered opinion that ZBB concept need to be applied not only at the stage of finalization of the budgetary allocation but also as a tool for better, rational, prudent and more focused financial planning requiring *ab-initio* planning. They feel ideally it need to be applied at the initial planning stage within the Department, not only to give a much needed reorientation to the budgetary planning of the Department but also to

enable the Planning Commission to analyse and appreciate the performance and achievements in a more focused and professional manner. On the functional plane, such an initiative by the Department, as will be borne out by the subsequent narrative, will be of immense utility as it may provide a sound base to the ZBB exercise conducted by the Planning Commission and thereby reduce considerably the time taken in finalization of allocations at the extant ZBB exercise stage. The Committee also desire the Department to consider the feasibility of carrying out Zero Based Budgeting for Annual Plans also. Being the fundamental unit of planning system in the Country, the Annual Plans need to be worked out with all meticulousness and care unlike the present system in which goals are dependent on funds and not vice-versa. The Committee would like to be apprised of the considered views of the Department on this aspect well before they take up the examination of the Demands for Grants of the Department for the next fiscal in Feb-March, 2010.

Budgeting of a Scientific Department

3.49 The Committee while noting with appreciation the contribution of ICAR in the past in enabling the Country acquire self-sufficiency in food production are, however, aghast to find that the Government never cared to nurture DARE / ICAR as an entity that has performed. This resulted in this Scientific Department getting continuously clubbed with other general administrative Ministries / Departments in the assessment of their organizational, functional and financial requirements. That this sorry situation is obtaining six decades after independence and with a

well laid down system of planning and decision making in place is incomprehensible to them. Having noted further that the Planning Commission have acknowledged this bitter truth in the Eleventh Plan document that the Government need to treat the Scientific Departments on a different footing vis-à-vis other Ministries / Departments for their functional, human resource and financial requirements, the Committee are certain that the Government is well aware of this plain speaking of the Plan body. It becomes highly untenable in view of the above fact that it is not the lack of awareness but the lack of will that is prohibiting the Government from bringing in the required reforms in the budgeting procedures and in subsequent allocations for the Scientific Departments. They strongly feel that the Government and the planners need to do what they, ought to have done decades ago. It is needless to emphasise that Scientific Departments have their own typical requirements of human resource, working and finances. And to keep them at the cutting edges of performance, they ought not be kept on the same footing as the general administrative Ministries / Departments. They, therefore, desire the Government to immediately extricate themselves from the inertia they are in and undo this wrong of decades together so that the Scientific Department are given their due, if not more, to enable, DARE / ICAR to perform in a conducive atmosphere and deliver to their optimum.

3.50 Further, the Committee are highly disappointed with the attitude of the Department and the response about the requirements as a Scientific Department. The replies were too vague and general in nature,

for the Committee to come to right conclusions about the exact requirements of the Department. The Committee are of the firm opinion that the endeavors of the Government in this matter will fructify only if they are presented with some concrete proposals by the Department for consideration and approval. They would like to caution the Department that merely saying that they feed the Nation inspite of severe handicaps or that major policy decisions are required to usher in changes in their working would not suffice. They, therefore, desire the Department immediately to get down to the task of working out a well considered and cogent proposal delineating their typical requirements of manpower, functioning and finances and the amendments / changes required to be made in the extant rules and regulations concerning these elements with a view to fructify them. The Committee would like such a proposal to be worked out by the Department and sent for the consideration of the Government before their next Demands for Grants are presented to the Parliament.

Delinking of Annual Plan (2007-08) from the Eleventh Plan

3.51 During the course of the examination of the Demands for Grants of the Department of Agricultural Research & Education, the Committee note that the Planning Commission had informed the Department in December, 2006 / January, 2007 that only their Annual Plan (2007-08) proposals would be considered and not the Eleventh Plan as a whole. This, according to the Department was done because the Planning Commission had to communicate the Annual Plan 2007-08 outlay of the Departments in February, 2007, while the Eleventh Plan related Report

of the Steering Group on Agriculture and Allied Sectors, constituted by the Planning Commission itself was finalized only in April, 2007. Besides, it was also done to ensure that the reports of the Sub-Committee of National Development Council and the Eleventh Plan Working Group on Agricultural Research and Education are taken into account while taking up overall formulation of the Eleventh Five Year Plan Document. The Committee further note that on the consequences of this delinking, initially the Department merely stated that it was just an administrative technicality on the part of the Planning Commission and they followed procedures as desired by agencies like Planning Commission. However, after persistent queries by them, it was finally admitted that the delinking of Financial Year 2007-08 from the Eleventh Plan was a factor impacting some delay in the process of clearance of various schemes of Eleventh Plan for implementation. The Committee are greatly distressed to find that the communication of the Planning Commission after the endorsement of the Eleventh Plan by the National Development Council was received in the Department only in January, 2008 resulting in the loss of a precious year in this preliminary process. Although the Department through their efforts got all EFCs and SFCs cleared in about one year from the date of receipt of the communication from the Planning Commission, the sad fact remains that by then virtually the first two years of the Eleventh Plan were over resulting in timelines of all schemes going haywire. This according to them would very obviously entail an inflated financial cost also. While deprecating this sloppy planning process, the Committee find it inexplicable as to why the Government or the other agencies involved in the process did

not consider to convert 2007-08 as an Annual Plan year, as has been done in the past, so that the Eleventh Plan could have started from 2008-09. This would have cushioned the Plan from the cascading effects of the procedural delays, staggering of timelines and risking inflated costs during the ongoing Plan. The Department cannot be absolved of their inaction in this crucial matter as knowing fully well the negative connotations of the delinking of Annual Plan 2007-08 from the Eleventh Plan, they did not take any initiative of pointing out to the appropriate authorities instead claiming that compliance with the procedure of other agencies and general elections in the Country as alibis for their inaction before the Committee. They desire the Department to be more proactive in future in such matters of crucial importance.

Budgetary Allocation

3.52 The Committee note that the Department were allocated a sum of Rs.12023 crore for the Eleventh Plan against Rs.12176.40 crore sought by them while the Department had sought a far greater amount of Rs.15000 crore for the Tenth Plan. Seen in real terms, the allocation of Rs.12176.40 crore sought for Eleventh Plan is substantially less than what was sought five years back for the Tenth Plan. The Department advanced a strange logic for downsizing their outlay for the Eleventh Plan stating that the Planning Commission had asked them to project the Eleventh Plan fund requirements using three scenarios viz. reflecting an increase of 5%, 10% and 15% respectively with respect to the terminal year of Tenth Plan. The Committee can in no way justify such restrictive mathematical formulae prescribed by the Planning

Commission while asking a Scientific Department to workout their projections for as important a thing as the Five Year Plan outlay. This becomes inexplicable given the fact that the Eleventh Plan Working Group and the Expert Group, both constituted by the Planning Commission itself had recommended a whopping Rs.31672.00 crore and Rs.36000.00 crore respectively for the purpose. The Committee cannot but deprecate such casual attitude towards financial planning and management.

They observe a similar fate befalling the allocations made to the Department for the Annual Plans of the Eleventh Plan. For 2007-08, a sum of Rs.1620.00 crore was allocated as BE. This was reduced to Rs.1434.00 crore at RE stage. In 2008-09, a sum of Rs.1760.00 crore was allocated as BE. The same amount has been allocated as BE for the ongoing Fiscal as well when the Department had sought an allocation of Rs.4000.00 crore. The Department have also not acquitted themselves well by failing to utilize even these reduced allocations. In 2007-08 and 2008-09 they could spend only Rs.1284.25 crore and Rs.1653.80 crore respectively and in the ongoing Fiscal just 37% of the allocation viz. Rs.652.28 crore in the first six months was spent. The consequence of the low releases and still lower utilizations is that halfway through the Eleventh Plan, the Department has barely managed to spend 30% of the total allocations. The way things stand as of now, the Committee have every reason not to share the optimism of the Department that the balance funds would be spent in the remaining period of the Eleventh Plan. Rather, the Committee apprehend that schemes would get

staggered resulting in cost and time overruns. Another serious dimension would be that in order to spend funds in this Plan itself, half baked schemes would be rushed through with scant regard for either qualitative or quantitative norms. In both the cases, the prospects appear to be really very grim. They, therefore, are of the considered opinion that the ongoing midterm appraisal should chalk out specific implementation and execution strategies to ensure that balance funds to the maximum possible extent are utilized during the remainder of the Eleventh Plan without compromising on qualitative and quantitative parameters. They would like to be apprised of the efforts made by the Department in this regard at the earliest.

Further, it would not be out of context to comment upon the manner in which the Department have been furnishing information to them while the Demand for Grants (2009-10) were examined. The Department continued to invite their attention to the Document on DFG without ever realizing that the figures of allocations sought for Annual Plans are not mentioned in the said Document. Attention of the Committee was also invited to Annual Plans of previous years without appreciating the fact that these were not made available to them. The Committee are not at all impressed by this thoroughly condescending attitude of the Department in the matter of supply of papers and records sought by the Parliamentary Committee. They express serious displeasure and desire the Department to be extremely careful while furnishing information to the Parliament and its Committees in future.

Launching of New Schemes

3.53 The Committee find that the Department were implementing 71 Schemes in the Tenth Plan. With the addition of three new Schemes this figure has gone upto 74 in the Eleventh Plan. They are, however, concerned to note that out of these three new Schemes only one viz. National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management has been approved by the Government in 2008-09. The remaining two namely National Institute of Agriculture Biotechnology and the National Institute of Biotic Stress Management are still on paper. Though earmarked for implementation in the ongoing Financial year, the EFC proposals of these two Schemes were circulated to the appraisal agencies only on 25 September, 2009. While the comments of Planning Commission, Department of Biotechnology, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries have been received, the comments of Department of Agriculture and Co-operation, Department of Science and Technology and the Ministry of Environment and Forest are yet to be received. In the meantime, the Department have requested the Department of Expenditure to convene the EFC for the two Schemes. The Committee strongly feel that these two new Schemes have already been delayed inordinately. They, therefore, desire the Department to try their level best to ensure that all formalities pertaining to these Schemes of national importance are completed with utmost promptitude and their implementation commences at the earliest.

Quarter -4 and March Spending Slippages

3.54 The Committee note that Ministry of Finance modified the Budget and Cash Management guidelines issued in 2006-07 stipulate maximum spending ceiling of 33% in Quarter – 4 of a Fiscal and of 15% in the month of March and that any breach of these two ceiling limits require regularization by the Ministry of Finance. The Committee, however, note with concern that the Department have breached Q-4 norms in both the previous years with spending of 35.79% in Q-4 of 2007-08 and of 43.64% in Q-4 of 2008-09. They have also not adhered to the March spending ceiling of maximum 15% in March, 2009. What is more disturbing is that the Department have not even bothered to report these violations to the Ministry of Finance for regularization. They consider this a major failure on the part of the Department, and are of the strong opinion that unless financial prudence is practiced in letter and spirit, the entire purpose of this initiative for systemic improvement will be defeated. The Committee, therefore, desire that rather than seeking regularization of all such violations in future, as promised by the Department to them, the Department should endeavour to adhere to Q-4 and March expenditure norms without fail in future.

Mid-Term Appraisal

3.55 The Committee observe that mid-term appraisal of the Eleventh Plan schemes of the Department is presently underway and the first meeting was held on 5 November, 2009. The Department is awaiting the proceedings of the first meeting and the appraisal is yet to be completed. They further observe that ICAR has developed mechanisms

for evaluation through independent agencies. Evaluation of 8 institutions have so far been completed by the outside agencies. The Committee desire the Department to get the mid-term appraisal by Planning Commission completed at the earliest and the findings and recommendations be gainfully utilized for drawing up the proposals for allocations to various schemes for the next year's Budgetary Outlay of the Department.

CHAPTER – IV

SECTORAL PROGRAMMES

Some of the important Sectoral Programmes of the Department evaluated during the course of examination of Demands for Grants (2009-10) by the Committee are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

CROP SCIENCE

4.2 For Crop Science Scheme, the Department sought Rs.1991.08 crore for the Eleventh Plan and the Outlay provided viz. Rs. 1958.76 crore more or less matches the same. The BE, RE and Actuals during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan are as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-08	310.00	240.50	232.92
2008-09	315.00	303.50	285.16

4.3 About the reasons necessitating downsizing of BE at RE stage in both the years and the Actuals being lesser than even the RE in both the years, the Department stated that the EFC proposals of different Schemes could be approved by 2008-09, and therefore proposals for purchase of equipments and for works could not materialise.

4.4 Asked whether they would be able to spend the balance three-fourth of Plan allocation of the Scheme in the remaining less than three years of the Eleventh Plan with hardly 26.5% of Plan allocation spent in the first two years resulting in under utilization of earmarked funds and the extent to which various projects were affected, the Department replied that the SFC/EFC of different Schemes are now approved and therefore the purchase of

equipments and items of works are being processed i.e. substantial funds will be needed during current Financial Year and remaining 2 years of XIth Plan. Since the major amount was planned to be spent from third year onwards on works and some costly equipments, therefore, affected the earmarked programme of the Schemes of Crop Science Division. In the ongoing Fiscal the Department have spent Rs.95.24 crore as on 30 September, 2009 out of BE of Rs.304.00 crore.

HORTICULTURE

4.5 Under this Scheme an amount of Rs.702.52 crore was proposed by the Department for the Eleventh Plan against which the approved allocation is Rs.726.75 crore. The Actuals during the first two Fiscals add upto Rs.165.82 crore only. For the ongoing Fiscal the Department have been provided Rs.90.00 crore against Rs.260.00 crore sought by them. The Plan expenditure for Horticulture Division up to September 2009 has been Rs 76.53 crore. All the ongoing schemes were cleared by the XI Plan SFCs/EFCs by the end of second year of XI Plan, as this was a very lengthy exercise, less funds were utilized during the first two years of XI Plan. Now, as all the ongoing schemes have been cleared, the Department has to implement all the approved activities/programmes including related infrastructure development etc., with full vigour, so the Department anticipates higher utilization during the current financial year 2009-10 and the remaining two years of XI Plan.

4.6 When asked if the Department had projected the Revised Estimates for Horticulture Scheme, it was stated that the Horticulture Division has projected the RE of Rs.136.00 crore for 2009-10 which is awaiting allocation.

As research is a continuous process, delay in funding in one year will not have cascading effect on the schemes, provided full funding is received during the remaining part of the XI Plan.

4.7 To a query regarding the projects under the Horticulture Scheme which may miss timelines because of lower release /underutilization of funds in the first three years, the Department stated all the projects would be completed as per schedule.

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

4.8 The Department have got an allocation of Rs.745.09 crore for this Scheme which is one fifth more than the outlay sought for Eleventh Plan viz. Rs.630.12 crore. The allocation during 2007-08 and 2008-09 was Rs.80.00 crore and Rs.100.00 crore respectively. During the last two Financial Years, the Department have been able to spend a sum of Rs.182.83 crore. The BE for 2009-10 is pegged at Rs.102.00 crore. The Plan expenditure upto September, 2009 is Rs.44.78 crore.

4.9 On the issue of higher allocation under NRM Scheme, the Department have clarified that substantially higher funds were allocated to this Division because an amount of Rs 99.45 crore for the scheme of Scaling Up of Water Productivity in Agriculture was additionally provided in line with Union Budget announcement of 2007-08. Besides, the schemes of North East Region were also provided substantially higher funds as felt necessary by the XI Plan SFC/EFC to provide adequate funds to the schemes of North East Region on a priority.

4.10 Asked if the Department would be able to absorb the rest of the allocation in the remaining period of the Plan since not even 25% allocation

has been spent in the first two years of the Plan, it was stated that all the ongoing schemes were cleared by the XI Plan SFCs/EFCs by the end of second year of XI Plan, because it was a very lengthy exercise, this was the reason that less funds were utilized during the first two years of XI Plan. Now as all the ongoing schemes have been cleared, the Department has to implement all the approved activities/programmes including related infrastructure development etc., with full vigour, so the Department anticipates higher utilization during the current financial year 2009-10 and the remaining two years of XI Plan.

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

4.11 The Department have been allocated Rs.300.00 crore for this Scheme against the proposed Outlay of Rs.262.20 crore. The actual expenditure during the first two Fiscals at Rs.73.15 crore is less than 25% of the total Outlay. This year the BE is Rs.43.00 crore and a sum of Rs.15.20 crore has been spent upto September, 2009 out of this.

4.12 When asked why have allocations not been spread more evenly so that in the first three Years, the Scheme should not have faced a resource crunch like situation inspite of ample funds being available in totality and only 44% funds spent/committed in the three Years of the Plan and the Department's assessment of full utilisation of the allocated amount in the remaining two Years, the Department reiterated the position as stated in reply to similar queries with regard to schemes under Crop Sciences, Horticulture and Natural Resource Management as referred to in preceding paras.

ANIMAL SCIENCE

4.13 The BE, RE and Actuals during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan under Animal Science Scheme are as under :-

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-08	90.00	80.00	71.71
2008-09	90.00	90.00	87.18

The performance of the Department in implementing this Scheme is not at all encouraging. Out of the earmarked Outlay of Rs.1035.39 crore for Eleventh Plan only Rs.158.89 crore has been spent during the first two years which is 15% of the earmarked Outlay. The BE for 2009-10 is Rs.92.00 crore.

4.14 When enquired about the reasons behind such unrealistic annual allocations vis-à-vis total funds earmarked for the Scheme during each of the three Years of the Plan and its effect on the implementation of various Projects under this Scheme, the Department informed that during the first two years the utilization of funds has been low as the EFCs of various schemes were under the process of clearance and the two major schemes i.e. NDRI and IVRI have recently been cleared in the months of March, 09 and August, 09, respectively. Since all the schemes have now been cleared and the major portion of allocation was for new initiatives/ new works and equipments, proposed during XI Plan, the Division will be able to utilize the balance of three fourth funds in the remaining XI Plan period.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

4.15 The BE, RE and Actuals during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan for Agricultural Extension are as under :-

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-08	281.00	320.50	268.45
2008-09	301.00	315.00	292.48

Out of the earmarked Outlay of Rs.2100.00 crore for this Scheme during Eleventh Plan, the Department have been able to spend Rs.560.93 crore i.e. 26.71% of the total during the first two years of the Plan. Even in case of the KVKs, which have been allocated Rs.2052.00 crore out of the total Rs.2100.00 crore under this Scheme, the spending is 26.72% of the total allocation.

4.16 When asked why has this self inflicted resource cut been imposed by the Department on one of their Flagship Schemes viz. the KVKs and to what extent would the scarcity of resources in the first three years of the Plan affect the overall achievements of the Agriculture Extension Scheme in general and the KVKs component in particular, the Department stated that the Government(CCEA) approved the XI Plan proposals with the total allocation of Rs.2052.00 crore by the end of December, 2008. Anticipating the time taken for approval of the XI Plan proposals, no provision was made for construction of new works, procurement of new equipments, furniture, vehicles etc. under non-recurring head during the first two years of the Plan period. All the planned and targeted technical activities have been achieved

during the first two years of XI Plan. During the third year of XI Plan i.e. RE 2009-10 allocation of Rs.358.02 crore has been proposed and on availability of the said amount the targeted achievements will not be affected.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

4.17 The BE, RE and Actuals during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan for Agricultural Education are as under :-

Year	BE	RE	(Rs. in crore)
			Actuals
2007-08	312.00	361.00	349.23
2008-09	350.00	380.00	379.97

The Department have been able to utilise 28.21% of the funds earmarked for various components of Agricultural Education Scheme in the first two years of Plan i.e. Rs.729.20 crore out of Rs.2585.00 crore. With a BE of Rs.370.00 crore for the ongoing Fiscal, the funds spent/committed would still be hardly 40% of the total Outlay.

4.18 When asked how would the balance funds be utilised during the remaining two years of the Plan, the Department stated that the amount of Rs 2585 crore was only the earmarked provision for XI Plan for Education Division. However, as per XI Plan an amount of Rs 2414.97 crore was approved for this Division by the competent authority. The utilization during first two years of XI Plan was Rs 729.20 crore against the RE of Rs 741 crore implying that the utilization during first two years was more than 98%.

4.19 Under the 'Development and Strengthening of Agricultural Universities' component of the Agricultural Education Scheme, the Department have been able to spend only Rs.233.83 crore in the last two years. This is 11% of the total allocation of Rs.2119.35 crore. The Department justified the low

expenditure by stating that in so far as the development and strengthening of agricultural universities component is concerned, during first two years, a total amount of Rs 427.42 crore was allocated as BE and Rs 415.50 crore as RE against which the utilization was Rs 233.83 crore which is 56.28% , because this scheme was approved in the end of second year, hence, utilization was less. The Department anticipates higher utilization during third year and remaining two year of the Plan period. The Department will be providing the projected funds at RE 2009-10 and in the remaining two years subject to overall fund availability.

4.20 In respect of another vital Component of the Scheme viz. 'Educational Quality and Reforms', the Department have been able to spend just 1% of the total allocation of Rs.3.10 crore in the first two years. A sum of Rs.11.00 lakh has been earmarked as BE for 2009-10.

4.21 On the reasons for such a slack performance, justification for projection of Rs.3.10 crore for this Component and how the huge balance would be utilised in the remaining two years of the Plan, the Department stated that there is no slackness in performance. Beginning this Plan, particularly the year 2007-08, unprecedented and exemplary quality and reform initiatives were undertaken by the Education Division of the ICAR, comprising first ever and massive exercise of PG course curricula and syllabi revision, implementation of the revised UG course curricula and syllabi, a great fillip to Accreditation process, revision for ICAR Model Act for Agricultural Universities, and establishment of Coordination Committee for the ICAR Deemed Universities etc.

4.22 Elaborating further on the steps taken in this regard, the Department in a detailed reply stated :-

“(a) The first ever massive exercise to revise the Common Academic Regulations, Course Curricula and Syllabi of all Post-graduate (masters and doctoral) programmes (about 95) was undertaken through a National Core Group, 18 Subject Matter Area Committees, one Review Committee and thus, through involvement of about 1000 academicians and other stakeholders of agricultural education. Many of the AUs have already implemented the revised curricula and syllabi and others have conveyed to implement from the next academic year.

Thirteen more SAUs/DUs were accredited and accreditation renewal was carried out in 5 SAUs/DUs. Process of accreditation of five more SAUs and of extension of accreditation of 4 SAUs is in progress. Thus, a total of 27 AUs have been accredited. The remaining AUs have also been pursued to expedite their accreditation process.

The Meetings of Accreditation Board and its three Sectoral Committees on (i) Accreditation Norms and New Institutions & Programs; (ii) Curricula & Equivalence; and (iii) Governance, Personnel & Financial Policies were regularly held.

A first ever Workshop on ‘Quality Assurance in Higher Agricultural Education’ for NEH region was organized on March 26, 2009 at Assam Agricultural University Campus at Khanapara.

The quantifiable parameters for accreditation have been worked out.

The course curricula and syllabi of the UG programmes was got revised through a Deans’ Committee, and circulated to all AUs for implementation. Most of the AUs have already implemented the revised course curricula and syllabi.

Advisories are sent to AUs for implementing National Eligibility Test (NET) as an essential qualification for recruitment to Assistant Professor and equivalent positions for reducing inbreeding and education quality enhancement.

For uniformity in structure and effective governance of agricultural universities in India, the Model Act for Agricultural Universities in India (1994) has been revised and communicated to all AUs for adoption.

A Coordination Committee for the ICAR Deemed Universities has been set up under the Chairmanship of DG, ICAR to bring in uniformity in academic regulations and systems. Already, one meeting is held.

(b) Depending upon the availability of lower than the demanded funds, the allocation to the sub-scheme 'Quality Assurance and Reforms' was restricted to Rs. 11.00 lakhs each during 2008-09 and 2009-10. Against the allocation of Rs. 11.00 lakhs during 2008-09, Rs. 10.83 lakhs was spent. It is expected that the budget for 2009-10 will be enhanced and fully utilized. Plans are already under way to utilize the projected demand in the next two years."

4.23 It has also been stated that there has not been under performance in this scheme in so far as the physical targets are concerned. The efforts mentioned earlier have benefited the higher agricultural education system through review of the governance mechanism and available infrastructure and facilities, identifying the weaknesses and threats, and making the curricula and syllabi, knowledge as well as skill oriented, utilitarian and up-dated.

4.24 Similarly, in case of another component 'Nitch Area of Excellence', the Department have been able to spend 5.84% of the total Outlay in the last two years. The BE for 2007-08 was Rs. 43.50 crore while for 2008-09 it was Rs.25.15 crore. The corresponding spending being Rs.12.03 crore and Rs. 'Nil' respectively. On the reasons for such gross under-utilisation and the likelihood of meeting the Eleventh Plan targets and goals for this Component in the remaining years of the Plan, the Department stated that in so far as the 'Nitch Area of Excellence' is concerned, during first two years, a total amount of Rs 12.03 crore was utilized against the funds provided at RE level of Rs.30.10 crore which is 39.95% , because this scheme was approved in the end of second year, hence, utilization was less. The Department anticipates higher utilization during third year and remaining two years of the Plan period.

4.25 Under the 'Experimental Learning' Component of the Agricultural Education Scheme, allocations have neither been indicated for the Eleventh Plan as such nor for the first two years of the Plan. However, an amount of Rs.26.36 crore has been shown as RE for 2008-09 and similar amount has been shown as BE for the current year.

4.26 When asked to explain the reason for the funding pattern under the 'Experimental Learning Component', the Department stated that it has already been included in the XI Plan and is one of the agreed activities in the EFC/CCEA note.

4.27 Similarly, in case of the Component 'Modernisation of University Farms' no allocations have been indicated for the Eleventh Plan as also the first two years of the Plan. However, an amount of Rs.85.53 crore has been shown as RE for 2008-09 and a similar amount has been shown as BE for 2009-10.

4.28 Asked wherefrom the funds would be released for this Component when no provisions have been made in the Eleventh Plan for it, the Department stated that under the XI Plan the component of 'Modernization of AU Farms' stands approved with an outlay of Rs.421.95 crores for three years (2008-09 to 2010-11) and accordingly, the budget provision has been made.

4.29 A provision of Rs.65.00 crore has been made in the RE of 2008-09 for the Component 'Special Grants'. In 2009-10, Rs.31.16 crore have been proposed for this Component but no corresponding BE is indicated. Clarifying in the matter, the Department stated that a provision of Rs 65 crore has been made in RE 2008-09 and Rs.31.16 crore for 2009-10 for 3 universities (PAU, Ludhiana, Institution of Excellence, TNAU and Institution of Excellence

GBPUAT). The special grants are announced by the Govt. of India considering the achievements of the Universities and the requirement of funds for further upgradation of infra-structure and facilities for enhancement of quality of education. Particularly, the reputed Universities of long standing are covered under such provision.

4.30 There were mismatches in the figures under various columns for the Library Component of the Scheme, asked to reconcile the same, the Department stated that the total outlay included in the EFC/CCEA document for the Library component is Rs. 125.00 crores that includes Rs. 20.00 crores for 2007-08, Rs.25.00 crores for 2008-09, Rs.25.00 crores for 2009-10, Rs.25.00 crores for 2010-11 and Rs.30.00 crores for 2011-12.

4.31 The Department have indicated the Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth as a Component of the Agricultural Education Scheme. However, no allocations have been indicated for the same either in the Eleventh Plan as a whole or in each of the three years of the Plan. When asked about the status of Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth and why no allocations have been made for it in the Eleventh Plan, the Department informed them that Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth (MPKV) is a university accredited by the ICAR. The special grant of Rs. 100.00 crores to the MPKV, was announced during the current Plan and the funds towards this, are provided separately by the Government of India. Additionally, a sum of Rs. 6.50 crores during 2007-08, Rs.7.67 crores during 2008-09 and Rs. 2.67 crores so-far during 2009-10 have been provided to MPKV under the ongoing scheme 'Strengthening and Development of AUs'.

CENTRAL AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY IMPHAL

4.32 Under this Scheme, an expenditure of Rs.135.33 crore has been incurred on Central Agriculture University, Imphal in last two Fiscals. This is less than 25% of the total allocation of Rs.552.27 crore. When enquired about the reasons for low allocation and utilisation of funds till date, the timelines for the various projects concerning the University during the Eleventh Plan and to what extent would they be met, the Department informed that the approval of Government of India for the implementation of XI Plan proposal of Central Agricultural University, Imphal was received for Rs. 499.07 crore only towards the end of financial year, 2008-09 vide letter No. 5-7/2006-CAU dated 16 December, 2008. The expenditure of Rs. 135.33 crore is therefore, 27.11% during the first two Fiscals of the Plan. Furthermore, due to delay in the approval of Plan proposal no expenditure was possible on the New Schemes (New Initiatives) and construction works proposed for implementation during the Eleventh Plan period which alone accounted for Rs. 40.00 crore for the initial two financial years of 2007-08 and 2008-09.

4.33 Out of the total provision of Rs. 115.56 crore for the X Plan for carried over construction works, Rs. 58.25 crore was to be utilized on civil works of CAU (HQ) and College of Agriculture both of which are located at Imphal. Due to difficult law and order situation, the National Buildings Construction Corporation a Government of India Undertaking which was entrusted with both these Projects backed out of their agreement resulting the University to identify another executing agency for this purpose. For doing so, lot many codal formalities had to be completed afresh which took almost full one year. Hence no utilization of funds except the nominal mobilization expenditure could be made. However, the new executing agency i.e. Engineering

Projects India Ltd. another Government of India Undertaking has now awarded the works to contractors and the construction is going on satisfactorily.

As the sanction to the XI Plan proposal of CAU was issued in December 2008, the University anticipates to carry out various projected activities, though there is difficult administrative and political situation in the region.

ICAR HEADQUARTERS

4.34 The ICAR Headquarters Scheme has been allocated a sum of Rs.100.00 crore instead of Rs.85.00 crore proposed by the Department. The financial performance of the Department in regard to this Scheme is as follows :-

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-08	37.50	21.00	11.03
2008-09	15.00	26.50	21.21
2009-10	30.00	-	-

4.35 When asked about the reasons for drastic downsizing of BE 2007-08 from Rs.37.50 crore to Rs.21.00 crore at RE stage and not even half of this drastically reduced RE could actually be spent , the Department replied that the BE for 2007-08 (Plan) for Rs.37.50 Crore included Rs.20.00 Crore for the Oversight Committee being operated by the Education Division of the Council. However, at the RE stage, the budget was made as per the budgetary heads approved in the XI Plan, sanction for which did not include Oversight Committee Budget which was meant to be taken up by the Education Division separately in their budget.

The shortfall during 2007-08 was mainly under the sub-head "Support to CGIAR system" to a tune of Rs.4.00 crore and in the sub-head "Publicity and Public relations" to a tune of Rs.1 crore. This shortfall was due to the reason that EFC of ICAR Headquarter was then yet to be cleared.

4.36 About the reasons for doubling RE from Rs.15 crore (BE) to Rs.26.50 crore in 2008-09 and not fully utilising the same, the Department stated that the BE 2008-09 was Rs.15.00 crore for ICAR Headquarters. However, at the RE stage, an additional sum of Rs.3.25 Crore was required under sub-head Works for releasing first instalment for the newly approved work item of XI Plan viz. construction of Auditorium. Further, a separate EFC of IPR was conducted under title "Intellectual Property Management and transfer of Commercialization of Agricultural technology scheme (up-scaling of existing component i.e. IPR under ICAR Headquarters. Scheme on management and information services) and sanction issued on 06.06.08. After the issue of sanction of IPR, the budget of IPR for 2008-09 to the tune of Rs.7.28 Crore was projected in ICAR Headquarters budget at the RE stage 2008-09. Due to above reasons, the RE nearly doubled in respect of its BE 2008-09.

4.37 The major shortfall under RE 2008-09 was under the component "IPR" as the XI Plan sanction of IPR which was issued on 06.06.2008 has major portion of budget under sub-head "pay and allowances and operational expenses". Similarly, the budget of IPR under RE 2008-09 mainly contained provision for "pay and allowances and operational expenses" but as the suitable manpower approved in XIth Plan has yet not been approved by the Ministry of Finance hence the funds allocated for under RE 2008-09 could not be fully utilized.

4.38 The Actuals and shortfall / excess figures have not been indicated against the following components of ICAR Headquarters Scheme viz. Support to Prof. Soc. Including NAAS ; Support to CGIAR ; and Evaluation of Plan Schemes. Clarifying this, the Department stated that the ICAR Headquarter is a single scheme and the budget/ Expenditure is shown for ICAR Headquarter as a single entity. However, the components viz. Support to Professional Societies including National Academy of Agricultural Sciences (NAAS), Support to Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and Evaluation of Plan Schemes are part of ICAR Headquarters Scheme.

In so far as reflection of actuals and shortfalls/ excess in respect of the three components viz Support to Professional Societies including NAAS, Support to CGIAR and Evaluation of Plan Schemes is concerned, the same is summarized as under:

Support to Professional Societies including NAAS

(Rs. In Lakhs)

2007-08				2008-09			
BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess	BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess
200	250	206.46	-43.54	175	275	197	-78

Support to CGIAR

(Rs. In Lakhs)

2007-08				2008-09			
BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess	BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess
1210	1210	800	-410	600	800	1020	+420

Evaluation of Plan Schemes

(Rs. In Lakhs)

2007-08				2008-09			
BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess	BE	RE	Actual Expdtr	Shortfall/ Excess
0	25	14.91	-10.09	0	27	7.24	-19.76

4.39 Funds have not been allocated in the Eleventh Plan to the component '3 New Institutes' under the ICAR Headquarters Scheme. However, a sum of Rs.3.85 crore has been shown as RE for 2007-08 and a sum of Rs.50.00 crore has been proposed as Outlay for the ongoing Fiscal, though no allocation has been made there against in the BE.

4.40 When asked about the status of the Component as on date and the reasons for allocation mismatches, the Department stated that the Veerappa Moily Oversight Committee on the implementation of new reservation policy in higher education for OBC had recommended creation of 3 new institutes viz. National Institute of Abiotic Stress Management(NIASM), National Institute of Agriculture Biotechnology(NIAB) and National Institute of Biotic Stress Management(NIBSM). Out of these the NIASM had already been approved by the Government for establishment during 2008-09. The proposals of the remaining two new schemes have already been circulated to the appraisal agencies for comments. Some more time was taken in the formulation of these two schemes (NIAB and NIBSM) as various kinds of background information had to be gathered and deliberated at length before formulating the EFC proposals. It is expected that the EFC of these two schemes will be held shortly. In so far as the provision of Rs 3.85 crore at RE 2007-08 is concerned, it was just a token provision. During current financial year 2009-10 a token provision of Rs 50 crore was kept for the left over 2 new schemes

(NIAB and NIBSM) for which the EFC is expected to be held shortly after receiving the comments from appraisal agencies (Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance etc.).

4.41 No sums have been allocated to the Component 'Oversight Committee' in the Eleventh Plan. However, a sum of Rs.20.00 crore has been shown as BE for the year 2007-08. No further details about RE or Actuals have been indicated there against. No sums have been allocated for the purpose during 2008-09 or the ongoing Fiscal.

EXTERNALLY AIDED PROJECTS

4.42 The BE, RE and Actuals during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan for Externally Aided Projects is as under :-

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-08	285.00	85.70	51.88
2008-09	257.00	257.00	207.99

Under the Indo-US Knowledge Initiative for which a sum of Rs.50.00 crore has been allocated only 22% funds have been utilised in the first two years i.e. Rs.11.10 crore. In the third year also the BE is Rs.5.00 crore.

4.43 When enquired how do the Department propose to utilise the allocated amount in entirety during the Plan when hardly a third of the total funds were spent, it was stated that in the SFC document of the Indo-US AKI, a sum of Rs. 32.28 crores was approved for three years i.e. 2007-08 to 2009-10. The guidelines of the scheme envisage the matching grant from the US side. The low expenditure, particularly during the last two years i.e. 2008-09 and 2009-10 is mainly due to the non-availability of committed funds from the US-side. Therefore, India-side invested accordingly.

4.44 Similarly, in case of 'National Fund for Basic and Strategic Research' the Department have been able to spend Rs.15.66 crore in the last two years. This is hardly 16% of the total allocated i.e. Rs.100.00 crore. About the reasons for this less than optimal utilisation of funds and the Department's plans to utilise the balance funds in the remaining part of the Eleventh Plan, it was stated that the XI Plan approval of this scheme has been just received from Ministry of Finance and now it is anticipated that substantial funds will be utilized in the remaining period of 2009-10 and remaining two years of XI Plan.

Poor Utilization in Crop Science Scheme

4.45 The Committee find that the Department have been provided with Rs.1958.76 crore for this Scheme in the Eleventh Plan which almost matches their requirement (Rs. 1991.08 crore). What, however, is a matter of anxiety for the Committee is that the Department have been able to spend roughly 26.5% of the total Plan allocation in the first two Fiscals. Even during the current year, and in spite of their assertions to the contrary, the spending in the first six months has been Rs.95.24 crore only out of Rs.304.00 crore. Thus, at halfway stage of the Plan, the Department have been able to spend a mere Rs.620.32 crore out of Rs.1958.76 crore which is less than 32% in percentage terms. Given this scenario of gross under allocations and still lesser utilization, year after year, the Committee are compelled to conclude that the Crop Science Scheme is bound to miss both its cost as well as time lines. While expressing their displeasure on the extant poor financial management of this important Scheme till date in the Eleventh Plan, they exhort the

Department to atleast pull their socks up now and implement Scheme more professionally and judiciously during the remaining part of the Eleventh Plan. They also expect the Planning Commission to ensure that the Department will not remain cash strapped as in the previous years of the Eleventh Plan and all justified requirement of funds for the Crop Science Scheme will be met with alacrity.

Horticulture

4.46 The Committee observe that the Horticulture Scheme suffers from a different malaise. While the Department sought an amount of Rs.702.52 crore for this Scheme, they have been allocated Rs.726.75 crore, which is slightly higher than what they had asked for. Hereagain, the Department have been able to spend hardly 23% of the total allocation in the first two years of the Plan. In the third year i.e. 2009-10 when according to the Department the spending could have picked up, they have been allocated a sum of Rs.90.00 crore against Rs.260.00 crore sought by them. Further, the Department have already spent a major chunk i.e. Rs.76.53 crore in the first six months of the ongoing Fiscal. At such a speed, the Department would face a funds crunch sooner than later or else they may have to go slow on the implementation side. The Committee are dismayed with this method of funds allocation. Keeping the extant scenario in view, they desire the Government to infuse the Department with funds immediately at RE stage for the Horticulture Scheme to ensure that the Scheme continues unhindered.

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

4.47 The Committee observe that an allocation of Rs. 630.12 crore was sought for this Scheme against which a substantially higher amount of Rs.745.09 crore was allocated for the purpose. The Committee, are, however, disappointed to observe further that the Department could spend less than one fourth of the sum allocated during first two years of the Plan. In the Third year also , upto September, 2009, they have been able to spend only 40% or so of Rs. 102.00 crore allocated to them. As usual, the Department attributed the delays in sanctions/approvals as the reason for not making much headway in the first two years of the Plan. However, the assurance that the Department would work with full vigour in the remaining three years of the Plan and funds utilization would be higher remains to be seen. With half of the Eleventh Plan over and barely 30% of the funds spent, the situation is not as rosy as the Department would let the Committee believe. The Committee strongly believe that enough time has been wasted in the ongoing Plan on matters of planning and conceptualizing and what is required at this juncture is the execution and implementation of the Scheme with single minded purpose so that its intended benefits start accruing without any delay. They expect the Department to keep its assurance given to them in this regard.

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

4.48 The Committee note that in this Scheme also the Department have been allocated substantially higher sum (Rs. 300 crore) than what was sought (Rs. 262.20 crore). They, however, find it disconcerting that the actual expenditure at Rs.73.15 crore in the first two fiscals is even

less than one-fourth of the total Outlay. In the ongoing Fiscal also, the Department have been able to spend only Rs.15.20 crore out of the BE of Rs. 43.00 crore in the first six months. In percentage terms, it works out to roughly one-third of the allocation. As in the case of replies to the other such instances, the Department have expressed optimism about higher utilization during the current Fiscal and the remaining two years of the Eleventh Plan which the Committee can only take with a pinch of salt. The Committee strongly feel that if the Department have to ensure that the remaining two-thirds of the allocations are spent judiciously in the remaining two and a half years of the Eleventh Plan they have to really make a herculean effort. They, therefore, recommend the Department to rework their priorities in the Agricultural Engineering Scheme in the light of the mid-term appraisal and implement them in a focused and time bound manner in the remainder of the Eleventh Plan so as to ensure that both the cost and timelines of these Schemes are not staggered.

ANIMAL SCIENCE

4.49 The Committee observe that out of the earmarked outlay of Rs. 1035.39 crore the Department have been able to spend just Rs. 158.89 crore which translates to about 15 per cent of the total outlay during the first two years of the Plan. This in their opinion is one of the worst performances of the Department in the Eleventh Plan. In the ongoing year also, the BE of Rs. 92.00 crore is not at all indicative of any extraordinary efforts by the Department. Assuming that the entire amount is spent, the total expenditure in the first three years of the Plan

would still be approximately one-fourth of the earmarked outlay. The Committee are distressed to note that two of the major Schemes under Animal Science viz. NDRI and IVRI have been cleared as recently as in the months of March and August, 2009 respectively, which mirrors the sorry state of affairs on the planning and approvals front. Now that the approvals/sanctions in respect of the Schemes of the Division are in place, they hope the Department would move full steam ahead and be able to utilize the balance three-fourth funds in the last two years of the Eleventh Plan in a judicious and professional manner.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

4.50 The Committee note that Agricultural Extension consists mainly of the Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) component which is a flagship Scheme of the Department of Agricultural Research and Education. Out of the earmarked outlay of Rs. 2100.00 crore for Agricultural Extension in the Eleventh Plan, Rs. 2052.00 crore stands allocated to KVKs. The Committee are, however, disheartened to observe that even the flagship Scheme of the Department suffers from the malaise of gross underspending. In the first two years of the Plan, only 27 odd per cent have been spent out of the total allocation. The Committee are one with the Department on the point that if CCEA approval for the allocation had not been delayed upto end December, 2008, the performance of the Department could have been different. They expect that with the approvals/sanctions stages now being over, the Department would make a sincere effort to utilize the outstanding balance during the remainder of the Eleventh Plan so that the KVKs are not affected by the

self-inflicted resource crunch and hope for much better if not outstanding results on this front.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

4.51 The Committee are not at all satisfied with the manner in which various schemes under Agricultural Education have been handled by the Department. Overall they have been able to spend Rs. 729.19 crore out of Rs. 2414.97 crore during first two years of the Plan which is less than one third of the Plan allocation. It is needless for them to point out that here too, the Department had furnished information to them in a very casual manner as commented elsewhere in this Report. This is evident from the varying figures furnished in respect of Eleventh Plan Outlay of Rs.2585.00 crore which was subsequently changed to Rs.2414.97 crore as approved for this Division by the competent authority. They would like to have an explanation from the Department as to how, when and by whom the Outlay of Rs. 2855.00 crore was scaled down to Rs.2414.97 crore and why the same was not conveyed to them when the first set of figure was provided to them. They cannot but caution the Department to be very careful in such matters in future.

Further, the Committee observe that out of the total allocation of Rs. 2119.35 crore a sum of Rs. 233.83 crore only has been spent during the first two years of the Eleventh Plan in respect of the scheme under Agricultural Education viz. Development and Strengthening of Agricultural Universities. This is roughly 11 per cent of the total allocation. The Department chose to defend this under-utilisation by stating that the utilization of Rs.233.83 crore is 56.28 per cent of RE

allocation of Rs.415.50 crore for the first two years of the Plan. But, the sad fact, that stares us in the face is that almost 90 per cent of the allocation is still unspent and needs to be absorbed in the remaining three years of the Plan which in the view of the Committee is virtually an insurmountable task.

Educational Quality and Reforms

4.52 The Committee are concerned to note that in another vital Component of Agricultural Education viz. Educational Quality and Reforms, the Department have been able to spend just 1 per cent of the total allocation of Rs. 3.10 crore in the first two years and a measly sum of Rs. 11.00 lakh has been earmarked as BE for the ongoing Fiscal. The Committee are not at all convinced by the long winding reply about the several massive exercises being conducted under the Scheme and the unprecedented and exemplary quality of reform initiatives undertaken by the ICAR. What matters is that either the projection of Rs. 3.10 crore as Outlay for this Scheme for the Eleventh Plan was woefully off the mark or that the Department have miserably failed on the implementation side of this Scheme. The Department's contention that there has not been under performance in this Scheme so far as physical targets are concerned goes on to further confirm the Committee's apprehensions about the financial projections of the Scheme.

Similarly, the Committee are distressed to note that in another Component of Agricultural Education i.e. 'Nitch Area of Excellence', the Department have been able to spend just 5.84 per cent of the total outlay in the last two years. Out of the BE of Rs.43.50 crore for 2007-08,

the spending was Rs.12.03 crore. In 2008-09 nothing was spent from the BE of Rs.25.15 crore. The gross under-utilisation was attributed by the Department in the first year to the delayed approval of the Scheme at the end of the second year of the Plan. The Committee are highly intrigued by this reply of the Department since in the second year the expenditure has been nil. They would, therefore, like a detailed explanation in the matter from the Department within one month of presentation of this Report in the Parliament.

Experimental Learning Component

4.53 During the course of their scrutiny of the Demand for Grants and other documents furnished to them by the Department, the Committee found several inconsistencies in the figures. Under the 'Experimental Learning Component of the Agricultural Education Scheme', allocations have neither been indicated for the Eleventh Plan as such nor for the first two years of the Plan. However, an amount of Rs. 26.36 crore has been shown as RE for 2008-09 and a similar amount has been shown as BE for the current year. The Department in a clarification have informed them that the Experimental Learning Component has already been included in the Eleventh Plan and is one of the agreed activities in the EFC/CCEA note.

Similarly, in case of the Component 'Modernisation of University Farms' no allocations have been indicated for the Eleventh Plan as also in the first two years of the Plan. However, an amount of Rs. 85.53 crore has been shown as RE for 2008-09 and a similar amount has been shown as BE for 2009-10. In the context of this Component too, the

Department stated that it stands approved with an outlay of Rs. 421.95 crore for three years i.e. 2008-09 to 2010-11.

Mis-match and inconsistencies in figures

4.54 The Committee further observe mismatches in the figures under various columns of 'Library Component' of Agricultural Education Scheme. In like manner they also observe that the Department indicated Maharishi Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth (MPKV) as a Component of Agricultural Education Scheme while no allocations have been indicated for the same either in the Eleventh Plan nor in each of the three years of the Annual Plans. The Department clarified that MPKV is a University accredited to ICAR. The special grant of Rs. 100.00 crore to MPKV was announced during the current Plan and funds towards this are provided separately by the Government of India. Additionally, a sum of Rs. 6.50 crore during 2007-08, Rs. 7.67 crore during 2008-09 and Rs. 2.67 crore so far during 2009-10 have been provided to MPKV under the ongoing Scheme Strengthening and Development of AUs.

The Committee take strong exception to the way facts and figures pertaining several important Schemes of the Department have been furnished to them. They are also not convinced by the clarifications given by the Department in this regard. They, therefore, desire a detailed explanation from the Department on how and why figures pertaining to the Schemes mentioned above were reflected in a particular manner in the document pertaining to Demand for Grants as also the manner in which the Department propose to reflect the figures furnished by them as clarifications.

CENTRAL AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, IMPHAL

4.55 The Committee note that in case of the Central Agricultural University, Imphal also that the Department have not acquitted themselves well. In the last two Fiscals, less than 25 per cent of the total allocation of Rs. 552.27 crore has been spent. It is most unfortunate that approval of the Government for the implementation of the Scheme was received as late as on 16 December, 2008 and for an amount of Rs. 499.07 crore only. The delay in this case has been further aggravated by the fact that the agency entrusted with the implementation of the Project backed out because of law and order situation and the formalities to engage another agency took almost a year. The Committee are, however, happy to note that the new executing agency has already awarded works and construction is going on satisfactorily. In the considered opinion of the Committee, the Central Agricultural University, Imphal would be a much needed interface with the agriculture sector and allied activities in the North-east and therefore its implementation needs to be accorded highest priority by the Department. They, therefore, desire the Department to work out a rigid time schedule for the implementation of this Project at the earliest. The Committee would like to be apprised of the same.

ICAR Headquarters – Proper reflection of Schemes

4.56 The Committee note that the Department had to resort to a drastic downsizing of the BE 2007-08 from Rs.37.50 crore to Rs.21.00 crore at RE stage. The Department could, however, spend only Rs.11.03 crore out of this reduced amount. According to the Department, the curtailing

was necessitated because initially, a sum of Rs.20.00 crore under ICAR Headquarters was included for the Scheme 'Oversight Committee' which is otherwise operated by the Education Division of ICAR. At the RE stage, the allocation was made as per the budgetary heads approved in the Eleventh Plan sanction which did not include Oversight Committee since it was meant to be taken up by another Division separately. Apart from this, the Committee also observe that the Actuals, Shortfall / Excess figures in respect of support to Prof. Soc. Including NAAS, Support to CGIAR and Evaluation of Plan Schemes had not been indicated in the Document on DFG (2009-10). The Committee are not convinced with the Department's contention that ICAR Headquarter is a single scheme and budget / expenditure is shown for it as a single entity. They wish to point out that when the detailed figures for these components were subsequently furnished to them, substantial shortfall / excess was observed in both the years.

Again, the Committee find that no funds had been allocated for the component 3 New Institutes but a sum of Rs.3.85 crore had been shown as RE for 2007-08 and a sum of Rs.50.00 crore has been proposed as Outlay for the ongoing Fiscal, though no allocations have been made against it in the BE. The Department have explained these two amounts as token provisions for the Schemes which are yet to be approved. The Committee find it strange as to how such substantial amount can be treated as token provisions for Schemes which are yet to be approved. From all the instances cited above, the Committee feel that the system of budgeting under the ICAR Headquarters has a lot of scope for improvement so as to introduce more clarity and

transparency in it. With the clubbing of all Schemes / Components under one entity, it becomes very difficult to come to right conclusions on individual Schemes / Components having sizable investments of public money. The Committee would, therefore, like to have the well considered opinion of the Department to make the budgetary provisions reflective of the true performance of all Schemes / Components. They would like to be apprised of the action taken in the matter at the earliest.

Externally Aided Projects

4.57 The Committee after going through the information relating to the Externally Aided Projects find that the situation is not any better. In case of Indo-US Knowledge Initiative which was launched with much fanfare there has been consistent low release of funds. The result being that even if the entire BE of Rs.5.00 crore is utilized this year, the total spending in three years of the Eleventh Plan would be less than one third of the total Outlay of Rs.50.00 crore. The Department's explanation attributing low expenditure to non-availability of matching grant from the US side does not cut ice with the Committee. Almost three years of the Plan have gone by and the Department have not been able to persuade the other side to release matching grants in suitable proportions is nothing but the failure of the Department to work towards a mutually beneficial arrangement. The Committee would, therefore, urge the Department to take up the matter with the US side through appropriate channels to ensure that matching grants in requisite proportions are contributed by them from the current fiscal itself so that the Initiative is not frittered away.

The Committee have found more or less similar situation obtaining in the case of another Externally Aided Project viz. National Fund for Basic and Strategic Research. Out of an Outlay of Rs.100.00 crore, a sum of Rs.15.66 crore only has been spent during the first two years of the Plan purportedly due to the fact that the approval of this Scheme from the Ministry of Finance has been received very recently. Now that the approvals / sanctions are in place, the Committee expect the Department to pursue this important Scheme earnestly so as to ensure that delays till date do not affect its implementation proper in the remaining period of the current Plan. They would like to be apprised of the progress made in respect of both these Externally Aided Projects at regular intervals.

New Delhi ;
February, 2010
Magha, 1931 (Saka)

BASUDEB ACHARIA,
Chairman,
Committee on Agriculture

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(2009-10)**

MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 5th November, 2009 from 1100 hours to 1305 hours in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Basudeb Acharia – Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Narayan Singh Amlabe
3. Shri Shri K.C. Singh 'Baba'
4. Shri Thangso Baite
5. Shri Jayant Chaudhary
6. Smt. Ashwamedh Devi
7. Smt. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
8. Shri Sk. Nurul Islam
9. Shri Naranbhai Kachhadia
10. Shri Prabodh Panda
11. Shri Nripendra Nath Roy
12. Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

13. Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi
14. Shri A. Elvarasan
15. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
16. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy
17. Shri Bharatsinh Prabhatsinh Parmar
18. Prof. M.S. Swaminathan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy - Director
3. Shri P.C. Koul - Additional Director

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION)

1. Dr. Mangala Rai - Secretary, DARE & DG, ICAR
2. Shri Chaman Kumar - Additional Secretary & FA (DARE/ICAR)
3. Dr. S.P. Tewari - Deputy Director General (Education)
4. Dr. S. Ayyappan - Deputy Director General (Animal Sciences & Fisheries)
5. Dr. A.K. Singh - Deputy Director General (Natural Resource Management)
6. Dr. H.P. Singh - Deputy Director General (Horticulture)
7. Dr. S.K. Datta - Deputy Director General (Crop Sciences)
8. Dr. M.M. Pandey - Deputy Director General (Agriculture Engineering)
9. Dr. K.D. Kokate - Deputy Director General (Agriculture Extension)

2.	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
3.	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
4.	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
5.	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
6.	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX

7. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of DARE to the Sitting of the Committee and asked them to introduce themselves.

8. The Committee then took the Oral Evidence of the representatives of the Department for and in connection with examination of Demands for Grants (2009-10) of the Department. The members sought several clarifications on the various aspects of the Subject. The representatives of the Department responded to them. As the examination of the Demands for Grants (2009-10) remained inconclusive, the witnesses were directed to appear before the Committee again on 12 November, 2009 at 1100 hours for further Oral Evidence on the subject.

9. The Chairman, thereafter, thanked the witnesses for appearing before the Committee as well as for furnishing valuable information desired by the Committee on the subject. He also directed them to send at the earliest information on points on which information could not be provided by them during the Sitting to the Committee Secretariat.

A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept separately.

The Committee then adjourned.

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(2009-10)**

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 12th November, 2009 from 1100 hours to 1330 hours in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Basudeb Acharia – Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Jayant Chaudhary
3. Smt. Ashwamedh Devi
4. Shri Biren Singh Engti
5. Shri Prabodh Panda
6. Shri Premdas
7. Shri Vitthalbhai Hansrajbhai Radadiya
8. Shri Nripendra Nath Roy
9. Shri Uday Singh
10. Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

11. Shri Narendra Budania
12. Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi
13. Shri A. Elvarasan
14. Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi
15. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
16. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy
17. Shri Bharatsinh Prabhatsinh Parmar

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy - Director
3. Shri P.C. Koul - Additional Director

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION)

10.	Dr. Mangala Rai	-	Secretary, DARE & DG, ICAR
11.	Dr. S.P. Tewari	-	Deputy Director General (Education)
12.	Dr. S. Ayyappan	-	Deputy Director General (Animal Sciences & Fisheries)
13.	Dr. A.K. Singh	-	Deputy Director General (Natural Resource Management)
14.	Dr. H.P. Singh	-	Deputy Director General (Horticulture)
15.	Dr. S.K. Datta	-	Deputy Director General (Crop Sciences)
16.	Dr. M.M. Pandey	-	Deputy Director General (Agriculture Engineering)
17.	Dr. K.D. Kokate	-	Deputy Director General (Agriculture Extension)

2. xx xx xx xx xx

3. xx xx xx xx xx

4. xx xx xx xx xx

5. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of DARE to the Sitting of the Committee and asked them to introduce themselves.

6. The Committee then took further Oral Evidence of the representatives of the Department in connection with examination of Demands for Grants (2009-10) of the Department. The members sought several clarifications on the various aspects of the Subject. The representatives of the Department responded to them.

(At around 1215, hours the Chairman withdrew from the Sitting and Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi took the Chair).

7. The Acting Chairman, thereafter, thanked the witnesses for appearing before the Committee as well as for furnishing valuable information desired by the Committee on the subject. He also directed them to send at the earliest information on points on which information could not be provided by them during the Sitting to the Committee Secretariat.

A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept separately.

The Committee then adjourned.

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(2009-10)**

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee sat on Monday, the 4th January, 2010 from 1500 hours to 1530 hours in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Basudeb Acharia - *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Narayan Singh Amlabe
3. Shri Thangso Baite
4. Smt. Ashwamedh Devi
5. Smt. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
6. Shri Naranbhai Kachhadia
7. Shri Prabodh Panda
8. Shri Nripendra Nath Roy
9. Shri Uday Singh
10. Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Narendra Budania
12. Shri Satyavrat Chaturvedi
13. Shri A. Elavarasan
14. Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi
15. Shri Mohd. Ali Khan
16. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy

SECRETARIAT

- 1. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy - Director
- 2. Shri P.C. Koul - Additional Director

2. At the outset the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the members to the Sitting of the Committee. Thereafter, the Committee took up the Draft Report on Demands for Grants (2009-2010) relating to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) for consideration.

After some discussion and some minor modifications suggested by Members, the Committee adopted the draft Report.

3. The Committee, then, authorized the Chairman to finalise the Draft Report after getting it factually verified from the concerned Department. Being inter-session, the Committee also authorized the Chairman to present the Report to the Hon'ble Speaker at the earliest.

4. XX XX XX XX XX

The Committee then adjourned.

/-----/

DARE+ NFBSRA	4550.00	472.05	10.37	950.00	1150.14	121.07	1100.00	677.44	61.59			
CAU	5500.00	8049.00	146.35	5500.00	5500.00	100.00	13400.00	8033.0	59.95			
Total	140000.00	137056.53	97.90	162000.00	131718.71	81.31	176000.00	167525.03	95.18			
ICAR	134301.00	128535.48	95.71	136430.00	125068.57	91.67	165900.00	158814.59	95.73			
DARE+ NFBSRA	650.00	472.05	72.62	1470.00	1150.14	78.24	1100.00	677.44	61.59			
CAU	8049.00	8049.00	100.00	5500.00	5500.00	100.00	9000.00	8033.00	89.26			
Total	143000.00	137056.53	95.84	143400.00	131718.71	91.85	176000.00	165261.03	93.90			

Note- Figures of Expenditure are based on Audited Annual Accounts.
NFBSRA=National Fund for Basic and
Strategic Research in Agriculture.

ANNEXURE `B`

7 (c)

(Rs. In Lakhs)

Quantum of funds spent by ICAR in March 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09-March spendings in % terms of total BE & total RE funds

Period	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	BE/RE	Expenditure	Exp.%	BE/RE	Expenditure	Exp.%	BE/RE	Expenditure	Exp.%
BE									
ICAR	129950.00	7556.86	5.82	155550.00	15358.58	9.87	161500.00	34054.79	21.09
DARE+ NFBSRA	4550.00	435.14	9.56	950.00	206.16	21.70	1100.00	209.31	19.03
CAU	5500.00	687.82	12.51	5500.00	1041.06	18.93	13400.00	1700.00	12.69
Total	140000.00	8679.82	6.20	162000.00	16605.8	10.25	176000.00	35964.10	20.43
RE									
ICAR	134301.00	7556.86	5.63	136430.00	15358.58	11.26	165900.00	34054.79	20.53
DARE+ NFBSRA	650.00	435.14	66.94	1470.00	206.16	14.02	1100.00	209.31	19.03
CAU	8049.00	687.82	8.55	5500.00	1041.06	18.93	9000.00	1700.00	18.89
Total	143000.00	8679.82	6.07	143400.00	16605.8	11.58	176000.00	35964.10	20.43

Note- Figures of Expenditure are based on Audited Annual Accounts.

NFBSRA=National Fund for Basic and Strategic Research in Agriculture.