

SECOND REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2009-2010)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2009-2010)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 17 December, 2009
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 17 December, 2009*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 2009/Agrahayana, 1931 (Saka)

CRD No. 2

Price : Rs. 84.00

© 2009 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Thirteenth Edition) and printed by National Printers, New Delhi-110028.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
ABBREVIATION	(vii)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
	(i) Background	1
	(ii) Responsibility of the Department	1
CHAPTER II	Status of implementation of the recommendations made by The Committee in the Thirty-Sixth Report under direction 73A of the Direction by the Speaker, Lok Sabha	3
CHAPTER III	Overall Analysis	6
	A. Evolution of Schemes	6
	B. Policy Interventions	6
	C. General Analysis	9
	Five Year Plans	
	(i) Utilisation of funds during Tenth Plan	9
	(ii) Agreed and Proposed Outlay during Eleventh Plan	10
	(iii) Utilisation during Eleventh Plan	11
	(iv) Utilisation during Annual Plans	14
CHAPTER IV	Major issues	17
	A. Extent of wastelands/degraded in the country	17
	B. Investment and Workdone on wastelands in the country	20

C.	Review of IWDP, DPAP, DDP projects	24
D.	Unspent balances	30
E.	Outstanding utilization certificates	31
F.	Progress on Bio-diesel programme	33
CHAPTER V	Scheme-wise Analysis	36
A.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme	36
B.	National Land Record Modernization Programme ..	42
APPENDICES		
I.	Scheme-wise outlay (2009-2010)	49
II.	State-wise category-wise waste land in India—2003	50
III.	Extracts of the Minutes of the third sitting of the Committee held on 14 October, 2009	52
IV.	Extracts of the Minutes of the sixth sitting of the Committee held on 10 November, 2009	55
V.	Extracts of the Minutes of the seventh sitting of the Committee held on 14 December, 2009	58
VI.	Statement of Recommendations/Observations	60

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
6. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit
7. Shri H.D. Kumaraswamy
8. Shri Raghuvir Singh Meena
9. Shri Sidhant Mohapatra
10. Shri Gobinda Chandra Naskar
11. Shri Rakesh Pandey
12. Shri P.L. Punia
13. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
14. Shri Jagdish Sharma
15. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
16. Shri Jagdanand Singh
17. Dr. Sanjay Singh
18. Shri Makansingh Solanki
19. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
20. Shrimati Usha Verma
21. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Ganga Charan
23. Vacant*
24. Shri Silvius Condpan
25. Shrimati Kanimozhi
26. Dr. Ram Prakash
27. Shri P.R. Rajan
28. Shri Arjun Singh
29. Shri Bhagwati Singh
30. Shrimati Maya Singh
31. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*

* Consequent upon the resignation of Shri Ajay Singh Chautala from the membership of Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 3rd November, 2009 *vide* Notification No. RS. 10/2009-T dated 6 November, 2009.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2009-2010) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Second Report on Demands for Grants (2009-2010) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources of the Ministry of Rural Development on 10 November, 2009.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 14 December, 2009.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) for placing before them the requisite material and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

6. The Committee would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI,
16 December, 2009

25 Agrahayana, 1931 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

REPORT
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY
BACKGROUND

India with only 2 per cent of world's geographical area has 18 per cent of world's human population. Over the years the per capita land availability has also declined from 0.89 hectare in 1951 to 0.37 hectare in 1991; and that of agricultural land also declined from 0.48 hectare to 0.16 hectare during the above period. The Parthasarthy Committee Report on watershed programmes in India has shown that irrigated agriculture appears to be hitting a plateau, the dry land farming has suffered neglect. The Report concludes that the productivity of dry land agriculture needs to be developed if food security demands for the years 2020 are to be met. A greater focus of watershed development programmes to increase productivity of land in rain-fed areas may hold the key to meeting the challenges of food security in years to come. Out of 328.7 million hectare of geographical area of India, 142 million hectare is net cultivated area. Of this, about 57 million hectare (40 per cent) is irrigated and the remaining 85 million hectare (60 per cent) is rain-fed. The rain-fed area is generally subject to wind and water erosion and is in different stages of degradation. As per Parthasarthy Committee Report an estimated 125 million hectare of degraded land in rain-fed areas including 80 million hectares of land under dryland farming needs to be developed in next 15 years with an investment of Rs. 1,50,000 crore. Out of 125 million hectare, 75 million hectare is to be covered by the Department of Land Resources.

Responsibility of the Department of Land Resources

1.2 The Department of Land Resources under Ministry of Rural Development was created in 1999 and it implements the following programmes:

- (i) Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP);
- (ii) National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP);
- (iii) Re-settlement and Rehabilitation Policy, 2007;

- (iv) Implementation of Land Acquisition Act, 1894;
- (v) Agrarian Reforms; and
- (vi) Bio-Diesel Programme.

1.3 Since 'Land' is a State subject, Department of Land Resources gives financial support to States for the purpose of watershed development and land development activities in rural areas in the country.

1.4 The Department is administering three Area Development Programmes *viz.* Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) for development of wastelands/degraded lands to check the diminishing productivity and wasteland and loss of natural resources. Based on Parthasarathy Committee recommendations as also based on persistent recommendations of this Committee over the years the three area development programmes have been merged into single programme of 'Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2008, with the intention to achieve optimum use of resources, sustainable outcomes and integrated planning.

1.5 In addition the Department has been administering two schemes of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) for land record purposes. Based on Cabinet decision taken on 21st August, 2008 these two programmes were replaced with National Land Record Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) with the goal of ushering in the system of conclusive titles with title guarantee to replace the current presumptive title system in the country. Besides the Department also implements Externally Aided Projects and is working on Bio-fuel scheme also.

1.6 The Department's budget of Rs. 2405.04 crore during 2009-2010 consists of IWMP (Rs. 1911 crore) and NLRMP (Rs. 400 crore) Externally Aided Projects (Rs. 57 crore) and Bio-fuel Scheme (Rs. 30 crore).

1.7 In the present Report the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the overall analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demands for Grants (2009-2010).

CHAPTER II

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE IN THE THIRTY-SIXTH REPORT UNDER DIRECTION 73A OF THE 'DIRECTIONS BY THE SPEAKER', LOK SABHA.

As per Direction 73A of the 'Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha', the Minister concerned shall make once in six months a Statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of the recommendations contained in the Reports of Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry.

2.2 The Thirty-Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development on Demands for Grants (2008-09) of the Department of Land Resources was presented to Lok Sabha on 17th April, 2008. The Statement with regard to this Report had fallen due on 17th October, 2008. However, the Statement on the said Report was made by Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development in Lok Sabha on 12 December, 2008.

2.3 During the Fourteenth Lok Sabha the Committee on Rural Development had presented five original Reports and five Action-taken Reports on Demands for Grants of the Department of Land Resources. As per Direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker', Lok Sabha, the Minister concerned shall make once in six months, a Statement in the House regarding the status of implementation of recommendations contained in Reports (including those Reports which are on Demands for Grants) of Departmentally Related Standing Committees of Lok Sabha with regard to his Ministry. These Statements have already been laid on the Table of the House.

2.4 When asked to state how the Department reviews implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in their earlier Reports at regular intervals with the States and Union Territories and how the Department deals with the implementation of recommendations categorized as 'interim' in the aforesaid Reports of the Committee, the Ministry in a written note stated as under:—

"The Department holds the recommendations of the Committee in the highest esteem and, therefore, reviews the implementation of

the recommendations of the Committee with all the States/UTs implementing the programme, from time to time.”

2.5 Asked about the fate of implementation of recommendations categorized as ‘interim’ in the aforesaid Report the Department in a written note clarified:—

“The Committee had made 3 recommendations on which final replies were awaited. All of them have now been complied with, as indicated below:

- (a) **The Committee had observed** that per hectare norms of the treatment of wasteland work were revised from Rs. 4000/- per hectare to Rs. 6000/- per hectare *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2000. Various State Governments represented to the Parthasarthy Committee for increase in per hectare cost of wasteland. The Committee also referred to their earlier recommendation (Para 4.30 of 27th Report). Committee recommended that issue of hike in per hectare cost needs to be examined by the Department. **It was informed by the Minister** that the approval of expenditure Finance Committee of Ministry of Finance has been sought in this regard.

The Cabinet has approved the revised cost norms. The revised cost norms are Rs. 12000/- per hectare for the plains and Rs. 15000/- per hectare for the hilly and difficult areas. The cost is to be shared in the ratio of 90:10 between Centre and States.

The new IWMP projects have been sanctioned during the current financial year as per the revised cost norm.

- (b) **The Committee had desired that** the modalities and guidelines of the restructured programme of land records, namely, the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) be furnished to the Committee expeditiously. **The Minister had informed that** the EFC’s clearance for the NLRMP had been obtained and the Cabinet Note had been sent to the Cabinet Secretariat for placing the same before the Cabinet. Thereafter, detailed implementation guidelines for the Programme would be finalized and circulated among all concerned and a copy would be furnished to the Cabinet Secretariat.

The Cabinet approved the NLRMP on 21st August, 2008 and the scheme is already under implementation. Detailed

Guidelines, Technical Manuals, DPR formats and MIS have been prepared and sent to the States/UTs.

- (c) **The Committee had recommended that** ways and means should be found out through technological intervention to achieve the objective of having correct and up to date land records so as to give required security to the owner of the land. The Department should take desired initiatives and inform the Committee accordingly. **The Minister had informed that** approval of the EFC for NLRMP had been obtained and the Cabinet Note had been sent to the Cabinet Secretariat for consideration.

As mentioned above, after the Cabinet's approval, the programme is under implementation. Already, 69 Districts in 20 States/UTs have been provided with Rs. 188.75 crore in 2008-09 and 33 Districts in 7 States with Rs. 135.31 crore during the current financial year for implementing the programme.

2.6 The Committee note that Direction 73 A of the 'Directions by the Speaker' is not being followed in the right spirit. This is evident from the considerable delay in making the Statement by the Minister in the House regarding status of implementation of recommendations contained in Thirty-Sixth Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2008-2009) in respect of the Department of Land Resources. In Committee's opinion the Department has not shown the desired urgency and will to make the Statement within the stipulated period. The Committee desire that in future the Statement under Direction 73A should be made within the prescribed time limit. The Committee are, however, glad to note that their recommendations made in their previous Reports regarding enhancing the per hectare cost norms for wasteland development and finalization of guidelines of the restructured programmes of land record management have found favours from EFC in the Ministry of Finance as well as the Cabinet Secretariat that resulted in finalization of cost norms as also NLRMP.

CHAPTER III

OVERALL ANALYSIS

A. Evolution of Schemes

Initially the Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) was started in 1973-74 to tackle the special problems faced in severe drought affected States. This was followed by launch of Desert Development Programme (DDP) in 1977-78 in both hot deserts areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Haryana and cold deserts areas of J&K and Himachal Pradesh. With a view to accelerate the pace of development of wastelands/degraded lands in the country initially in 1985 National Wasteland Development Board was constituted. Subsequently in 1989-90 came the Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP) for developing wastelands in the county. IWDP is being implemented in Blocks that are not covered under DPAP and DDP programmes. Wastelands has been defined as degraded lands which can be brought under vegetative cover with reasonable efforts that are currently under-utilized and also those lands which are deteriorating for lack of appropriate water and soil management or on account of natural causes. The total extent of wasteland in the country is 55.27 million hectare. The development of waste lands and degraded lands under the programme is expected to promote the generation of employment in the rural areas leading to sustainable development of land and equitable sharing of the benefits.

B. Policy Interventions

3.2 The following are the major policy interventions done for development of degraded/wastelands in the country:—

- In 1994 Hanumantha Rao Committee while appraising the impact of DDAP/DDP suggested common set of operational Guidelines and expenditure norms for all the three area development programmes of IWDP, DDAP and DDP. Accordingly the Guidelines for Watershed Development was framed and enforced from 1st April, 1985.
- In 2001, these 'Common Guidelines' were revised with a view to make these more focused transparent and suitable to local requirement.

- In 2003, these Guidelines were further revised and renamed as Hariyali Guidelines.
- In 2008, these Guidelines further underwent revision in the light of Eleventh Plan emphasis on covering the rain-fed areas in the country through watershed approach. These are called 'Common Guidelines' for Watershed Development, 2008. These have been enforced *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2008.
- With the enforcement of the 'Common Guidelines' 2008 for all watershed projects including IWDP, DPAP and DDP the existing area development programmes of IWDP, DDAP and DDP has been merged in a single programme *viz.* Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). The salient features of IWMP in comparison with the on going programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP are as detailed below:—

S.No.	Contents	Provisions for on-going DDP, IWDP and DPAP	On-going Provisions under IWMP
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Programmes	IWDP, DPAP, DDP	IWMP
2.	Project Area	One micro-watershed (500 ha. average size)	A cluster of micro-watersheds (1000 ha. to 5000 ha.)
3.	Selection of watershed	Project area did not exclude assured irrigation area	Assured irrigation area excluded from project area
4.	Cost per ha.	Rs. 6,000	Rs.12,000 for plains and Rs. 15,000 for difficult and hilly areas
5.	Central Share and State Share	75:25 for DPAP and DDP 92:8 for IWDP	90:10 for IWMP
6.	Project Period	5 years	4 to 7 years
7.	Number of Installments	5 (15%, 30%, 30%, 15%, 10%)	3 (20%, 50%, 30%)
8.	Fund Allocation	Training & comm. 5% Mobi. 5% Admn. 10% Works 85%	Institution & Capacity building 5% Mon. & Eval. 2% Admn. 10% Works & Entry Point Activities 78% Consolidation 5%

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9.	Institutional Support	Weak Institutional arrangements	Dedicated Institutional Structures at Central, State, District, Project and Village level
10.	Role of States	Only advisory and supervisory with no budget support	Sanctioning authority for projects with funding support for monitoring
11.	Planning	No separate component	1% for DPR Preparation with scientific inputs
12.	Monitoring & Evaluation	No separate component Mid-term & final evaluation	2% of project cost. Evaluation after every phase of the project will be done and release of installment is based on the satisfactory report of the evaluation.
13.	Sustainability	Weak mechanism with WDF as a tool	Consolidation Phase with WDF and livelihood component as a tool
14.	Livelihood	Not included	Included as a component

3.3 The Committee are also dismayed to learn that wastelands in the country as on today is as high as 55.27 million hectare in spite of implementation of three area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP over the last twenty years. The Committee, therefore, doubt the utility of these programmes as the achievements have not been on expected lines over the years. The Committee recall that in the previous Thirty-sixth Report para 3.34 the Committee had underlined the need for monitoring of different projects under IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In view of the above the Committee recommend that the ongoing schemes be implemented in a more focused manner so that something tangible is discernible at ground level.

3.4 The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made. They are dismayed to note that too many policy interventions on wasteland development have been made from time to time. For instance, consequent upon Hanumantha Rao Committee recommendations in 1994 the three area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP were implemented on watershed basis; accordingly, the guidelines were framed on watershed basis. In 2001 and 2003 these guidelines were further revised for making them more focused. Finally in 2008 the Department of Land Resources have come out with 'Common Guidelines' based on the recommendations of

Parthasarthy Committee Report. In Committee's view such frequent changes in policy for wasteland development may be one of the reasons for slow progress in this area. The Committee also feel that frequent changes not only lead to confusion among project implementing agencies (PIAs) about implementation of the programmes but also do not project a clear and true picture about the programmes among the beneficiaries and public at large. The Committee, therefore, desire that PIAs should be properly educated in different States so that the on going projects are completed in time. The Committee would also like that all the corrective action should be taken so as to achieve the indicated objectives under the aforesaid schemes and also to ensure cent percent utilization under different schemes along with achieving the physical target.

C. General Analysis

3.5 The Demands for Grants (2009-2010) of the Department of Land Resources laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 10th July, 2009 have made a provision of Rs. 2405.04 crore with Plan component of Rs. 2400 crore and non-Plan component of Rs. 5.58 crore. This is almost equal to the budget estimate of the previous year (2008-2009). The Scheme-wise allocations are at *Appendix I*.

FIVE YEAR PLANS

Allocation *vis-à-vis* utilization during 10th Plan (2002-2007) and so far during 11th Plan (2007-2012)

3.6 The following are the proposed outlay, agreed outlay, actual expenditure during 10th Plan and so far during 11th Plan relating to the Department of Land Resources is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Outlay	10th Plan (2002-2007)	11th Plan (2007-2012)
Proposed	5965	16,420
Agreed	6526	17,205.49
Actual Expenditure	5701.50 (upto 31.3.2007)	4337.37 (as on 31.10.09)

(i) Utilisation of funds during 10th Plan:

Allocation *vis-à-vis* utilization

3.7 During the course of examination it came out that during the 10th Plan as against the allocation of Rs. 6526 crore, the expenditure was Rs. 5509 crore.

3.8 On being asked about the reasons for under-utilization during 10th Plan period the Department clarified:—

“During the 10th plan, Rs. 1000 crore was marked for new initiatives for Wasteland Development schemes. However, no new schemes were taken up during the 10th Plan resulting in the short fall in expenditure of Rs. 824.50 crore.”

(ii) Proposed and Agreed Outlays during 11th Plan (2007-2012):

3.9 As against the proposed outlay of Rs. 16,420 crore of the Department for 11th Plan the agreed outlay was Rs. 11,600 crore. On being asked about the programme-wise requirement for demanding Rs. 16, 420 crore, the Department in a written note furnished the following details:—

“The programme-wise requirement proposed for 11th plan is as below:

S.No.	Scheme	XI Plan (2007-12) proposed (Rs. in crore)
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	4280.00
2.	Desert Development programme	2140.00
3.	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	5280.00
4.	Integrated Watershed Management Programme	
5.	Total Watershed Programme	11700.00
6.	Computerization of Land Records	The provisions for these schemes indicated against the scheme NPCLRM
7.	SRA & ULR	
8.	Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR)	
9.	Externally Aided Projects (EAP)	176.34
10.	Technology Development, Extension & Training Scheme (TDET)	110.00
11.	Investment Promotional Scheme	16.50
12.	Appraisal, Monitoring & Evaluation	
13.	Communication	
	New initiatives	
14.	Bio fuels	1304.00
15.	National Programme Land Resource Management (NPLRM)	3104.00
16.	Professional Support, Capacity building, M&E, IEC, TDET, etc.	10.00
17.	Implementation of Monitoring of National Rehabilitation Policy	
	Total PLAN	16420.84”

3.10 The Committee wanted to know as to how the Department's projections during 11th Plan period are going to be affected by getting Rs. 11,600 crore only, the Department clarified:—

“The Department's 11th plan provision has been kept at Rs. 17205.49 crore. For the NLRMP, there is likelihood of a shortfall for which the Planning Commission is being requested to make additional allocation.”

(iii) Utilisation during 11th Plan (2007-2012):

3.11 It came out during the course of examination that during 11th Plan as against the allocation of Rs. 11,600 crore, an expenditure of Rs. 3196.81 crore has been made so far during the first two years of the Plan. For optimal utilization of outlay of Rs. 2320 crore should have been utilized by the Department annually. The Committee pointed out that a huge outlay of Rs. 8403.19 crore now remains to be utilized during the remaining three years of the Plan period.

3.12 On being asked as to how the Department plans to utilise the allocations, the Department in a written note informed the actual expenditure as on 31.10.2009 is now Rs. 4337.37 crore.

3.13 It also came out during the course of examination that for IWMP, it has set out a target of covering 25 million hectare of area in the country during the current Plan period (2007-2012). Whereas in respect of another Programme of NLRMP, the Department proposed to complete the task of land record modernization in the country by the end of 12th Plan (2012-2017). The Committee pointed out that the two major programmes of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) and NLRMP which received main budget of the Department had been created recently by merger of earlier programmes and the third programme of Bio Fuel is yet to be cleared by the Cabinet. The Committee wanted to know as to how the Department plans to grapple with the phenomenal task set forth above for each programme with a limited budget of Rs. 2400 crore, the Department in a written note clarified:—

“For IWMP, the Department had set out a target of covering 25 million ha. of area in the country during the current Plan period (2007-2012). However, the Cabinet approval for the IWMP was accorded on 26.02.2009 and therefore, the programme has been launched from 2009-10 onwards. The target for covering the area under IWMP in the remaining 11th Plan period has been revised

to 22.65 million ha. The strategy showing quantum of funds required for new projects under IWMP and meeting the committed liabilities of ongoing projects during each year of the remaining Plan period has been worked as below:—

Year	Physical target (million ha.)	Funds required (Rs. in crore)					Total
		For new IWMP projects	For ongoing IWMP projects	For ongoing pre-IWMP projects	For institutional structures	For other schemes	
2009-10	5.41	704	0	1111.00	71	25	1911.00
2010-11	8.50	1572	1228	2054.56	115	25	4994.56
2011-12	8.74	1616	3763	1272.25	121	25	6797.25
Total	22.65	3892	4991	4278.2	307	75	13702.81

3.14 About utilization of Plan allocation under NLRMP, the Department has further clarified as under:—

“Under the NLRMP, the 11th Plan allocation is only Rs. 581.00 crore, against which Rs. 188.76 crore has already been released during 2008-09 and Rs. 400 crore has been allocated for 2009-10. Thus, no plan allocation will remain available with the Department beyond the current financial year for the NLRMP. However, in view of this situation, the Planning Commission is being requested to increase the 11th Plan allocation for the NLRMP.”

3.15 In this connection the Committee wanted to know whether the issue of higher allocations for Eleventh Plan period was taken up by different Working Groups of the Planning Commission, the Department in their written note clarified as under:—

“Based on the Parthasarathy Committee recommendations, the Department submitted the proposal for 11th Plan to the Planning Commission. It is expected that Planning Commission has taken these recommendations into consideration while fixing up the allocation which have increased from Rs. 4400 crore in 10th Plan to Rs. 15359 crore during 11th Plan.”

3.16 The Committee are glad to find that the Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) outlay of Rs. 17205.49 crore available to Department of Land Resources is almost three times the Plan allocations of Rs. 6526 crore

during Tenth Plan (2002-2007). The Committee find that enhanced allocation is mainly for on going watershed programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP and projects under new programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) and also for new programmes *viz.* National Land Record Management Programme (NLRMP), Bio Fuel etc. The Committee are unhappy to find that as against the huge allocations of the order of Rs. 17,205.49 crore for Eleventh Plan Period, the expenditure up to 30.10.2009 *i.e.* by the mid of the Eleventh Plan is only Rs. 4337.37 crore representing 30 per cent of the total allocations. They are also distressed to learn that the Department has lowered the Plan targets for watershed development from original level of 25 million hectares to 22.65 million hectares for the remaining period of the current Plan. Such reduction in targets during the remaining part of the Eleventh Plan was not at all desirable keeping in view the monumental task assigned to the Department of Land Resources by the Parthasarthy Committee that envisages covering a total of 75 million hectares of rain-fed area in the country in fifteen years time at the rate of covering 25 million hectare in every five Year Plan from Eleventh Plan onwards with a huge expenditure of Rs. 150,000 crore. The Committee desire a clarification from Department in this regard. Even though the Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) has been launched in 2009-2010 itself, the Committee wish to point out that this is only a merger of the three programmes earlier being implemented by the Department *viz.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In view of this the reduction in physical targets is completely unjustified particularly when huge funds out of the Eleventh Plan allocations are still left with the Department.

3.17 About NLRMP, the Committee feel that there could not be a case of worse planning than in this case. It is surprising to find that against the Eleventh Plan allocation of Rs. 581 crore, after release of Rs. 188.76 crore during previous year *i.e.* 2008-2009 and Rs. 400 crore as allocation for current year, the Department does not have any allocations available for remaining two years of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee have been informed that the Planning Commission is now being requested in this regard for necessary funds. About Bio-fuel Programme the Committee find the Programme is still awaiting clearance. In Committee's opinion all these developments of reduction in targets under IWMP, lack of funds for NLRMP and uncertainty over bio-fuel do not speak well about the over all functioning of the Department, particularly, when the utilization of Plan funds is only 30 per cent so far. This definitely calls for renewed efforts to be made

on the part of the Department in all these areas in order to fully utilise the allocation of the order of Rs. 17,205.49 crore for Eleventh Plan Period. The Committee, therefore, recommend that concerted efforts should be made in these areas so as to utilise full outlay during remaining two years of the current Plan. The Committee also strongly recommend that adequate allocation should be provided to NLRMP and the Department should make every effort to ensure that it is meaningfully utilized.

(iv) Annual Plans (2007-2008 and 2008-2009)

Allocation *vis-à-vis* utilization

3.18 The BE, RE and Actuals of the Department during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 and BE during 2009-2010 are as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Actuals
2007-2008	1500	1400	1403.86
2008-2009	2400	1800	1793.18
2009-2010	2400		

3.19 The Committee pointed out that there had been reduction at RE stage during 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 of the order of Rs. 100 crore and Rs. 600 crore respectively. The Committee wanted to know the reasons therefor. The Department explaining the reasons for 2007-2008 informed as under:—

“The reduction of Rs. 100 crore from the BE (Rs.1500 crore) to RE (Rs.1400 crore) during 2007-08 was done in the following programmes/schemes:

Professional Support	Rs. 61.00 crore
Externally Aided Projects	Rs. 35.00 crore
Others	Rs. 4.00 crore
Total	Rs. 100.00 crore

The ‘Professional Support’ being a new area of the Department, there was a slow expenditure during 2007-08. In Externally Aided Projects, the saving was due to non-receipt of proposals from the States.”

3.20 For lowering the estimates at RE stage during 2008-2009 the Department has given the following reasons:—

“During 2008-09, there was a reduction of Rs. 600.00 crore from BE (Rs. 2400 crore) to RE (Rs. 1800 crore) in the following programmes/schemes:

IWMP	Rs. 280 crore
NLRMP	Rs. 270.10 crore
Bio Fuels	Rs. 49.90 crore
Total	Rs. 600.00 crore

During 2008-09, the Department decided to give priority for completion of ongoing projects. Accordingly a major part of the budget was kept for completion of ongoing projects. An amount of Rs. 328 crore (18%) was kept for sanctioning of new projects under IWMP. But the Cabinet approval for this programme was given very late in the Financial Year *i.e.* on 26.02.09. By that time the Department's budget has been substantially reduced at RE Stage from Rs. 1825 crore to Rs. 1545 crores and the Revised Budget of the programme was exhausted under ongoing projects.”

3.21 Asked about the tentative Revised Estimates during 2009-2010 the Department in a written note clarified:—

“Under IWMP, a budget provision of Rs. 1968 crore including Rs. 57 crore of Externally Aided Projects have been provided for 2009-10. Against this allocation, an amount of Rs. 1003.98 crore has been released to States as on 31.10.2009. Hence, for IWMP the Revised Estimates are likely to remain the same as the Budget Estimates.

Under the NLRMP, at the present time, the RE is the same as the BE for 2009-10. However, the BE of Rs. 400 crore includes earmarked allocation of Rs. 150 crore made by the Planning Commission for last mile connectivity of tehsils and modern record rooms at tehsil level. The present NLRMP scheme envisages implementation of the programme in only those districts which have been selected by the States/UTs and for which funds have been sanctioned by the Central Govt., while releasing this earmarked amount would require a change in the pattern of implementation of the scheme from district-wise to State/UT-wise.

So far, under the NLRMP, Rs. 135.32 crore has been released during 2009-10, out of the BE of Rs. 400 crore.

Rs. 30 crore budgeted for the Bio-diesel Programme is likely to remain unutilized.”

3.22 The Committee are constrained to note that there has been reduction of Plan funds at revised estimate stage during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 to the extent on Rs. 100 crore and Rs. 600 crore respectively. Various reasons like slow expenditure on the schemes of ‘Professional Support’ and non-receipt of proposals from the States for ‘Externally Aided Projects’ during 2007-2008 and delay in Cabinet clearance for IWMP during 2008-2009 have been given as reasons for such reduction at RE stage. The Committee feel that these reasons were well within the control of the Department. In their view, had the Department taken sufficient caution, huge aforesaid reduction in Plan Budget during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 could have been avoided.

3.23 The Committee note that for IWMP against the outlay of Rs. 1968 crore during 2009-2010, the releases so far are Rs. 1003.98 crore, whereas for NLRMP against the outlay of Rs. 400 crore the releases are Rs. 135.52 crore only. The Committee are constrained to learn that Rs. 30 crore for bio-fuel may go unutilized. The Committee recommend that the Department should strive hard to increase pace of releases in the remaining half of the current year particularly in respect of NLRMP to ensure full utilization of funds. Besides, it should also be ensured that the funds utilized lead to achievement of corresponding physical targets. Besides, the Committee also recommend that the Department should make all out efforts for obtaining clearance for the bio-fuel programme from the Group of Ministers for its finalization after taking into account necessary impact assessment study of plantation work already done on Jatropha, so that Rs. 30 crore earmarked for this programme does not go unutilized.

CHAPTER IV

MAJOR ISSUES

A. Extent of Wasteland/degraded land in the country

With regard to extent of wasteland/degraded land in the country, the Department has informed that two wastelands atlas have been brought out one in 2000 and another in 2005 by National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad. Explaining further details in this regard, the Department has given the following information:

“The scientific study using satellite imageries for identifying the extent of wastelands in the country was first time carried out by the Department of Land Resources, in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad and published as the Wasteland Atlas of India, 2000. According to this Atlas, the extent of wasteland in the country is estimated at 63.85 million hectares.....”

Asked about the work done so far, the Department has clarified:—

“The Department of Land Resources, in collaboration with NRSA, Hyderabad, brought out the Wasteland Atlas of India, 2005. According to this Atlas, the extent of wasteland in the country is estimates to be 55.26 million hectares.”

The category-wise and State-wise details are at *Appendix-II*.”

4.2 Asked about the workdone so far and the extent of wasteland in the country, the Secretary Department of Land Resources clarified:

“We have got an atlas prepared by NRSA from the satellite. The first atlas was prepared in the year 2000. We had 63.85 million hectares of wastelands in the country and they classified various types of wastelands. Then, we got another atlas prepared in 2005. By then, the wastelands had declined to 55.27 million hectares.”

4.3 Explaining further the witness stated:—

“We have again requested them to make another atlas because they could not tell us the details of 8.58 million hectares..... So, this year, they would let us know what is the land use of the area that has declined. We have been writing repeatedly to the State Governments. They themselves are unable to tell us exactly how they have utilized this wasteland. So, the MIS that we have made for IWMP, we have put one item as to how much of actual wasteland they have brought under cultivation. There is no database as of today as to what exactly has happened to each hectare of that wasteland.”

4.4 In reply to a post evidence query about workdone in this regard the Department informed as under:—

“The data available for wastelands in the country, as per the Report of the Technical Committee on Watershed Programmes in India chaired by Shri S. Parthasarthy is as follows:—

Estimates of degraded land in India needing watershed treatment (million ha).

1.	National Commission on Agriculture (1976)	175	(secondary data)
2.	Ministry of Agriculture, Gol (1985)	174	Land degradation Statistics of States
3.	National Bureau of Soil Survey & Land Use Planning, Nagpur (1994)	188	Mapping on 1 : 4.4 million scale
4.	Ministry of Agriculture, Gol (1994)	107	Land degradation Statistics of States
5.	National Remote Sensing Agency (2000)	64	Mapping on 1 : 50000 scale

Source: Planning Commission 2004.

4.5 About actual workdone on wasteland development, the Department clarified in a post evidence reply:—

“The Department of Land Resources as a separate department was created in 1999. Till the new Department was created, 8403 watershed projects were sanctioned upto 1998-99 at a total cost of Rs. 2105.93 crores, covering an area of 5.26 M.Ha under the area development programmes. An amount of Rs. 815.67 crores was released for these projects upto 1998-99.

During the last ten years, *i.e.*, from 1999 to 2008-09, 36659 watershed projects were sanctioned at a total cost of Rs. 15813.07 crores, covering an area of 27.05 M.Ha. An amount of Rs. 8438.03 crores has been released upto 31.03.2009 for these projects.

Therefore, for all the watershed projects sanctioned by the Department of Land Resources, funds to the tune of Rs. 9253.7 crores had been released against the Central share of Rs. 14299 crores, as on 31.3.2009.

From 1.4.2009, Rs. 673.27 crores for pre-IWMP projects and Rs. 287.51 crores for projects under IWMP including Institutional Support, respectively, have been released.”

4.6 The Committee are constrained to note that there is no updated data about wastelands in the country. The Committee are also anguished to note that whatever data that has been relied upon by the Department of Land Resources is based on Wastelands Atlas of India brought out by the Department of Land Resources in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad dating back to 2005, *i.e.* four years old. The Secretary, Land Resources candidly admitted before the Committee that in spite of repeated requests to different State Governments, the States are unable to inform the Department about exact area of wasteland utilized by them. The Department has also furnished varying data of wastelands as referred to in Parthasarthy Committee Report. The Committee feel that these data also do not serve the purpose of getting accurate area of wastelands in the country. According to, the Secretary, Land Resources, NRSA, Hyderabad has been asked to bring out another Atlas of Wasteland showing updated position. The Committee are dismayed to note that in the age of satellite imagery, the country is bereft of the basic data of wasteland in the country. The Committee, wonder how in the absence of basic data the ambitious programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme can be implemented in a result oriented manner in the country in the coming years. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should take up the matter of bringing out the updated wasteland Atlas urgently with NRSA, Hyderabad. At the same time States should be asked to report the utilization of wastelands in their respective States. The Committee also recommend in the wasteland Atlas there should be clear data regarding wastelands as also those under rainfed area in order to have a clear picture in the matter. The concrete action in this regard should be communicated to the Committee.

B. Investment made and workdone

4.7 In order to accelerate the pace of development of wastelands/ degraded lands in the country, the Government had set up National Wasteland Development Board (NWDB) in 1985 under the Ministry of Environment and Forests. Subsequently, in 1999 a separate Department of Land Resources was set up under the Ministry of Rural Development. It came out during the course of examination that actual investment on the area of land development and land record management started flowing in from Seventh Plan (1985-89) onwards. In this connection, the Committee wanted to know the Plan-wise investment made in land resources and land record management from Seventh Plan Period (1985-1989) onwards by the Centre as well as by States in the country, the Department in a written note furnished the following information:—

“The plan-wise investment made in land resources and land record management from Seventh Plan Period (1985-1989) onwards by the Centre as well as by States in the country is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Plan Period management	Investment of land resources and land record	
	Centre	States/UTs
VIIth Plan (1985-1989)	655.93*+17.38@ = 673.31	State share for land development till the Department of Land Resources was created varied among the States depending upon geographical conditions and also between the programmes. From 1999, the two programmes of DPAP and DDP were funded between the Centre and the States at the ratio of 75:25 and IWDP was funded at the ratio of 92:8.
Annual Plan (1989-1990)		
Annual Plan (1990-1991)	158.24*+15.01@ = 173.25	Under the land records management, the State share for SRA&ULR was 50% of the total project cost. CLR was fully funded by the Central Govt.
Annual Plan (1991-1992)	149.50*+7.52@ = 157.02	
VIIIth Plan (1992-1997)	1219.46+157.65@ = 1377.11	
IXth Plan (1997-2002)	2223.79+255.32@ = 2479.11	
Xth Plan (2002-2007)	5236.87+464.63@ = 5701.50	
XIth Plan (2007-2012 (till 31.3.2009))	2708.94+335.94@ = 3044.88	

* The figures include investment made under DPAP and DDP programmes, which were under the Ministry of Rural Development. From 1992 onwards, the programme of IWDP was added on.

@ The figures relate to investment made under land records management.

4.8 The Department in their post evidence replies have informed that actual investment on land resources development is Rs. 12,353 crore since Seventh Plan onwards.

4.9 In this connection, during the course of evidence through a presentation it was brought to the notice of the Committee that as a result of watershed programmes, an increase of the order of the 50 per cent in rural income, 35 per cent increase in productivity, creation of 154 days of employment per hectare and above all 3.2 metre increase in water level has been achieved.

4.10 The Committee enquired as to what extent these figures are realistic and whether they were based on some reliable studies. The Committee wanted to know the details about wasteland in the country and how it has improved over the years and what was the impact of watershed on agriculture.

4.11 The Secretary, Land Resources submitted during evidence that the study conducted by Tata Institute of Energy Research (TERI) relates to Andhra Pradesh covering IWDP blocks of Chitur, Adilabad, Anantpur, etc. In Bihar DPAP blocks of Jhabua, Jamui, Madhubani etc., have been covered and IWDP Gaya and Nawada have been covered.

4.12 The Committee during the course of oral evidence further desired in what way the watershed development activities undertaken over the years resulted in increase in crop yield, increasing the water table in view of change seen in climate or on patterns of rain, the representative of the Department further elaborated:—

“The study says, on the part of efficiency, Watershed performed well. Wherever it has performed, it has performed well. It is with a mean benefit to cost ratio of two. The benefit to cost ratio is two which indicates that investment in Watershed Programme is economically viable and substantially beneficial. That is what they say. Then, it says, Mean rate of return 27.4 per cent on watershed investment shows marginal efficiency of the project in certain cases. It also says, another important purpose of the Watershed Programme was to generate employment opportunities and through that alleviate rural poverty and reduce disparities among rural households. The mean additional annual employment generation in the watershed on various activities and operations was about 154 person days, which was presented actually from here only.”

4.13 The Committee wanted to know whether the Department actually verified the results of these studies, the Secretary in post evidence reply answered in negative.

4.14 Asked about the details of various studies/evaluation in this area, the Department in a post evidence reply furnished details:

List of Reports available with the Department

By Department of Land Resources:

1. A Comprehensive Assessment of Watershed Programmes in India by International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Hyderabad.
2. Compendium of Impact Assessment Study of the Watershed Development Programme by TERI, New Delhi.
3. Evaluation of Watershed Programmes in the districts of Tonk, Jhalawar, Rajasamand, Ajmer, Jalore, Jaipur, Sirohi, Baran, Sawai Madhopur, Banswara, Dungarpur of Rajasthan by Indira Gandhi Panchayati Raj & Gramin Vikas Sansthan (SIRD), Jaipur, Rajasthan.

By Other Agencies

1. Technical Report—Watershed Development in Madhya Pradesh by Gujarat Institute of Development Research.
2. Watershed Development Programme in Gujarat : A Overview by Development Support Centre (DSC).
3. Transforming Rural Livelihoods in India by the Department for International Development (DFID) for Andhra Pradesh.

4.15 Asked about the details of findings/conclusions drawn from the studies/evaluation, the Department in post evidence reply submitted as under:

“The findings of the survey are:

- Watershed programmes are benefiting rain-fed areas with Benefit : Cost ratio of 2.01
- Internal Rate of Return 27.4%
- Enhancing rural incomes by 58%
- Increasing agricultural productivity by 35% besides protecting the environment
- Employment generation increased by 154 days per ha. per year
- Irrigated area increased by 51.5%

- Cropping intensity increased by 35.5%
- Ground water table improved by 3.2 meters
- Runoff declined by 13%

This study was assigned to ICRISAT by National Watershed Committee headed and chaired by Secretary, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation in the year 2004. This Committee has 26 members from different Departments including Planning Commission and Deptt. of Expenditure as well as 6 representatives from the State Govts. by rotation. As per the decision of this Committee, the study was financed by both Department of Agriculture & Cooperation and Department of Land Resources.”

4.16 According to the above material of ICRISAT micro level case studies were conducted in different agro-eco regions of the country in the State of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka wherein different watersheds falling in various districts were covered.

4.17 Evaluation of watershed was also done by the Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) covering different districts in eight States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka and Kerala.

4.18 The Committee are unhappy to note that the impact of the huge investment of over Rs. 12000 crore made in land resources in the country since Seventh Plan (1985-1989) has not been properly assessed throughout the country for the purpose of ascertaining its return in agriculture inputs, employment etc.

4.19 In this connection, the Committee have been informed by the Department that various findings of the evaluations/studies like watershed programme undertaken indicate an increase in rural income by 58 per cent, agricultural income by 35 per cent, employment generation by 154 days per hectare per year and improvement in ground water table by 3.2 metres etc. Strangely, the above findings have not been verified by the Department. In the absence of proper verification of data by the Department, the Committee wonder how the Department could rely on these ambitious findings in toto. In their view, these findings may be based on sporadic studies. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department of Land Resources should undertake a comprehensive study at the earliest to ascertain the impact of the huge investment already made in watershed development activities on areas like agriculture, employment, increase in ground water recharge

etc. The concrete action taken should be communicated to the Committee.

C. Review of IWDP, DPAP and DDP projects sanctioned prior to 2007-2008

4.20 Programme-wise number of projects sanctioned, amount sanctioned and releases made during the period 1995-1996 to 2008-2009 has been as under:—

Programme	Number of Projects Sanctioned (*)	Amount sanctioned (Rs. in crore)	Releases made (Rs. in crore)
IWDP	1,877	6067.38	3,468.38
DPAP	27,439	-	3,286.12
DDP	15,746	4487.12	2,499.19

(*) During 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 no new projects were sanctioned.

4.21 During the course of examination the Committee pointed out that there was a big gap between amount sanctioned *vis-à-vis* releases made for IWDP and DDP projects.

4.22 Asked about the reasons for such huge gap in the amount sanctioned and releases made for these projects, the Department of Land Resources in a written note clarified as under:—

“The total projects sanctioned and releases made to IWDP, DPAP and DDP (as on 31.10.09) are as below:

Programme	Number of Projects Sanctioned	Total cost of the project (Rs. in crore)	Total central share (Rs. in crore)	Central share released (Rs. in crore)
IWDP	1,877	6067.38	5411	3734.38
DPAP	27,439	7364.00	5523	3520.92
DDP	15,746	4487.12	3365	2680.91
Total	45,062	17918.50	14299	9936.21

Out of the total Central share of Rs. 14299 crore sanctioned for these projects, Rs. 9936.21 crore (69.5 %) have already been released.

Under the above programmes, the projects are sanctioned with a project period of 5 years and the funds are released in

5 to 7 instalments during the project period. Out of 45062 projects sanctioned since 1995, 15709 no. of projects involving a cost of Rs. 7737.57 crore (Central Share Rs. 6379.27 crore + State Share Rs. 1358.30 crore) were sanctioned from 2004-05 to 2006-07. Most of these projects are within their sanctioned project period and still on-going. The funds for these projects are therefore still required to be released.”

4.23 Asked about the performance of States in this regard, the Department has given the following State-wise figures about projects sanctioned/completed/on-going from 1995-1996 to 2008-2009:—

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Total No. of projects sanctioned	Total No. of projects completed/closed	Total No. of ongoing projects	Amount released (Rs. in cr.)	Amount utilized (Rs. in cr.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	5398	2815	2583	1026.83	922.30
2.	Bihar	608	101	507	70.87	48.66
3.	Chhattisgarh	1230	272	958	265.15	207.53
4.	Goa	4	0	4	1.07	0.3227
5.	Gujarat	5590	1657	3933	945.65	777.34
6.	Haryana	1215	346	869	210.63	177.16
7.	Himachal Pradesh	1027	166	861	283.57	224.59
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	1326	216	1110	181.41	170.54
9.	Jharkhand	1620	263	1357	91.02	65.30
10.	Karnataka	4038	1296	2742	764.45	665.97
11.	Kerala	29	1	28	33.76	25.49
12.	Maharashtra	3700	829	2871	519.63	422.48
13.	Madhya Pradesh	3391	1710	1681	835.15	728.10
14.	Orissa	1408	213	1195	305.50	244.22
15.	Punjab	17	2	15	16.48	12.77
16.	Rajasthan	8775	2934	5841	1648.91	1411.02
17.	Tamil Nadu	1704	774	930	417.66	372.99
18.	Uttar Pradesh	1907	804	1103	607.35	561.38
19.	Uttarakhand	897	118	779	167.90	133.36
20.	West Bengal	588	135	453	57.1	34.73
	Sub-total	44472	14652	29820	8450.09	7206.99

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
North - Eastern States						
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	145	2	143	101.46	79.66
2.	Assam	149	3	146	218.47	202.24
3.	Manipur	43	2	41	65.05	NA
4.	Meghalaya	112	0	112	44.18	NA
5.	Mizoram	52	0	52	114.34	93.04
6.	Nagaland	42	24	18	191.22	188.78
7.	Sikkim	25	4	21	29.17	NA
8.	Tripura	22	0	22	15.83	14.00
	Total of NE	590	35	555	779.72	716.12
	Total	45062	14687	30375*	9242.3	7935.63

* Out of 30375 ongoing projects by the end of 2008-09, 2230 no. of projects have been completed during 2009-10 (as on 31.10.09).

4.24 On being asked about the completion of different on-going projects and the details of amount sanctioned/released and likely funds needed for their completion, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“The Department has been pressing upon the State Governments the urgency to complete ongoing projects within the next 2 to 3 years at every Review Meeting. Up to 2008-09, Rs. 9242.33 crore have been released. The likely funds required for completion of these projects is Rs. 4933.93 crore.”

4.25 The Committee pointed out that in the Outcome Budget, it has been stated that the timely completion of projects under three Area Development Programmes including projects as pointed out by the Committee have been the cause of concern of the Department. The Committee also pointed out that for this, the Department has stated that it has revamped the monitoring mechanism which has the following features:—

- (i) Mandatory mid-term evaluation of the projects by an independent evaluator after release of 45 per cent of project cost.
- (ii) For effective monitoring mechanism and performance grading of projects, the Department has taken more

initiative to monitor performance at the three stages as given below:—

- (a) Preparatory stage;
 - (b) Implementing /execution stage and ;
 - (c) Completion stage.
- (iii) State Rural Development Departments have also been involved in the matter.

4.26 On being enquired about the details of mid-term evaluation of various projects under IWDP, DPAP and DDP undertaken during the previous years, the Department of Land Resources stated as under:—

“The scheme-wise no. of mid-term evaluations of the projects under IWDP, DPAP and DDP during the previous years is given as below:—

S.No.	Name of the State	No. of projects in which mid term evaluations have been carried out		
		IWDP	DPAP	DDP
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	81	3547	906
2.	Bihar	1	65	
3.	Chhattisgarh	37	694	
4.	Goa	0		
5.	Gujarat	56	1728	3497
6.	Haryana	10		743
7.	Himachal Pradesh	43	278	479
8.	J&K	8	32	421
9.	Jharkhand	3	104	
10.	Karnataka	68	1790	1265
11.	Kerala	3		
12.	Madhya Pradesh	110	2822	
13.	Maharashtra	37	2259	
14.	Orissa	45	871	
15.	Punjab	8		
16.	Rajasthan	87	932	5832
17.	Tamil Nadu	65	1491	

1	2	3	4	5
18.	Uttar Pradesh	114	1706	
19.	Uttarakhand	25	343	
20.	West Bengal	4	127	
NE States				
21.	Arunachal Pradesh	33		
22.	Assam	37		
23.	Manipur	13		
24.	Mizoram	28		
25.	Meghalaya	14		
26.	Nagaland	42		
27.	Sikkim	10		
28.	Tripura	2		
	Total	984	18789	13143

4.27 Asked about any tangible results achieved as a result of such mid-term evaluation the Committee also wanted to know whether bench marking of projects as poor, good etc. based on the performance of the projects has brought out any discernable improvement in the evaluated projects. The Department of Land Resources in this context clarified as under:—

“The evaluator assesses the overall performance of the project as Poor, Satisfactory, Good, Very Good & Excellent. Based on the performance of the project, the evaluator also gives recommendations in the interest of the project. The recommendations of the evaluator are implemented by the PIA and an Action Taken Report is submitted to the Government. The release of next installment is made only after compliance of the recommendations of the evaluator. Thus, the quality of performance of each project has benefitted from the mid-term evaluations. So far, performance grading has not been computerized in the Department. However, for IWMP, the same will be computerized.”

4.28 The Committee are constrained to note that during the last fifteen years i.e. from 1995-1996 to 2008-2009 out of the total of 45,062 projects sanctioned in IWDP, DPAP and DDP projects involving a cost of around Rs. 17,918 crore with Central share of Rs. 14,299 crore the

actual releases have been only around Rs. 9936 crore. The Committee are not convinced with the reasons advanced for the lower releases that under the above programmes projects are sanctioned for a period of 5 years and funds are spread over 5 to 7 installments. The Committee are also constrained to note that out of the 45,062 projects sanctioned, only 14,687 have been completed which is less than one-third of total projects sanctioned. Remaining projects have been shown as on-going. The Department is stated to have been impressing upon the State Governments at the review meetings the urgency to complete ongoing projects in 2-3 years time. Yet the Committee feel that the completion of projects of as low as one-third of the total projects sanctioned indicates that necessary urgency for completion of projects as claimed by the Department is not realized at ground level in different States.

4.29 In this connection, the Committee have been impressing upon for proper monitoring of projects in their previous Reports presented to the Parliament from time to time. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that concerted and persistent efforts should be made not only by the Department of Land Resources but also by all the authorities/agencies involved in execution of these projects.

4.30 The Committee after going through the State-wise figures of projects sanctioned *vis-à-vis* projects completed find that the major States where large number of sanctioned projects are awaiting completion are Rajasthan, Gujarat, Karnataka etc. In Rajasthan out of 8,775 projects sanctioned only 2,934 projects have been completed, in Gujarat out of 5,590 projects sanctioned only 1,657 have been completed and in Karnataka out of 4,038 projects sanctioned only 1,296 have been completed. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the bottlenecks if any, in the completion of projects in such States should be removed and concrete efforts be made for expeditious completion of pending projects.

4.31 After examining the details of mid-term evaluation done in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP projects, the Committee are constrained to note that such evaluation was done in respect of only a few projects. For instance, in IWDP only 984 projects, in DPAP only 18789 projects and in DDP only 13143 projects were evaluated in the aforesaid mid-term evaluation. The Committee, therefore, desire that all the on-going projects in all the three programmes be evaluated in order to ensure their early completion.

D. Unspent Balances

4.32 The Programme-wise unspent balances of funds as on 31.03.2009 in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP is as under:—

Programme	Unspent balances (Rs. in crore)
I. IWDP	471.67
II. DPAP	444.45
III. DDP	390.59

4.33 From the statement of State-wise unspent balance given in the Outcome Budget, it is seen that the unspent balance in respect of major States are as detailed below:—

S.No.	Name of the State	Unspent Balances (Rs. in crore)		
		IWDP	DDAP	DDP
1.	Madhya Pradesh	57.78	53.272	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	42.69	37.113	24.73
3.	Himachal Pradesh	31.10	15.617	12.26
4.	Gujarat	30.38	48.201	89.73
5.	Karnataka	30.86	37.728	29.89
6.	Maharashtra	28.29	68.864	-
7.	Chhattisgarh	26.24	31.378	-
8.	Orissa	24.29	36.987	-
9.	Uttar Pradesh	23.52	22.454	-
10.	Uttaranchal	22.04	12.502	-

4.34 Asked about the reasons for huge unspent balances in each of these programmes in big States like Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh etc., the Department of Land Resources in a written note informed:—

“The big States like Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh have a large number of ongoing projects. And so they receive high central share of funds. Under the Guidelines, a project is entitled to claim next installment even when up to 50 % of the previous amount released is unutilized, so that the project does not suffer for want of funds. Therefore, the unspent balance for the project is completely eliminated only on completion of the project.”

4.35 The Committee are constrained to note that even after the persistent recommendations by the Committee, there have been huge amounts lying unspent in all the three Area Development Programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In this connection, the Committee are constrained to note that Rs. 471.67 crore in IWDP Rs. 444.45 crore in DPAP and Rs. 390.59 crore in DDP have been lying as unspent as on 31.3.2009. The Committee have been informed that under the guidelines, it is provided that a project is entitled to claim next installment even if upto 50 per cent of previous amount released is unutilized. It is for this reason that there are large amount of unspent balances in Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka etc. In view of the above, the Committee feel that in order to ascertain the exact position State-wise, a study be conducted in different on-going projects in order to ascertain whether this is the only reason for the funds remaining unutilized or there are other reasons like complacency on the part of the implementing authorities.

E. Outstanding Utilisation Certificates (UCs)

4.36 The Outcome Budget of the Department of Land Resources indicates programme-wise total utilization certificates outstanding as on 31.03.2009 together with amount involved as under:—

Sl. No.	Programme	Total no. of UCs Outstanding	Total amount involved (Rs. in crore)
(i)	IWDP	156	83.39
(ii)	DDAP	107	50.11
(iii)	DDP	6	.80
(iv)	Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)	31	196.70
(v)	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records (SRA&ULR)	31	89.00

4.37 The Committee wanted to know the details about pendency of the UCs alongwith their year-wise details, the Department of Land Resources gave the following information:—

“Out of 269 outstanding UCs of watershed programmes mentioned above, 60 no. of UCs involving Rs. 38.13 crore have been liquidated

as on 31.10.2009. The year-wise details of the remaining outstanding utilisation certificates is as given below:—

Year	IWDP (NNE)		IWDP (NE)		DPAP		DDP		Total	
	Nos. of UCs	Amount (Rs. in crore)	Nos. of UCs	Amount (Rs. in crore)	Nos. of UCs	Amount (Rs. in crore)	Nos. of UCs	Amount (Rs. in crore)	Nos. of UCs	Amount (Rs. in crore)
2000-01	0	0			1	0.20			1	0.2
2001-02	0	0			6	2.19			6	2.19
2002-03	0	0			5	2.40			5	2.4
2003-04	0	0	3	1.43	6	1.79			9	3.22
2004-05	2	1.48	2	0.65	7	4.52			11	6.65
2005-06	4	1.48	6	2.64	9	4.17			19	8.29
2006-07	19	9.54	28	14.82	17	10.19			64	34.55
2007-08	24	11.09	42	20.44	26	10.05	2	2.09	94	43.67
Total	49	23.59	81	39.98	77	35.51	2	2.09	209	101.17

CLR and SRA&ULR

“The utilization certificates pending under the CLR and the SRA&ULR are in respect of funds released upto 2007-08.

As the programmes were ongoing, further funds were being released to the States/UTs after utilization of more than 50% of funds released during previous years. Accordingly, funds remained unutilized with the States/UTs at the end of each financial year.”

The pending utilization certificates (UCs) indicated in the Outcome Budget as on 31.3.2009 did not include the funds released under the schemes of CLR and SRA&ULR during 2007-08. Presently, UCs in respect of Rs. 159.77 crore and Rs. 183.97 crore are pending under the schemes of CLR and SRA&ULR, respectively. Since these schemes have been merged with the NLRMP, the States/UTs have been requested to utilize the unspent balances during the current financial year and to submit UCs, so that the accounts are finally settled on 31.3.2010. The matter is also proposed to be reviewed during the Regional Review meetings scheduled during 5th to 26th November, 2009.”

4.38 The Committee wish to point out that like unspent balances, the issue of outstanding Utilisation Certificates (UCs) have been

continuously pursued by the Committee for necessary liquidation. Even after that the Committee find that large number of UCs involving crores of rupees are visible in this year's budget also. For instance, as many as 156 UCs in IWDP, 107 UCs in DPAP and 31 UCs each in CLR and SRA & ULR are lying outstanding as on 31.3.2009. Out of 269 outstanding UCs relating to watershed programmes, 60 UCs involving Rs. 38.13 crore are stated to have been liquidated as on 31.10.2009. The Committee recall that last year the figures of UCs in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP were 153, 115 and 24 respectively. The Committee are anguished to find that desired progress on this issue has not been discernible.

4.39 About liquidating outstanding UCs in CLRs and SRA & ULR, the Committee have been informed that as high as Rs. 159.77 crore in CLRs and Rs. 183.97 crore in SRAs and ULRs are presently lying unspent and States have been directed to submit UCs for their settlement by 31.03.2010 and the matter was to be reviewed on 5th and 26th November, 2009. The Committee would like to be informed about the outcome of these meetings. The Committee feel that although efforts have been made in this regard by the Department, yet the Committee apprehend that the desired results may not be achieved as was experienced during previous year. The Committee fail to understand why the State Governments are not submitting utilization certificates in time. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should pursue with the State Governments in this regard.

F. Progress on Bio-Diesel Programme

4.40 About Bio-Diesel Programme the Department in its brief note has informed that way back in April 2003, a Committee was set up by the Planning Commission which recommended for (a) setting up of a National Mission on Bio-Diesel; and (b) implementing the Programme in two phases, a demonstration phase followed by a self sustaining Programme. Planning Commission accorded in principle approval for both activities. On 8th March, 2007 Cabinet referred the matter to Group of Ministers (GoMs) gave it 'in principle' approval subject to certain conditions and modifications. Rs. 50 crore were provided for the Programme during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. For 2009-2010, Rs. 30 crore have been allocated for this Programme.

4.41 The Committee further desired to know as to why one of the most important energy saving Programme on Bio-diesel has been

inordinately delayed by the Government during the last six years. The Department clarified as under:—

“The proposal on demonstration phase of National Mission on Bio-diesel was sent to EFC for approval. EFC approved the proposal on 9.10.2006 and thereafter the proposal was placed before Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) on 8.3.2007. CCEA referred the matter to Group of Ministers (GoM). The GoM met on 16.5.2007, 13.6.2008 and 9.7.2008. Thereafter, Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE) placed the matter before the Cabinet on 1.9.2008 regarding National Policy on Bio-fuels and its implementation and setting up of National Bio-Fuel Coordination Committee and Bio-Fuel Steering Committee as per the recommendation of GoMs. Proposal on Demonstration phase of National Mission on Bio-diesel was not included by MNRE in its note placed before Cabinet as the same was not recommended by GoM.

The Cabinet considered MNRE note dated 1.9.2008 and decided that GoM should meet again to sort out the outstanding issues. GoM in its meeting held on 24.2.2009 approved the proposal on establishing a National Mission on Bio-diesel, in principle, subject to 3 conditions, one of them relates to the prior assessment of the plantation work already undertaken in the country and its positive feedback before initiating demonstration phase.

Now the department is in the process to carry out an Impact Assessment Study of Jatropha/Pongamia plantation in India through an independent agency. Further initiation of the demonstration phase will depend upon the outcome of this assessment study.”

4.42 The Committee also wanted to know whether the Department has taken the advice/opinion of experts before implementing the proposed mission, the Department clarified that:—

“The proposal on demonstration phase of National Bio-diesel mission has been approved by Cabinet with the condition that the prior assessment of the plantation work already undertaken in the country and its positive feedback should be taken into account before initiating demonstration phase. Thus, before implementing the proposed Mission, the impact assessment of existing Jatropha/Pongamia plantations in India by an expert agency will have to be taken into account.”

4.43 The Committee are unhappy to note that prolonged delay in finalization of the Bio-diesel programme for one reason or another

has occurred since the programme was started way back in April, 2003. The Committee also recall that this issue has been constantly pursued in their examination of Demands for Grants in the previous years. It has also figured in their Thirty-sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2007-2008). The Committee have now been informed that the programme has been approved by Group of Ministers at their sitting held on 24 February 2009 in principle, subject to three conditions. One of these relates to prior assessment of plantation work and positive feedback before initiating the demonstration phase. The Committee have also been informed that the Department is in the process of carrying out an Impact Assessment Study of Jatropha and Pongamia plantations in India by an independent agency. The Committee recommend that the Department should complete the above impact assessment study without any loss of time for taking final view on the issue. While recommending for expeditious clearance of National Mission on Bio-diesel, the Committee would like to emphasise that the Jatropha and Pongamia cultivation in the country should be done without affecting the food security and agricultural land of the country.

CHAPTER V

SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS

A. Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)

With effect from 1st April, 2008, the 'Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)' has been enforced under the Common Guidelines.

Aims:— The Programme is aimed at integrated development of wastelands/degraded lands based on village/micro watershed plans. It also aims to restore the ecological balance by harnessing conserving and developing degraded natural resources such as land, vegetative cover and water. The outcomes of the Programme are prevention of soil run off, regeneration of natural vegetation, rain water harvesting and recharging of ground water. The Outcomes seek to enable multi cropping and introduction of agro-based activities which help to provide sustainable livelihoods to the people residing in watershed areas.

5.2 During the course of examination it came out that aims and outcomes of IWMP deal with diverse areas like restoration of ecological balance, conservation of water, recharging of ground water, multi cropping pattern. These fall under Ministry of Environment and Forest, Department of Drinking Water, Department of Agriculture etc. On being asked as to whether the aforesaid Departments/Ministries were also consulted before arriving at the 'Common Guidelines' in order to have a coordinated approach, the Department of Land Resources clarified:—

"The Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008 have been approved by National Rain-fed Area Authority (NRAA) after holding a series of inter-ministerial consultations, at the initiative of the Planning Commission, with concerned Ministries including the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Department of Drinking Water, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, etc. in order to have a co-ordinated approach."

Implementation at Central level

5.3 In this connection the Committee were informed that an Internal Monitoring Cell has been set up in Department and a steering Committee

has been constituted to appraise and review IWMP at Ministry level. The Committee wanted to know whether the Internal Monitoring Cell and Steering Committee have started functioning. The Department of Land Resources clarified:—

“The Steering Committee has been constituted for administering the programme of IWMP. So far, 8 meetings of the Steering Committee have been held and the State Perspective and strategic plans of 18 States have been appraised and cleared by the Steering Committee.

The Cabinet, in its meeting held on 26th February 2009, had approved that for strengthening Internal Monitoring System in the Department of Land Resources, NRAA is to be transferred from the Department of Agriculture & Co-operation to DoLR. Till the NRAA is transferred to DoLR, a Cell may be created in the DoLR by engaging four Technical Experts. The Department received communication dated 16th April 2009 from the Cabinet Secretariat that the transfer of NRAA can be effected by transferring the relevant Business to the Department of Land Resources through an amendment in the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1981 for which a proposal may be moved with the approval of the Minister(s) in-charge of both these Departments. Accordingly, the Department, after obtaining the necessary approvals, submitted a proposal to the Cabinet Secretariat on 18th May 2009 for amendment in the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1981. As no reply was received from the Cabinet Secretariat, a reminder was also sent to the Cabinet Secretariat on 11th August 2009 to intimate the status of transfer of NRAA to the DoLR so that a decision on engagement of four Technical Experts can be taken in the Department. As soon as the response is received from the Cabinet Secretariat, further necessary action will be initiated.”

Implementation at State level

5.4 The Department has taken various measures to monitor the performance of the projects and has involved the State Rural Development Departments, which includes among others, setting up of a dedicated institution at State level *i.e.* State Level Nodal Agency (SLNA) with funding support from the Centre. The power to sanction the projects has been delegated to the States in the new Guidelines. The Department has further

stated that the SLNA will sanction watershed projects for the State on the basis of appraised State Perspective and Strategic Plan and to oversee the watershed projects.

5.5 When the Committee also wanted to know the details of areas covered under IWMP so far, as also any difficulties that are being faced by the Department in implementing aforesaid projects, the Department clarified as under:—

“The projects under IWMP are being sanctioned from the current financial year and as on 31.10.09, projects covering 3.51 million ha have been sanctioned under IWMP. Two States, namely, Bihar and West Bengal, have not yet constituted the State Level Nodal Agency (SLNA) which is the sanctioning body for IWMP projects. Eight States which have formed the SLNA are yet to submit their State Perspective & Strategic Plans in the prescribed formats to DoLR for appraisal and clearance. Further, proposals covering 50,000 ha area for a total project cost of Rs. 75 crore for the State of Uttarakhand have been appraised and cleared by the Steering Committee constituted by DoLR. However, the sanction of these projects from the SLNA is still awaited and the funds could not be released to the State. Some of the States have expressed difficulty in the fund flow mechanism between DRDA and the Project Implementation Agency (PIA). Accordingly matter has been taken up with the National Rain-fed Area Authority for making necessary amendments in the Common Guidelines-2008, so that there is flexibility in releasing funds by the State as per their convenience.”

Projects sanctioned

5.6 The Department has given the following details of the projects sanctioned by SLNAs under IWMP as on 31.10.09 in the States as below:—

Sl. No.	State	No. of projects	Area (ha)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Assam	57	220587
2.	Meghalaya	18	30000
3.	Nagaland	13	59343

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.	Orissa	43	222504
5.	Rajasthan	140	807739
6.	Gujarat	68	330486
7.	Madhya Pradesh	94	546896
8.	Punjab	6	35302
9.	Chhattisgarh	29	151716
10.	Andhra Pradesh	103	445844
11.	Himachal Pradesh	18	91885
12.	Karnataka	75	341990
13.	Tamil Nadu	37	186911
14.	Tripura	10	30283
15.	Sikkim	2	10500
	Total	713	3511986

Awareness about Common Guidelines

5.7 The Committee further pointed out that rural development programmes appear very good on paper. However, these are not implemented in proper way as the implementing agencies generally know very little about such programmes. On being asked about the efforts made by the Department so that implementing agencies at State/District and even at village level are fully and quickly aware about the new Programme and whether the aforesaid 'Common Guidelines' have been made available to implementing Agencies in different States/UT's Administrations to understand the Programme in a better way and enable them to generate proposals as the programme is demand driven. The Department of Land Resources submitted as under:—

“The Common Guidelines 2008 have been put on the website of the Department. The Department prepared an elaborate roll-out plan and circulated the same to all State Governments on 9th April 2008. This roll-out plan explained in very simple terms the sequence of events to be followed by the States in order to

implement IWMP. Thereafter, Regional Review Meetings were held from May-August 2008 at Chennai, Shillong, Dehradun and Udaipur where the Common Guidelines 2008 and the roll-out plan were discussed in detail and the doubts and queries of the States were addressed. The Common Guidelines were also made available in Hindi to the different States to save time in rolling out the IWMP as well as to ensure harmony in the translation. Non-Hindi speaking States further translated the Guidelines in the local language. The Department has also participated in the orientation workshops/meetings on Common Guidelines organized by NRAA and various State Governments. In addition, funds have been released to National level reputed institutes like ICRISAT, NIRD, CRIDA, TERI and IGNOU to enable the stakeholders at various levels to understand the programme in a better way and generate proposals under the programme.”

5.8 The Committee note that Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) being implemented from 1st April, 2008 under ‘Common Guidelines, 2008’ aims to restore the ecological balance by harnessing, conserving and developing degraded natural resources such as soil, vegetative cover and water so as to prevent soil run off, re-generate natural vegetation and for recharging of ground water and for rain water harvesting. The Committee have been informed that keeping in view the aforesaid diverse nature of subjects encompassing the jurisdiction of various Ministries/Departments viz. Agriculture, Drinking Water Supply, Environment etc. the ‘Common Guidelines’ have been approved at the level of National Rain-fed Area Authority (NRAA) under Ministry of Agriculture, in order to have a co-ordinated approach. However, the Committee are constrained to note that implementation mechanism both at Central as also at State level for implementing IWMP is not moving on expected lines.

5.9 In this connection, the Committee note that at Central level at the initial stage itself there is a delay in transfer of NRAA from Department of Agriculture & Cooperation to Department of Land Resources even after Cabinet Secretariat’s nod given in April, 2009. Not only that the decision of the Cabinet taken in February, 2009 regarding engagement of four technical experts in the Department of Land Resources pending transfer of NRAA to this Department has not been implemented. The Committee have been informed that pending the NRAA’s transfer Internal Monitoring Cell and a Steering Committee in the Department have started functioning for necessary appraisal

and clearance of projects under IWMP. However, the Committee are constrained to note that the Steering Committee has met on only eight occasions and appraised State Perspective and Strategic Plans from 18 States only. Thus, the Committee can only conclude that much is desired to be done with regard to implementation of IWMP at Central level. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the issue of transfer of NRAA should be taken up with Cabinet Secretariat seriously so that necessary mechanism is put in place with the Department of Land Resources.

5.10 The Committee also note with constraint that the necessary dedicated institution *viz.* State Level Nodal Agency (SLNA) for sanctioning of watershed projects under IWMP programme has not come up in big States like Bihar and West Bengal as late as October, 2009, particularly when the programme was started in April, 2009.

5.11 The Committee further note with dismay that the eight States which have constituted necessary SLNAs are yet to submit their State Perspective and Strategic Plans to the Department of Land Resources. Likewise, the Committee are surprised to note that in Uttarakhand, proposals worth Rs. 75 crore covering 50,000 hectare of area have been appraised and cleared by the Steering Committee at the Central level but are still awaiting necessary sanction from concerned SLNA. The Committee have also been informed that some States are facing difficulty in flow of funds from DRDAs to Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs). In order to resolve these, the NRAA is being approached for necessary changes in 'Common Guidelines, 2008'. In view of the above, the Committee recommend that a pro-active role on the part of Steering Committee is need of the hour for constitution of SLNAs in Bihar and West Bengal and for obtaining necessary State Perspective and Strategic Plans from the eight States which have constituted SLNAs but have not submitted these to Steering Committee. The Committee would also like to be informed about the States which are yet to submit such plans. The Committee recommend that the Department should take necessary action early on other issues highlighted above for expeditious implementation of IWMP.

5.12 The other important area that has invited the attention of the Committee is the role of multiple agencies of national reputation like ICRISAT, NIRD, TERI, IGNOU etc. for undertaking the work of

awareness about IWMP, generation of proposals under IWMP and for impact assessment of watersheds across the country. In this connection, the Committee feel that combined work of these organizations should be documented at one place at national level showing clearly their roles *vis-à-vis* achievements in their assigned areas. This will help the evaluator to understand the programme in a more holistic manner.

B. National Land Records Modernization Programme:

5.13 The National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) is a modified comprehensive programme approved on 21st August 2008 by merging of land records related programme of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) and Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULRs). The aim of the Programme is to make available updated land records in the country by use of modern methods of survey/re-survey and through computerization etc.

Eleventh Plan Outlay

5.14 Rs.581 crore have been provided for NLRMP during Eleventh Plan Period. The BE, RE and Actuals during 2007-2008 and BE, RE and Releases during 2008-2009 and BE during 2009-2010 are as detailed below:—

(Rs. in crore)

(2007-08)*			(2008-2009)**			2009-2010
BE	RE	Actuals	BE	RE	Releases	BE
145	145	144.96	473	202.90	191.47	400

* Under National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resource Management Programme (NPCLRM)

** National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP)

Implementation

5.15 NLRMP is a time-bound programme which has been aimed to cover the entire country by the end of Twelfth Plan through a ladder like approach envisaging primary ladder for conclusive title and secondary ladder for archival purposes for strengthening of revenue administration.

The Department has given the following details of Primary and Secondary ladders proposed under the programme:—

The Primary & Secondary Ladders proposed under NLRMP

Ladder – Like approach

- Primary ladder – for conclusive titles
- Secondary ladder – for archival purposes and strengthening of revenue administration

Primary Ladder : approach 1

Registration-Computerisation of SROs	Training and strengthening of training institutions
Integration of registration and land records maintenance systems	Strengthening of technical organization
Automatic mutation following registration	Record rooms at registration/tehsil levels
Mutation-updating of pending cases and their computerization	Link up with development process
Integration of textual and spatial data	Legal changes
Survey, including ground control networks and ground truthing	Conclusive titles

Primary Ladder : approach 2

Survey, including ground control networks and ground truthing	Training and strengthening of training institutions
Mutation-updating of pending cases and their computerization	Strengthening of technical organizations
Integration of textual and spatial data	Record rooms at registration/tehsil levels
Registration-Computerization of SROs	Link up with development process
Integration of registration and land records maintenance systems	Legal changes
Automatic mutation following registration	Conclusive titles

Secondary Ladder

- Computerization of existing records
- Scanning of existing survey maps
- Computerization of legacy mutation data
- Record rooms

5.16 The Department further informed that these activities are to be covered in the district which will be unit for implementation. Under the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP), the strategy is to cover the districts in the following manner:—

Year	Districts to be covered		Districts covered
2008-09	1 to 2 districts per State/UT	70	69
2009-10	3 to 4 districts per State/UT	140	33 (as on 31.10.2009)
2010-11	3 to 4 districts per State/UT	140	
2011-12	2 to 3 districts per State/UT	105	
Total		455	102

Rest of the districts will be covered in the 12th Plan period. However, the States/UTs which wish to complete the work earlier would be able to do so and also go for a public-private-partnership (PPP) model in the non-sensitive districts. The allocation of Rs. 400 crore is adequate to cover the target for 2009-10.”

5.17 The Department has informed that NLRMP has been sanctioned in 102 districts in 23 States/UTs.

5.18 The Committee enquired whether the NLRMP districts are capable enough to shoulder the work of the new Programme on ladder approach basis, the Department informed that:

“the NLRMP involves a high degree of capacity building among the Revenue, Survey and Registration staff, which is an ongoing programme. The PPP model has also been permitted under the Programme to assist the States/UTs to achieve their targets within the scheduled period. A combination of Departmental capacity building and outsourcing to skilled private agencies will enable districts to shoulder the work on a ladder-like basis. However, in those districts where the original cadastral survey is to be undertaken may need more time and handholding than the districts where resurveys are being carried out.”

5.19 It also came out during the course of examination that the Programme is to be implemented as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme with various components with following assistance:—

S. No.	Schemes	Centre	States
1.	Comuterisation of Land Records	100%	-
2.	Survey/Re-survey	50%	50%
3.	Computerisation of Registration	25%	75%
4.	Setting up Modern Record Rooms	50%	50%
5.	Training and Capacity Building	100%	-
6.	Core GIS	100%	-

5.20 On being asked whether the 100 per cent Central funds are very much needed for all the components for the success of the Programme, the Department replied in the affirmative.

5.21 The Committee also wanted to know the findings/feedback emerging out of the workshops organized for the purpose, the Department submitted as under:—

“In the review of the Programme with the State/UT officials held on 18-19th August, 2009, the following progress was indicated by the State/UT representatives:—

- Andhra Pradesh – completed tendering
- Bihar – funds being released by the State to the implementing agencies
- Gujarat – work started in Jamnagar, other districts at tendering stage
- Haryana–funds have not been released by the State Government to the implementing department
- Himachal Pradesh – tendering was scheduled for 22.8.2009
- J&K – not reported yet
- Kerala – funds released in last month only
- Maharashtra – tendering process going on

- Madhya Pradesh – tenders floated
- Manipur – work reported to be completed, needs evaluation
- Meghalaya – not reported yet
- Nagaland – work reported to be completed, evaluation request sent to IIT, Guwahati
- Orissa – Budget provision made for State share
- Punjab – work begun in 2 districts
- Sikkim – not reported yet
- Tripura – State Government yet to release the funds to the implementing department
- Uttar Pradesh – funds likely to be released by the State Government to the implementing departments shortly
- West Bengal – work in progress in 10 districts, 9 additional districts sanctioned only last month
- Andaman & Nicobar Islands – work in progress in South Andaman district
- Puducherry – not reported yet

States/UT's which have not taken funds under NLRMP so far: Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Mizoram, Tamil Nadu, Uttarakhand, Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Delhi, and Lakshadweep.

Regional Review meetings have been scheduled between 5th and 26th November, 2009 to appraise further progress made in this regard."

5.22 The Committee note that the Department of Land Resources has come out with a National Land Record Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) for making available updated land records in the country by use of modern methods of survey, re-survey and through computerization etc. The Committee are constrained to note that Eleventh Plan allocation for NLRMP of Rs. 581 crore is hardly commensurate with the work involved. As pointed out by the

Committee in an earlier Chapter, the Department does not have any allocations available from 2010-2011 onwards. The Committee have been informed that Planning Commission is being requested to increase the Eleventh Plan allocation for NLRMP. The Committee are unable to comprehend as to how the Department has conceptualized the funding requirements for the mammoth work of updation and modernization of land records in the country particularly when the funds were only available for the programme in first three years of the current Plan. The Committee feel that this is a very sorry state of affairs and puts a big question mark on overall process of programme-wise preparation of Budget Estimates and also on planning process for Eleventh Plan Period and beyond. The Committee, therefore, desire that a detailed reply about requirements of funds for the programme for the remaining plan period and beyond be furnished to the Committee so as to reach at logical conclusion.

5.23 The Committee are dismayed to note that implementation of the NLRMP so far in the country is also far below the expectations. As against the target of 210 districts as on 31.10.2009, the actual coverage was as low as 102 districts for this programme. The Committee apprehend that with this slow pace the target of covering 455 districts in the country by 2011-12 is unachievable by any stretch of imagination. The Committee, therefore, recommend that all out efforts be made to speed up NLRMP coverage as per targets drawn in this behalf.

5.24 The Committee note that Department has delineated ladder like approach for securing conclusive titles of land records in the country ranging from computerization to automated mutation of property after its registration. The Committee have been informed that as a result of the review of NLRMP held on 18 -19 August, 2009 various revelations have been made available from different States in this regard. These relate to various flaws like delay in release of amount, non-reporting of progress, non-utilisation of funds under NLRMP etc. In view of the serious revelations reflected above, the Committee feel that ladder like approach as also other details may be communicated to these States so as to eliminate the bottlenecks being faced by these States. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a time-bound approach is very necessary for securing the goals of NLRMP during the designated period.

5.25 On the issue of funding pattern for NLRMP for different components like Survey of land, computerization of registrations and

setting up Modern Record Rooms, the Department of Land Resources has informed that these require 100 per cent Central funds like other components of Programme. The Committee recommend that keeping in view the mammoth task, the Department should review the funding pattern in respect of the aforesaid components under intimation to the Committee. The Committee note that the thrust of the Government is on computerization of land records. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that ways and means should be found out through technological intervention to achieve the objective of having correct up-to-date land records so as to give the required security to the owner of the land. The Department should take the desired initiative in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

NEW DELHI;
16 December, 2009

25 Agrahayana, 1931 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN,
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

OUTCOME BUDGET 2009-10, DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES

Financial Requirements Scheme-wise outlays

(Rs. in crore)

S.No.	Name of scheme/programme	Budget Estimates 2009-10
1.	Plan Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP)	1911.00
	(a) Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP)*	
	(b) Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)*	
	(c) Desert Development Programme (DDP)*	
2.	Externally Aided Projects	57.00
3.	National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management (NPCLRM)**	400.00
	(a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)***	
	(b) Strengthening of Revenue Admn. and Upgradation of Land Records (SRA&ULR)***	
	(c) Comprehensive Modernisation of Land Records (CMLR)***	
4.	Professional Support & Other Activities	
5.	Bio-fuel	30.00
6.	R&R policy/others	02.00
	Total Plan	2400.00
	Non-Plan Sectt. Economic-services	5.64
	Grand Total (Plan and non-plan)	2405.64

* The provision for IWDP, DPAP and DDP stands merged with the provision for Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP).

** Renamed as National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) from 2008-09.

The provision for Professional support & Other Activities stands merged with the respective schemes.

*** The Schemes of CLR and SRA&ULR have been merged with the revised scheme of NLRMP.

APPENDIX II
STATE -WISE CATEGORY-WISE WASTELANDS IN INDIA—2003

S.No	STATENAME	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Total WL	TGA	%To TGA	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	174.23	48.06	83.92	15666.32	2241.32	290.71	28.95	161.45	264.85	7.82	1.03	6.24	20097.58	2519.91	8.76	49.11	4.18	0.00	267.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	205.90	3.26	2921.25	234.67	0.00	45267.15	275068	16.48
2.	Andhra Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	2606.04	2608.91	26.81	18.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	496.22	1116.91	0.18	11.58	302.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	749.23	61.28	10178.70	18175.95	83743	21.70
3.	Assam	0.00	0.00	0.00	1780.95	314.11	1201.81	385.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	3495.08	435.89	2489.74	3536.33	0.00	0.00	392.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14034.08	78438	17.89
4.	Bihar	135.53	0.00	0.00	458.75	325.22	647.33	755.88	0.00	0.00	76.20	0.00	0.00	2807.69	51.10	2.62	4.87	15.53	15.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.84	0.18	103.97	32.67	0.00	5443.68	94171	5.78
5.	Chhattisgarh	49.11	1.68	0.00	2812.41	1192.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	69.39	56.38	2820.18	129.36	0.00	4.59	3.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.50	4.91	394.98	12.39	0.00	7584.15	135194	5.61
6.	Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.88	230.54	41.55	10.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	52.01	1.01	0.00	33.42	0.00	0.00	8.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.49	0.00	58.41	4.94	0.00	531.29	3702	14.35
7.	Gujarat	150.52	240.72	0.00	11507.23	4967.40	0.00	99.99	0.00	1411.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	1365.19	193.02	71.84	68.60	0.00	0.00	78.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	55.47	0.00	56.12	111.91	0.00	20377.74	196024	10.40
8.	Haryana	21.96	3.24	0.00	1100.09	61.94	19.64	23.95	11.12	49.55	20.36	0.00	0.00	500.78	8.36	899.39	251.31	4.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	141.57	0.71	53.65	3.23	91.41	0.00	0.00	3266.45	44212	7.39	
9.	Himachal Pradesh	9.63	0.00	45.50	2173.17	148.24	16.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	988.11	155.36	6330.07	46.11	167.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.09	0.45	4479.27	1632.11	12142.78	28336.80	55673	50.90
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	199.26	70.37	49.33	264.07	261.46	181.28	7.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6521.71	119.01	751.69	187.76	39.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1584.20	0.00	0.00	3.03	34915.70	3971.09	21074.98	70201.99	101387	69.24	
11.	Jharkhand	397.55	9.59	3.95	1846.32	462.46	35.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7120.15	643.94	39.91	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	88.03	63.07	416.11	35.99	0.00	1116526	79706	14.01
12.	Karnataka	11.72	34.70	0.08	4098.25	730.31	21.70	4.49	0.30	141.23	25.90	0.00	0.00	5240.10	1225.86	37.83	290.54	33.09	0.00	4.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	199.10	6.88	1417.22	12.68	0.00	13536.58	191791	7.08
13.	Kerala	0.00	0.00	0.00	691.26	3.24	19.94	248.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	425.53	0.00	124.00	51.56	0.00	0.00	11.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.18	0.00	183.49	17.56	0.00	1788.80	38863	4.60
14.	Madhya Pradesh	1732.11	1427.55	2114.66	27079.57	1974.31	0.00	50.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17549.17	4188.35	29.64	6.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	121.48	0.00	779.19	80.51	0.00	57134.03	308252	18.53
15.	Maharashtra	1182.04	6.68	0.00	19249.73	10086.88	395.61	4.22	38.02	19.89	228.22	0.00	0.00	12334.27	1735.63	308.63	317.70	0.00	0.00	48.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	112.54	0.67	2399.68	806.88	0.00	49275.41	307690	16.01
16.	Manipur	0.00	0.00	0.00	8072.81	0.00	194.76	90.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	3697.14	1119.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13174.74	22327	58.01
17.	Meghalaya	0.00	0.00	0.00	1010.35	1584.11	11.52	4.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.62	627.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.15	0.00	55.23	0.00	0.00	3411.41	22429	15.21
18.	Mizoram	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2870.46	1146.95	452.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4469.88	21081	21.20
19.	Nagaland	0.00	0.00	0.00	1713.17	59.18	0.60	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	801.30	1116.60	8.19	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.44	0.00	3709.40	16579	22.37
20.	Orissa	800.62	0.92	8.01	7537.96	618.05	218.23	171.45	0.00	8.69	23.95	541.03	636.26	5217.25	2307.29	0.00	135.68	3.07	0.03	73.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.23	1.83	668.91	150.38	0.00	18952.74	155707	12.17
21.	Punjab	0.00	33.41	0.00	165.71	72.21	371.30	28.53	0.00	16.07	1.16	0.00	0.00	4.62	0.00	0.00	338.58	117.12	1.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.12	0.00	0.00	14.48	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	1172.84	50362	2.33

S.No	STATE NAME	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Total WL	TGA	%To TGA	
22.	Rajasthan	3968.08	1094.00	1638.81	30010.58	6846.24	115.92	144.06	633.60	658.04	2474.08	0.00	0.00	8909.91	710.30	8766.47	181.28	178.64	10.92	0.00	2672.88	16380.70	8529.06	1746.03	233.77	398.68	5039.99	211.81	0.00	101453.86	342239	29.80	
23.	Sikkim	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	746.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	944.71	299.47	1812.16	3808.21	7096	53.87	
24.	Tripura	0.00	0.00	0.00	275.22	0.00	0.00	12.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.37	284.89	640.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1322.97	10486	12.62	
25.	Tamil Nadu	107.97	61.76	0.04	4539.72	1055.68	286.77	101.54	162.15	257.17	471.22	0.00	0.00	8060.01	71.37	115.28	78.58	45.68	0.11	339.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	164.35	21.53	1164.41	198.14	0.00	17303.29	130058	13.30	
26.	Uttaranchal	0.68	51.53	7.97	2363.25	169.66	123.96	64.66	4.57	1.18	1.11	0.00	0.00	1069.48	131.91	1404.17	43.06	40.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.10	0.06	325.84	1169.47	9119.54	16097.46	53483	30.10	
27.	Uttar Pradesh	1521.14	1493.04	238.60	3001.78	617.16	884.28	964.29	1558.01	2521.28	763.20	20.35	0.00	1807.61	358.76	79.84	13.31	626.39	4.43	78.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.12	31.94	379.75	11.36	0.00	16984.16	240928	7.05	
28.	West Bengal	14.95	108.18	0.00	482.00	747.50	227.53	1183.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	996.95	35.58	71.72	33.28	262.00	0.00	12.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.51	15.83	146.29	33.63	0.00	4397.56	88752	4.95
29.	Union Territory	5.95	0.00	0.00	20.01	4.28	7.86	0.05	0.47	0.04	11.50	0.00	0.00	192.68	0.00	0.00	1.97	2.95	0.00	20.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	45.96	0.00	0.00	314.38	10973	2.87
	Total	10283.06	4685.43	4070.85	130666.60	37382.89	5341.15	4403.82	2569.69	5349.64	4104.72	12218.99	6546.87	108417.76	18134.05	19344.30	2138.24	1945.55	32.24	943.14	2672.88	16380.70	10262.95	1746.74	1421.72	555.63	57747.11	9097.38	54328.16	552682.26	3186414	17.45	

Source : 1:50,000 Wasteland Maps-2003 prepared based on IRS-LISS III Data

*Note : 1,20,849.00 Sq km in Jammu & Kashmir is not mapped and hence not considered for calculating the percentage.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Gullied and/or ravinous land (Shallow) | 16. Degraded land under plantation crop |
| 2. Gullied and/or ravinous land (Medium) | 17. Sands-(Flood Plain) |
| 3. Gullied and/or ravinous land (Deep) | 18. Sands-(Levees) |
| 4. Land with scrub | 19. Sands-(Coastal Sand) |
| 5. Land without scrub | 20. Sands-(Semi Stab.-Stab>40m) |
| 6. Waterlogged and Marshy land (Permanent) | 21. Sands-(Semi Stab.-Stab Moder. High 15-40m) |
| 7. Waterlogged and Marshy land (Seasonal) | 22. Sands-(Semi Stab. to Stab. low<15m) |
| 8. Land affected by salinity/alkalinity (Strong) | 23. Sands-(Closely Spaced Inter-Dune Area) |
| 9. Land affected by salinity/alkalinity (Moderate) | 24. Mining Wastelands |
| 10. Land affected by salinity/alkalinity (Slight) | 25. Industrial Wastelands |
| 11. Shifting cultivation area (Abandoned Jhum) | 26. Barren Rocky/Stone Waste/Sheet Rock Area |
| 12. Shifting cultivation area (Current Jhum) | 27. Steep Slopping Area |
| 13. Underutilised/degraded notified forest land | 28. Snow covered and/or Glacial Area |
| 14. Underutilised/degraded notified forest land (Agri) | Total Wasteland Area |
| 15. Degraded pastures/grazing land | TGA: Total Geographical Area |

APPENDIX III

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE THIRD SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 14TH OCTOBER, 2009

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1800 hrs. in Committee Room No.'139', First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri Sidhant Mohapatra
6. Shri Rakesh Pandey
7. Shri P.L. Punia
8. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
9. Shri Jagdish Sharma
10. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
11. Shri Jagdanand Singh
12. Dr. Sanjay Singh
13. Shri Makansingh Solanki
14. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
15. Shrimati Usha Verma
16. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti

Rajya Sabha

17. Shri Ganga Charan
18. Shri Silvius Condpan
19. Dr. Ram Prakash
20. Shri P.R. Rajan
21. Shri Bhagwati Singh
22. Shrimati Maya Singh
23. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

**Department of Land Resources
(Ministry of Rural Development)**

1. Shrimati Rita Sinha — *Secretary*
2. Shri Arvind Mayaram — *Additional Secretary and
Financial Adviser*
3. Shri Chinmay Basu — *Additional Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened for briefing by the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Chairperson welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources and highlighted certain issues like the contentious issue of rehabilitation and re-settlement of the (project affected) displaced persons and safeguards measures that has been initiated for the aggrieved

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

parties. Thereafter, the Secretary, Department of Land Resources made a power point presentation about various schemes and programmes of Department of Land Resources *viz.* Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) (named after integrating the three area development programmes – Drought Prone Areas Programme, Desert Development Programme, Integrated Wastelands Development Programme), National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) (formulated by merging two schemes of computerization of Land Records and strengthening of revenue administration and updating of land records), National Mission on bio-diesel, showing the financial and physical performance of each scheme/programme.

4. Subsequently, the members of the Committee sought clarifications. The major points raised by the members *inter-alia*, included the basis of selection of areas/projects under watershed development goal of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) and time frame of the scheme for coverage of entire degraded area in the country. The Secretary responded to the queries raised by members. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of the Department of Land Resources for briefing the Committee.

[The witnesses then withdrew.]

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 5. | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| 6. | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |

The Committee then adjourned.

A record of the verbatim proceedings has been kept.

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

APPENDIX IV

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 10TH NOVEMBER, 2009

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1400 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'G-074', Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri H.D. Kumaraswamy
6. Shri Rakesh Pandey
7. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
8. Shri Jagdish Sharma
9. Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu
10. Shri Jagdanand Singh
11. Shrimati Usha Verma
12. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri Ganga Charan
14. Dr. Ram Prakash

15. Shri P.R. Rajan
16. Shri Bhagwati Singh
17. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Sundar Prasad Das — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

- (i) *** *** *** *** ***
- (ii) Representatives of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
1. Smt. Rita Sinha — *Secretary*
 2. Shri Chinmay Basu — *Additional Secretary (LR)*
 3. Shri Arvind Mayaram — *Additional Secretary & Financial Advisor*
 4. Smt. Krishna Tyagi — *CCA*
2. *** *** *** *** ***
3. *** *** *** *** ***

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

4. The Chairperson welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) to the sitting. Thereafter, the Secretary, Department of Land Resources with prior permission of Chairperson gave a power point presentation on the subject. The Committee, thereafter, took oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on their Demands for Grants (2009-2010). The main points that came up for discussion include outcome of huge investment made by the Department on Wastelands Development activities through its area development programmes, studies undertaken to evaluate the achievement of these programmes, objectives of these programmes, progress on updation and

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

modernization of land records in the country, etc. The Secretary, Department of Land Resources replied to various queries raised by members on aforesaid issues. The Chairperson also asked Secretary, Department of Land Resources to furnish replies to queries which remained unanswered. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of the Department of Land Resources.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX V

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2009-2010)

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 14TH DECEMBER, 2009

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Committee Room 'A', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Sumitra Mahajan — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Pulin Bihari Baske
3. Shri Kunvarjibhai Mohanbhai Bavalia
4. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
5. Shri Gobinda Chandra Naskar
6. Shri Rakesh Pandey
7. Shri P.L. Punia
8. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
9. Shrimati Usha Verma

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Ganga Charan
11. Shri Silvius Condpan
12. Shrimati Maya Singh

APPENDIX VI

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

Serial No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.6	The Committee note that Direction 73A of the 'Directions by the Speaker' is not being followed in the right spirit. This is evident from the considerable delay in making the Statement by the Minister in the House regarding status of implementation of recommendations contained in Thirty-Sixth Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2008-2009) in respect of the Department of Land Resources. In Committee's opinion the Department has not shown the desired urgency and will to make the Statement within the stipulated period. The Committee desire that in future the Statement under Direction 73A should be made within the prescribed time limit. The Committee are, however, glad to note that their recommendations made in their previous Reports regarding enhancing the per hectare cost norms for wasteland development and finalization of guidelines of the restructured programmes of land record management have found favours from EFC in the Ministry of Finance as well as the Cabinet Secretariat that resulted in finalization of cost norms as also NLRMP.
2.	3.3	The Committee are also dismayed to learn that wastelands in the country as on today is as high as 55.27 million hectare in spite of implementation of three area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP over the last twenty years. The Committee, therefore, doubt the utility of these programmes as

the achievements have not been on expected lines over the years. The Committee recall that in the previous Thirty-sixth Report para 3.34 the Committee had underlined the need for monitoring of different projects under IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In view of the above the Committee recommend that the ongoing schemes be implemented in a more focused manner so that something tangible is discernible at ground level.

3. 3.4 The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made. They are dismayed to note that too many policy interventions on wasteland development have been made from time to time. For instance, consequent upon Hanumantha Rao Committee recommendations in 1994 the three area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP were implemented on watershed basis; accordingly, the guidelines were framed on watershed basis. In 2001 and 2003 these guidelines were further revised for making them more focused. Finally in 2008 the Department of Land Resources have come out with 'Common Guidelines' based on the recommendations of Parthasarthy Committee Report. In Committee's view such frequent changes in policy for wasteland development may be one of the reasons for slow progress in this area. The Committee also feel that frequent changes not only lead to confusion among project implementing agencies (PIAs) about implementation of the programmes but also do not project a clear and true picture about the programmes among the beneficiaries and public at large. The Committee, therefore, desire that PIAs should be properly educated in different States so that the on-going projects are completed in time. The Committee would also like that all the corrective action should be taken so as to achieve the indicated objectives under the aforesaid schemes and also to ensure cent percent utilization under different schemes along with achieving the physical target.
-

1	2	3
4.	3.16	<p>The Committee are glad to find that the Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) outlay of Rs. 17205.49 crore available to Department of Land Resources is almost three times the Plan allocations of Rs. 6526 crore during Tenth Plan (2002-2007). The Committee find that enhanced allocation is mainly for on-going watershed programme of IWDP, DPAP and DDP and projects under new programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) and also for new programmes viz. National Land Record Management Programme, Bio Fuel etc. The Committee are unhappy to find that as against the huge allocations of the order of Rs. 17,205.49 crore for Eleventh Plan Period, the expenditure up to 30.10.2009 i.e. by the mid of the Eleventh Plan is only 4337.37 crore representing 30 per cent of the total allocations. They are also distressed to learn that the Department has lowered the Plan targets for watershed development from original level of 25 million hectares to 22.65 million hectares for the remaining period of the current Plan. Such reduction in targets during the remaining part of the Eleventh Plan was not at all desirable keeping in view the monumental task assigned to the Department of Land Resources by the Parthasarthy Committee that envisages covering a total of 75 million hectares of rain-fed area in the country in fifteen years time at the rate of covering 25 million hectare in every five Year Plan from Eleventh Plan onwards with a huge expenditure of Rs. 150,000 crore. The Committee desire a clarification from Department in this regard. Even though the Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) has been launched in 2009-2010 itself, the Committee wish to point out that this is only a merger of the three programmes earlier being implemented by the Department viz. IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In view of this the reduction in physical targets is completely unjustified particularly when huge funds out of the Eleventh Plan allocations are still left with the Department.</p>

1	2	3
5.	3.17	<p>About NLRMP, the Committee feel that there could not be a case of worse planning than in this case. It is surprising to find that against the Eleventh Plan allocation of Rs. 581 crore, after release of Rs. 188.76 crore during previous year <i>i.e.</i> 2008-2009 and Rs. 400 crore as allocation for current year, the Department does not have any allocations available for remaining two years of the Eleventh Plan. The Committee have been informed that the Planning Commission is now being requested in this regard for necessary funds. About Bio-fuel Programme the Committee find the Programme is still awaiting clearance. In Committee's opinion all these developments of reduction in targets under IWMP, lack of funds for NLRMP and uncertainty over bio-fuel do not speak well about the over all functioning of the Department, particularly, when the utilization of Plan funds is only 30 per cent so far. This definitely calls for renewed efforts to be made on the part of the Department in all these areas in order to fully utilise the allocation of the order of Rs. 17,205.49 crore for Eleventh Plan Period. The Committee, therefore, recommend that concerted efforts should be made in these areas so as to utilise full outlay during remaining two years of the current Plan. The Committee also strongly recommend that adequate allocation should be provided to NLRMP and the Department should make every effort to ensure that it is meaningfully utilized.</p>
6.	3.22	<p>The Committee are constrained to note that there has been reduction of Plan funds at revised estimate stage during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 to the extent on Rs. 100 crore and Rs. 600 crore respectively. Various reasons like slow expenditure on the schemes of 'Professional Support' and non-receipt of proposals from the States for 'Externally Aided Projects' during 2007-2008 and delay in Cabinet clearance for IWMP during 2008-2009 have been given as reasons for such reduction at RE stage. The Committee feel that these reasons were well within the control of the</p>

1	2	3
		Department. In their view, had the Department taken sufficient caution, huge aforesaid reduction in Plan Budget during 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 could have been avoided.
7.	3.23	The Committee note that for IWMP against the outlay of Rs. 1968 crore during 2009-2010, the releases so far are Rs. 1003.98 crore, whereas for NLRMP against the outlay of Rs. 400 crore the releases are Rs. 135.52 crore only. The Committee are constrained to learn that Rs. 30 crore for bio-fuel may go unutilized. The Committee recommend that the Department should strive hard to increase pace of releases in the remaining half of the current year particularly in respect of NLRMP to ensure full utilization of funds. Besides, it should also be ensured that the funds utilized lead to achievement of corresponding physical targets. Besides, the Committee also recommend that the Department should make all out efforts for obtaining clearance for the bio-fuel programme from the Group of Ministers for its finalization after taking into account necessary impact assessment study of plantation work already done on Jatropha, so that Rs. 30 crore earmarked for this programme does not go unutilized.
8.	4.6	The Committee are constrained to note that there is no updated data about wastelands in the country. The Committee are also anguished to note that whatever data that has been relied upon by the Department of Land Resources is based on Wastelands Atlas of India brought out by the Department of Land Resources in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) Hyderabad dating back to 2005, <i>i.e.</i> four years old. The Secretary, Land Resources candidly admitted before the Committee that in spite of repeated requests to different State Governments, the States are unable to inform the Department about exact area of wasteland utilized by them. The Department has also furnished varying data of wastelands as referred to in Parthasarthy Committee Report. The Committee feel

that these data also do not serve the purpose of getting accurate area of wastelands in the country. According to, the Secretary, Land Resources, NRSA, Hyderabad has been asked to bring out another Atlas of Wasteland showing updated position. The Committee are dismayed to note that in the age of satellite imagery, the country is bereft of the basic data of wasteland in the country. The Committee, wonder how in the absence of basic data the ambitious programme of Integrated Watershed Management Programme can be implemented in a result oriented manner in the country in the coming years. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should take up the matter of bringing out the updated wasteland Atlas urgently with NRSA, Hyderabad. At the same time States should be asked to report the utilization of wastelands in their respective States. The Committee also recommend in the wasteland Atlas there should be clear data regarding wastelands as also those under rain-fed area in order to have a clear picture in the matter. The concrete action in this regard should be communicated to the Committee.

9. 4.18 The Committee are unhappy to note that the impact of the huge investment of over Rs. 12000 crore made in land resources in the country since Seventh Plan (1985-1989) has not been properly assessed throughout the country for the purpose of ascertaining its return in agriculture inputs, employment etc.
10. 4.19 In this connection, the Committee have been informed by the Department that various findings of the evaluations/studies like watershed programme undertaken indicate an increase in rural income by 58 per cent, agricultural income by 35 per cent, employment generation by 154 days per hectare per year and improvement in ground water table by 3.2 metres etc. Strangely, the above findings have not been verified by the Department. In the absence of proper verification of data by the Department, the

Committee wonder how the Department could rely on these ambitious findings in toto. In their view, these findings may be based on sporadic studies. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department of Land Resources should undertake a comprehensive study at the earliest to ascertain the impact of the huge investment already made in watershed development activities on areas like agriculture, employment, increase in ground water recharge etc. The concrete action taken should be communicated to the Committee.

11. 4.28 The Committee are constrained to note that during the last fifteen years *i.e.* from 1995-1996 to 2008-2009 out of the total of 45,062 projects sanctioned in IWDP, DPAP and DDP projects involving a cost of around Rs. 17,918 crore with Central share of Rs. 14,299 crore the actual releases have been only around Rs. 9936 crore. The Committee are not convinced with the reasons advanced for the lower releases that under the above programmes projects are sanctioned for a period of 5 years and funds are spread over 5 to 7 instalments. The Committee are also constrained to note that out of the 45,062 projects sanctioned, only 14,687 have been completed which is less than one-third of total projects sanctioned. Remaining projects have been shown as on-going. The Department is stated to have been impressing upon the State Governments at the review meetings the urgency to complete ongoing projects in 2-3 years time. Yet the Committee feel that the completion of projects of as low as one-third of the total projects sanctioned indicates that necessary urgency for completion of projects as claimed by the Department is not realized at ground level in different States.
12. 4.29 In this connection, the Committee have been impressing upon for proper monitoring of projects in their previous Reports presented to the Parliament from time to time. The Committee, therefore, strongly

1	2	3
		recommend that concerted and persistent efforts should be made not only by the Department of Land Resources but also by all the authorities/agencies involved in execution of these projects.
13.	4.30	The Committee after going through the State-wise figures of projects sanctioned <i>vis-à-vis</i> projects completed find that the major States where large number of sanctioned projects are awaiting completion are Rajasthan, Gujarat, Karnataka etc. In Rajasthan out of 8,775 projects sanctioned only 2,934 projects have been completed, in Gujarat out of 5,590 projects sanctioned only 1,657 have been completed, in Karnataka out of 4,038 projects sanctioned only 1,296 have been completed. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the bottlenecks if any, in the completion of projects in such States should be removed and concrete efforts be made for expeditious completion of pending projects.
14.	4.31	After examining the details of mid-term evaluation done in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP projects, the Committee are constrained to note that such evaluation was done in respect of only a few projects. For instance, in IWDP only 984 projects, in DPAP only 18789 projects and in DDP only 13143 projects were evaluated in the aforesaid mid-term evaluation. The Committee, therefore, desire that all the on-going projects in all the three programmes be evaluated in order to ensure their early completion.
15.	4.35	The Committee are constrained to note that even after the persistent recommendations by the Committee, there have been huge amounts lying unspent in all the three Area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP. In this connection, the Committee are constrained to note that Rs. 471.67 crore in IWDP Rs. 444.45 crore in DPAP and Rs. 390.59 crore in DDP have been lying as unspent as on 31.3.2009. The Committee have been informed that under the guidelines, it is provided that a project is entitled to

claim next instalment even if upto 50 per cent of previous amount released is unutilized. It is for this reason that there are large amount of unspent balances in Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka etc. In view of the above, the Committee feel that in order to ascertain the exact position State-wise, a study be conducted in different on-going projects in order to ascertain whether this is the only reason for the funds remaining unutilized or there are other reasons like complacency on the part of the implementing authorities.

16. 4.38 The Committee wish to point out that like unspent balances, the issue of outstanding Utilisation Certificates (UCs) have been continuously pursued by the Committee for necessary liquidation. Even after that the Committee find that large number of UCs involving crores of rupees are visible in this year's budget also. For instance, as many as 156 UCs in IWDP, 107 UCs in DPAP and 31 UCs each in CLR and SRA & ULR are lying outstanding as on 31.3.2009. Out of 269 outstanding UCs relating to watershed programmes, 60 UCs involving Rs. 38.13 crore are stated to have been liquidated as on 31.10.2009. The Committee recall that last year the figures of UCs in respect of IWDP, DPAP and DDP were 153, 115 and 24 respectively. The Committee are anguished to find that desired progress on this issue has not been discernible.
17. 4.39 About liquidating outstanding UCs in CLRs and SRA & ULR, the Committee have been informed that as high as Rs. 159.77 crore in CLRs and Rs. 183.97 crore in SRAs and ULRs are presently lying unspent and States have been directed to submit UCs for their settlement by 31.03.2010 and the matter was to be reviewed on 5th and 26th November, 2009. The Committee would like to be informed about the outcome of these meetings. The Committee feel that although efforts have been made in this regard by the

Department, yet the Committee apprehend that the desired results may not be achieved as was experienced during previous year. The Committee fail to understand why the State Governments are not submitting utilization certificates in time. The Committee strongly recommend that the Department should pursue with the State Governments in this regard.

18. 4.43 The Committee are unhappy to note that prolonged delay in finalization of the Bio-diesel programme for one reason or another has occurred since the programme was started way back in April, 2003. The Committee also recall that this issue has been constantly pursued in their examination of Demands for Grants in the previous years. It has also figured in their Thirty-sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2007-2008). The Committee have now been informed that the programme has been approved by Group of Ministers at their sitting held on 24 February 2009 in principle, subject to three conditions. One of these relates to prior assessment of plantation work and positive feedback before initiating the demonstration phase. The Committee have also been informed that the Department is in the process of carrying out an Impact Assessment Study of Jatropha and Pongamia plantations in India by an independent agency. The Committee recommend that the Department should complete the above impact assessment study without any loss of time for taking final view on the issue. While recommending for expeditious clearance of National Mission on Bio-diesel, the Committee would like to emphasise that the Jatropha and Pongamia cultivation in the country should be done without affecting the food security and agricultural land of the country.
19. 5.8 The Committee note that Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) being implemented from 1st April, 2008 under 'Common Guidelines, 2008'
-

aims to restore the ecological balance by harnessing, conserving and developing degraded natural resources such as soil, vegetative cover and water so as to prevent soil run off, regenerate natural vegetation and for recharging of ground water and for rain water harvesting. The Committee have been informed that keeping in view the aforesaid diverse nature of subjects encompassing the jurisdiction of various Ministries/ Departments *viz.* Agriculture, Drinking Water Supply, Environment etc. the 'Common Guidelines' have been approved at the level of National Rain-fed Area Authority (NRAA) under Ministry of Agriculture, in order to have a co-ordinated approach. However, the Committee are constrained to note that implementation mechanism both at Central as also at State level for implementing IWMP is not moving on expected lines.

20. 5.9 In this connection, the Committee note that at Central level at the initial stage itself there is a delay in transfer of NRAA from Department of Agriculture & Cooperation to Department of Land Resources even after Cabinet Secretariat's nod given in April, 2009. Not only that the decision of the Cabinet taken in February, 2009 regarding engagement of four technical experts in the Department of Land Resources pending transfer of NRAA to this Department has not been implemented. The Committee have been informed that pending the NRAA's transfer Internal Monitoring Cell and a Steering Committees in the Department have started functioning for necessary appraisal and clearance of projects under IWMP. However, the Committee are constrained to note that the Steering Committee has met on only eight occasions and appraised State Perspective and Strategic Plans from 18 States only. Thus, the Committee can only conclude that much is desired to be done with regard to implementation of IWMP at Central level. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the issue of transfer of NRAA should be taken up with Cabinet

1	2	3
		Secretariat seriously so that necessary mechanism is put in place with the Department of Land Resources.
21.	5.10	The Committee also note with constraint that the necessary dedicated institution <i>viz.</i> State Level Nodal Agency (SLNA) for sanctioning of watershed projects under IWMP programme has not come up in big States like Bihar and West Bengal as late as October, 2009, particularly when the programme was started in April, 2009.
22.	5.11	The Committee further note with dismay that the eight States which have constituted necessary SLNAs are yet to submit their State Perspective and Strategic Plans to the Department of Land Resources. Likewise, the Committee are surprised to note that in Uttarakhand, proposals worth Rs. 75 crore covering 50,000 hectare of area has been appraised and cleared by the Steering Committee at the Central level but are still awaiting necessary sanction from concerned SLNA. The Committee have also been informed that some States are facing difficulty in flow of funds from DRDAs to Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs). In order to resolve these, the NRAA is being approached for necessary changes in 'Common Guidelines, 2008'. In view of the above, the Committee recommend that a pro-active role on the part of Steering Committee is need of the hour for constitution of SLNAs in Bihar and West Bengal and for obtaining necessary State Perspective and Strategic Plans from the eight States which have constituted SLNAs but have not submitted these to Steering Committee. The Committee would also like to be informed about the States which are yet to submit such plans. The Committee recommend that the Department should take necessary action early on other issues highlighted above for expeditious implementation of IWMP.
23.	5.12	The other important area that has invited the attention of the Committee is the role of multiple agencies of

national reputation like ICRISAT, NIRD, TERI, IGNOU etc. for undertaking the work of awareness about IWMP, generation of proposals under IWMP and for impact assessment of watersheds across the country. In this connection, the Committee feel that combined work of these organizations should be documented at one place at national level showing clearly their roles *vis-à-vis* achievements in their assigned areas. This will help the evaluator to understand the programme in a more holistic manner.

24. 5.22 The Committee note that the Department of Land Resources has come out with a National Land Record Modernisation Programme (NLRMP) for making available updated land records in the country by use of modern methods of survey, re-survey and through computerization etc. The Committee are constrained to note that Eleventh Plan allocation for NLRMP of Rs. 581 crore is hardly commensurate with the work involved. As pointed out by the Committee in an earlier Chapter, the Department does not have any allocations available from 2010-2011 onwards. The Committee have been informed that Planning Commission is being requested to increase the Eleventh Plan allocation for NLRMP. The Committee are unable to comprehend as to how the Department has conceptualized the funding requirements for the mammoth work of updation and modernization of land records in the country particularly when the funds were only available for the programme in first three years of the current Plan. The Committee feel that this is a very sorry state of affairs and puts a big question mark on overall process of programme wise preparation of budget estimates and also on planning process for Eleventh Plan Period and beyond. The Committee, therefore, desire that a detailed reply about requirements of funds for the programme for the remaining plan period and beyond be furnished to the Committee so as to reach at logical conclusion.

1	2	3
25.	5.23	<p>The Committee are dismayed to note that implementation of the NLRMP so far in the country is also far below the expectations. As against the target of 210 districts as on 31.10.2009, the actual coverage was as low as 102 districts for this programme. The Committee apprehend that with this slow pace the target of covering 455 districts in the country by 2011-12 is unachievable by any stretch of imagination. The Committee, therefore, recommend that all out efforts be made to speed up NLRMP coverage as per targets drawn in this behalf.</p>
26.	5.24	<p>The Committee note that Department has delineated ladder like approach for securing conclusive titles of land records in the country ranging from computerization to automated mutation of property after its registration. The Committee have been informed that as a result of the review of NLRMP held on 18 -19 August 2009 various revelations have been made available from different States in this regard. These relate to various flaws like delay in release of amount, non-reporting of progress, non-utilisation of funds under NLRMP etc. In view of the serious revelations reflected above, the Committee feel that ladder like approach as also other details may be communicated to these States so as to eliminate the bottlenecks being faced by these States. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a time-bound approach is very necessary for securing the goals of NLRMP during the designated period.</p>
27.	5.25	<p>On the issue of funding pattern for NLRMP for different components like Survey of land, computerization of registrations and setting up Modern Record Rooms, the Department of Land Resources has informed that these require 100 per cent Central funds like other components of Programme. The Committee recommend that keeping in view the mammoth task, the Department should review the funding pattern in respect of the aforesaid components under intimation</p>

to the Committee. The Committee note that the thrust of the Government is on computerization of land records. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that ways and means should be found out through technological intervention to achieve the objective of having correct up-to-date land records so as to give the required security to the owner of the land. The Department should take the desired initiative in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

ABBREVIATIONS

BE	- Budget Estimate
CCEA	- Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs
CLR	- Computerisation of Land Records
DDP	- Desert Development Programme
DPAP	- Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	- District Rural Development Agency
DRI	- Differential Rate of Interest
DPR	- Detailed Project Report
DSC	- Development Support Centre
EFC	- Expenditure Finance Committee
ICAR	- Indian Council for Agricultural Research
ICRISAT	- International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IWDP	- Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
IWMP	- Integrated Watershed Management Programme
MNRE	- Ministry of New and Renewable Energy
NE	- North Eastern
NGO	- Non-Governmental Organisation
NIC	- National Informatics Centre
NIRD	- National Institute of Rural Development
NNE	- Non-North Eastern
NPCLRM	- National Programme for Comprehensive Land Resources Management
NRAA	- National Rainfed Area Authority
NREGS	- National Rural Employment Gurantee Scheme
NWDB	- National Wastelands Development Board
PIA	- Project Implementation Agency
PRIs	- Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	- Revised Estimate
RoR	- Record of Rights
SAUs	- State Agriculture Universities
SEZs	- Special Economic Zones
SIRD	- State Institute of Rural Development
SLNA	- State Level Nodal Agency

- SRA & ULR - Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
- TDET - Technology Development Extension and Training
- TERI - The Energy and Resources Institute
- UT - Union Territory
- WA - Watershed Association
- WC - Watershed Committee
- ZP - Zilla Parishad