

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2011-2012)

25

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

*[Action taken on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha)
on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources)
for the year 2011-12]*

TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2011-2012)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

*[Action taken on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha)
on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources)
for the year 2011-12]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 22.03.2012

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22.03.2012



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

March, 2012/Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)

Price : Rs.

© 2012 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 _____.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2011-2012)	(ii)
INTRODUCTION	(iii)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government	14
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	26
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	27
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	29

APPENDICES

I. Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR).....	30
II. Financial Progress (Release of Funds & Utilization reported) under the NLRMP 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2011-12 (31.12.2011).....	31
III. Extracts of minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 22 February, 2012.....	32
IV. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-first Report (15 th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development.....	33

(ii)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2011-2012)

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan - *Chairperson*

**MEMBERS
LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit
5. Shri Maheshwar Hazari
6. Shri Ramesh Vishwanath Katti
7. Shri P. Kumar
8. Shri Raghuvir Singh Meena
9. Dr. Ratna De (Nag)
10. Shri Rakesh Pandey
11. Shri A. Sai Prathap
12. Shri P.L. Punia
13. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
14. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
15. Shri Bishnu Pada Ray***
16. Dr. Sanjay Singh
17. Smt. Supriya Sule
18. Shri Kodikunnil Suresh
19. Shri Narendra Singh Tomar
20. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan
21. Smt. Vijaya Shanthi M**

RAJYA SABHA

22. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
23. Shri Ganga Charan
24. Shri Hussain Dalwai
25. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa
26. Dr. Ram Prakash
27. Shri P. Rajeeve*
28. Shri Mohan Singh
29. Smt. Maya Singh
30. Miss Anusuiya Uikey
31. Vacant****

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Brahm Dutt - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Raju Srivastava - Deputy Secretary

* Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 02.11.2011 *vice* Shri P.R. Rajan.

** Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 25.11.2011.

*** Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 03.01.2012 *vice* Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu.

**** Dr. (Smt.) Kapila Vatsyayan retired on 15.02. 2012.

(iii)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2011-2012) having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present the 25th Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 21st Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (15th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2011-12) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources).

2. The 21st Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 26 August, 2011. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 17 January, 2012.
3. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 22 February, 2012.
4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 21st Report of the Committee is given in **Appendix-IV**.

NEW DELHI;
21 March, 2012
1 Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2011-12) deals with the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in their Twenty-First Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) for the year 2011-2012.

2. The Twenty-First Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 26 August, 2011 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. The Report contained 17 Observations/Recommendations.

3. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report have been received from the Government. These have been examined and categorised as follows: -

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

Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15

Total:14

Chapter-II

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

Nil

Total:00

Chapter-III

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

Serial Nos. 6 and 17

Total:02

Chapter-IV

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

Serial No. 16

Total:01

Chapter-V

4. The Committee desire that final reply in respect of Recommendation at Serial No. 16 for which only interim reply has been submitted by the Government and Action Taken Notes on the Observations/Recommendations contained in Chapter-I of the Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.

5. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of their Observations/Recommendations that require reiteration or merit comments.

A. INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IWDP)

Recommendation (Serial No. 4, Para No. 2.4)

6. The Committee noted that IWDP had been under implementation since 1989-90 and was transferred to the Department of Land Resources alongwith National Wasteland Development Board in July 1992. From 1 April 1995, the Scheme was being implemented on a watershed basis in accordance with the guidelines for watershed development. The Committee were informed that the projects under the programme were sanctioned in the Blocks not covered by Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP). During the period from 1995-96 to 2006-07, 1877 projects were sanctioned under the Scheme. The Committee were also informed by the Department that during the period from 2007 to 2010, no new projects were sanctioned. Of the 1877 sanctioned projects, only 748 have been completed so far and 85 projects have been closed.

The Committee found that upto 31.12.2010 Rs. 4141.14 crore were released by the Government for the programme. Prior to 31.03.2000, projects under the programme were sanctioned at the cost norm of Rs 4000 per hectare funded entirely by the Central Government. The cost norm for the projects sanctioned after 1.4.2000 had been revised to Rs. 6000 per hectare. The funding of the projects was shared between the Centre and the States in the ratio of Rs. 5500 and Rs. 500 per hectare respectively. However, the projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.2000 continue to be funded entirely by the Central Government at the cost norm of Rs. 4000 per hectare. The Committee desired to know as to why the cost of the projects which were sanctioned prior to 1.4.2000 and not completed till date had not been revised. The Committee were of the view that not increasing the cost of the earlier projects will make them unviable. The Committee accordingly recommended the Government to revise the cost of the earlier projects (sanctioned prior to 1.04.2000).

7. The Department in their action taken reply have stated as under:-

“As per the policy decision taken by the Department, no central assistance is being released in any pre-Hariyali project (sanctioned from 1995-96 to 2002-03) after 31.03.2011 (except for those projects in snow covered areas where a grace period of three years beyond the cut-off date has been allowed).

Since there is no ongoing project sanctioned prior to 01.04.2000 in the snow covered areas of Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Jammu & Kashmir, the requirement of increasing the rates does not arise.”

8. **While appreciating the fact that there is no ongoing project (sanctioned prior to 01.04.2000) under the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) in snow covered areas of Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Jammu & Kashmir, the Committee feel that the Department have not paid much heed to their recommendation of revising the per hectare cost norm of earlier projects (sanctioned prior to 01.04.2000) in other parts of the country so that the remaining 1044 ongoing projects sanctioned from 1995-96 to 2006-07 do not become unviable and eventually closed as ‘non-performing projects’. The Committee, therefore, desire the Department to accord utmost importance to the issue of completion of remaining 1044 ongoing projects by adopting stringent monitoring mechanism in coordination with the States in every possible manner and persuade them to accomplish the task in a fixed timeframe.**

B. DROUGHT PRONE AREAS PROGRAMME (DPAP)

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para No. 2.6)

9. In order to address the specific problems of drought prone areas, DPAP was being implemented on watershed basis from 1995 onwards. The Committee found from the information provided by the Department that out of 74.5913 million hectare that had been identified under the DPAP programme, the project area was limited only to 13.7195 million hectare which comprised of 27439 projects. The Committee were astonished to find that no new projects had been sanctioned under this programme from 2007-08 onwards. Out of 27439 sanctioned projects, 6859 projects were still ongoing and the Department proposed to complete these projects by 2012. The Committee were further concerned to find that there were as many 1008 projects sanctioned during 2003-04 which were still ongoing i.e. even after seven years of sanction.

The Drought prone areas were amongst the most backward areas of the country and of the total identified area as drought prone in 16 States, the project area was only 13.7195 million hectare i.e. 18.39 percent of the total drought prone area. The Committee were perturbed to note that after 16 long years of operation, the proposed coverage of the projects was only 18.39 percent

of the total drought prone area. The Department had informed that under the revised programme of IWMP, priority will be given to identified areas. Though it was too early to comment on the progress of the new programme, the Committee recommended the Department to complete the ongoing projects of the existing programme on priority basis. The Committee also desired that the concept of accountability and fixing responsibility should be in built in project planning and implementation process.”

10. The Department in their action taken reply have stated as under:-

“So far 16,323 DPAP projects covering an area of 8.16 m.ha. have been completed. The recommendation of Hon'ble Standing Committee regarding close monitoring including regular visits by the project implementing authorities at the project sites is being followed through State Governments. The Department is also closely monitoring the implementation of the programme through Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development's progress review with States, Steering Committee meetings, Regional Review meetings, SLNA meetings held at State level and Department officials visit to States. The States have been advised to complete all on-going DPAP projects as per the timelines set by the Department i.e. December, 2012.

Unlike pre-IWMP projects, under IWMP Guidelines, there is an inbuilt mechanism of evaluating the projects by independent agencies after completion of each phase of activities of the projects i.e. preparatory phase, works phase and consolidation phase. The next installment of central fund is released on receipt of evaluation report and action taken on the recommendations of the evaluating agency.”

11. **During the course of examination by the Committee, it came out that out of 74.59 million hectare of identified area, the project area was limited only to 13.71 million hectare which comprised of 27,439 projects. The Committee also noticed that out of 27,439 projects, 6859 projects were still ongoing out of which 1008 projects were as old as seven years. Keeping in view the tardy progress in completion of DPAP projects, the Committee had recommended that close monitoring including regular visits by the project implementing authorities at the project sites should be adopted by the Department. From the Government's reply, it is observed that so far 16,323 projects covering an area of 8.16 million hectare have been completed. Besides, close monitoring including regular visits by the project implementing authorities at the project sites, the States have been advised to complete all on-going DPAP projects as per the timelines set by the Department i.e. December, 2012. The Committee are not at all satisfied with the progress as out of 27,439 sanctioned projects covering an area of 13.71 million hectare, so far 16,323 projects covering an area of 8.16 million hectare, which in percentage terms come to around 59 %, have been completed. The coverage**

scenario becomes all the more gloomy, when the completed project area of 13.71 million hectare is compared with the total identified drought prone area of 74.59 million hectare which is a meagre 18% of the total drought prone area of the country. Keeping in view the half-hearted and regressive progress made by the Department, the Committee are apprehensive that the Department would be able to complete all on-going DPAP projects by December, 2012. The Committee, therefore, desire the Department to accord utmost importance to the issue by initiating a sincere, innovative and time bound delivery mechanism involving all stake holders. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the progress made in this regard.

C. NATIONAL LAND RECORDS MODERNISATION PROGRAMME (NLRMP)

Recommendation (Serial Nos. 10,11,12 and 13, Para Nos. 2.10, 2.11,2.12 and 2.13)

12. The Committee noted that with the objective of removing inherent flaws in the existing land records system and bringing efficiency, transparency and easy accessibility to the system of Land Records, the centrally sponsored scheme on Computerization of Land Records (CLR) was launched in 1988-89. Initially, the pilot-projects were initiated in 8 Districts of 8 States. The Scheme was subsequently extended to rest of the country. Upto 2007-08, 583 Districts in the country were covered under the programme.

The Committee had been informed that since inception of the scheme, the Ministry had released Rs. 586.60 crore till 31.3.2008 for the programme out of this, utilization of funds by the States is Rs. 431.35 crore which is approximately 74 percent of the total funds released. Funds were also provided for setting up Data Centers. So far, Computer Data Centres had been set up in 4434 Tehsils/Talukas, 1045 sub-Division and 392 Districts of the country. The Committee found that the performance of the programme had been abysmally low. The Committee were of the view that although land is a State subject and switch over from manual system to a computerized environment required different kinds of activities involving establishment of hardware, creation of appropriate software, digitization of maps, data entry/re-entry, capacity building, etc. twenty years is too long a time to achieve the desired goals. The Committee had been informed that the programme had been merged with NLRMP from 2008-09 onwards. The Committee felt that merging/renaming/ reframing the programme would not serve the purpose unless there was a strong will from the Government, which, in this area, seemed lacking. Regular monitoring, audit and capacity building exercise should be done with more vigour and renewed approach to achieve full computerization of land records across the country. Besides, corrective action with regard to

the implementation of the programme should be taken urgently so as to achieve the objective of computerization of land records in all the States/UTs within the stipulated time frame.

13. With the objective of helping the States in updating and maintenance of land records, strengthening and modernizing revenue machinery, carrying out survey and settlement operations and strengthening training infrastructure, SRA & ULR was initiated in 1987-88. Funding under the scheme was shared between Centre and State in the ratio of 50:50. The Union Territories were provided full central assistance under the programme. Upto 31.3.2008, funds to tune of Rs. 475.36 crore were released to the States/UTs. The Committee found that with the expenditure of Rs. 349.30 crore which was about 73 percent of the total releases, the Department had been able to construct 1366 record rooms, 4311 office-cum-residence of Patwari/Talathi, 412 Tehsil Kacharies and 64 Training Institutes. The Committee also found that there were 19 States/UTs where no record rooms had been constructed. Similarly, in 20 States/UTs no office-cum-residence of Patwari/Talathi had been constructed, in 29 States/UTs no tehsil kacheries had been constructed and there were 14 States/UTs where no training institutes had been constructed/renovated/upgraded. It goes beyond saying that the performance of the programme had not been up to the mark. Infrastructure development and capacity building were very critical in the success of this programme and these aspects were lagging far behind. The Committee recommended the Government to take corrective action and strengthen the infrastructure in a time bound manner.

14. The two schemes of computerization of Land records and updating of Land Records & Strengthening of revenue administration were merged into a single scheme of NLRMP in 2008-09. The Committee were informed that in the previous run programmes of CLR and SRA & ULR, the choice of activities were left to the States and UTs most of them opted for activities that strengthened revenue administration but not necessarily helped in updation of Land Records. The Committee were also informed that this 'hamper-of-activities' approach led to eddying, each activity was goal in itself rather than a step in systematic ladder like approach towards achieving updated Land Records. The Committee were also given to understand that the way the Schemes were framed, the exit modes were not defined, nor were technology options for survey firmed up. The system of monitoring was not emphatically spelt out and both the schemes of CLR and SRA & ULR excluded inter-connectivity. The Committee fail to understand as to why it took the Department nearly 20 years to reach to these conclusions in the aforesaid two programmes. The Committee

were of the view that these problems should have been identified long back by the Department and corrective steps would have been taken.

The Committee were informed that for Capacity Building the Department proposed to setup a National institute of Land Administration (NILAM), but it was still in the process of getting sanction from the Planning Commission. The Committee also found that upto 31.3.2011, the Department had set up 15 NLRMP cells in different States of the country and according to their assessment, each State and UT needed at least one such cell. The Committee were of the view that Capacity Building was an integral and vital part of NLRMP and therefore, urged the Department to take the issue of training and capacity building more seriously and expedite the process of consultation with the Planning Commission to get the sanction for NILAM without further loss of time.

15. The Committee were informed by the Department that under NLRMP from 2008-09 to 2010-11, Rs. 538.18 crore had been released for the programme but the utilization reported by the States/UTs was merely Rs. 22.34 crore which was just 4.1 percent of the total amount released. The Committee urged the Government to work in coordination with States so as to achieve the ultimate goal of NLRMP.

16. The Department in their action taken reply have stated as under:-

“All the States and UTs except A&N Islands have implemented the CLR scheme, which has yielded good results, but not consistently across the country. The CLR has been merged with another scheme of this Department, i.e., Strengthening Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records (SRA &ULR) and a new and enhanced scheme in the form of the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) was launched in the year 2008-09. It includes the new components of Computerization of Registration and interconnectivity between revenue offices and between registration and revenue offices, so that we can have real time, up-to-date records. So far 243 districts have been covered under the NLRMP. All the districts are proposed to be covered by the end of the 12th Plan. The capacity building is an important component of the NLRMP. NLRMP Cells are being established at Administrative Training Institutes/ Survey Training Institutes/ Patwar Training Schools in the States/UTs where comprehensive training on various components of the NLRMP will be given. NIC has prepared an MIS for online monitoring of the NLRMP. States/UTs are being requested to keep this MIS up-to-date. Interim and final evaluation is also an integral part of the NLRMP. Further corrective action will be taken from time to time

based on feedback. The Core Technical Advisory Group (CTAG) has also made important recommendation improving the scheme including the following:

- (a) NLRMP should be implemented at State level by a State Level Society, also to be known as Project Management Unit (PMU). The PMU will further allocate funds to the District level on the basis of project prepared by the District Collectorate for activities to be taken up under NLRMP in the District.
- (b) District-level projects will be prepared after a baseline survey of status of computerization and requirements to provide a stated level of service, so as to provide adequate flexibility to meet hardware connectivity and other resource requirements.
- (c) Training institution building and capacity enhancement at local level would be a key component.
- (d) The State PMU would be responsible for coordinating the preparation and implementation of the district-level projects.
- (e) The State PMU would also be funded additionally for training, institution building, software development, capacity enhancement at State-level.
- (f) The approach would be a demand-driven close ended project to incentivize States who show commitment to implement the project quickly and effectively. Concurrent and final evaluation would be embedded in the project.
- (g) The project funding would be linked to sector reform with respect to systems, processes, human resource commitment etc. A separate portal would track the progress of key parameters and updating of the data would be a key prerequisite to continued funding.
- (h) The project should be treated as a Central Flagship project and linked to the ultimate objectives of Conclusive Titling. Processed spatial and non spatial data required for use by stakeholders at Central level (including Agriculture, Urban Development, Coal, Mines, Roads and Railway Ministries, Planning commission, etc.) needed to be specified as outputs to be made available by States as per a standard meta data nomenclature, through appropriate Central portal architecture.
- (i) At Central level, an institution needs to be created under DoLR which can set standards for Land Administration including citizen services and data provision to stakeholder. This institution can also advise State PMUs on various issues relating to data management (including spatial data) survey technologies (including satellite data), training and HR development etc. The institution could also facilitate creation of roadmap for Conclusive

Titling and for development of mechanism for coordinated land use planning keeping in view needs of industry, urbanization, infrastructure, agriculture, forestry, etc.”

The matter is under consideration.

The SRA & ULR scheme was a demand driven scheme. Funds under this were released as per the proposals of the States/UTs. The SRA & ULR has been merged with another scheme of this Department, i.e., CLR and a new and enhanced scheme in the form of the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) was launched in the year 2008-09. It includes the new components of Computerization of Registration and interconnectivity between revenue offices and between registration and revenue offices, so that we can have real time, up-to-date records. The capacity building is an important component of the NLRMP. NLRMP Cells are being established at Administrative Training Institutes/ Survey Training Institutes/ Patwar Training Schools in the States/UTs where comprehensive training on various components of the NLRMP will be given. However, the CTAG has recently made important recommendations.

EFC for the NILAM has been prepared and circulated to the concerned Ministries/ Departments for suggestions/ comments. The suggestions/ comments have been received on this EFC. Now a meeting of the EFC is proposed to consider this proposal. Capacity building is an integral part of the NLRMP and the Department is giving adequate focus on this aspect. So far funds have been sanctioned for the establishment of the 26 NLRMP Cells in 21 States/UTs. MIS has been made online for effective monitoring of the NLRMP. Exit mode has also been well defined in the Guidelines of the NLRMP. Change from the age old method of the manual system of land records management is an ambitious project and the technology has also undergone a sea change in recent years. Accordingly the NLRMP was launched in the year 2008-09 incorporating the lessons learnt from the earlier schemes of the CLR and SRA & ULR and the technology developments in the related fields. Based on a review of progress of NLRMP, the CTAG has made a number of recommendations for improving the scheme, including the mandate for the proposed NILAM, and the matter is under consideration.

So far funds to the tune of Rs. 48.54 crores have been utilized under the NLRMP. The Department is actively engaged with the States/UTs to usher in this modern system of land records management. The vital issue of the capacity building is being addressed with the establishment of the NLRMP Cells. So far funds have been sanctioned for the establishment of the 26 NLRMP Cells in 21 States/UTs. Dedicated Project Management Units (PMUs) are also being established in the States/UTs so that the efforts of various Departments handling different components of the land records, e.g. Registration, Revenue, Consolidation, and Survey etc. could be coordinated effectively.”

17. While observing sluggish pace of implementation of the centrally sponsored scheme on Computerization of Land Records (CLR) which was merged with another scheme i.e., Strengthening Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records (SRA & ULR) and thereafter again amalgamated with a new scheme in the form of National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP), the Committee had recommended the Department to take up the issue of training and capacity building more seriously and strengthen the infrastructure in a time bound manner by expeditious setting up of the National Institute of Land Administration (NILAM). Notwithstanding the fact that land is a State subject, the Committee also recommended the Government to work with the States with better coordination so as to achieve the objective of computerization of land records in all the States/ UTs in a specified time frame. The Department have, however, informed that so far, 243 Districts have been covered under NLRMP. The Core Technical Advisory Group (CTAG) has also made important recommendations for improving the scheme. Since capacity building is an important component of the scheme, NLRMP cells are being established at Administrative Training Institutes/ Survey Training Institutes/ Patwar Training School in the States/ UTs where comprehensive training on various components of NLRMP will be given. The Department have also informed that EFC for the NILAM has been prepared and circulated to the concerned Ministries/ Departments for suggestions/ comments. The Committee are dismayed to note that the scheme of Computerization of Land Records (CLR) was initially launched in 1988-89 and since then the scheme has been continuously merged/ renamed/ reframed and now rechristened as National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) in 2008-09. Even after the introduction of composite NLRMP, the objective of achieving universal computerization of land records, strengthening of revenue administration and updation of land records is still a distant dream. The situation becomes more precarious in view of the fact that the recommendations made by Core Technical Advisory Group (CTAG) on capacity building are still under consideration of the Government. The Committee, therefore, would like to reiterate that the Department should take all necessary steps to ensure that the requisite wherewithal's for this ambitious programme, be it the implementation of the recommendations of CTAG, establishment of NILAM or Dedicated Project Management Units (PMUs), are readily available for achieving the desired results. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

D. CONVERGENCE OF WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT WITH MGNREGA

Recommendation (Serial No. 17, Para No. 2.17)

18. It emerged during the discussion with the representatives of the Department of Land Resources that Watershed development activities of the Department could be merged with the MGNREGA activities of the Department of Rural Development. During the evidence, the Secretary agreed with the views expressed by the Committee and informed that the Department had made it compulsory for every State Government to converse watershed development works with the MGNREGA works and guidelines had also been prepared for the convergence. The Committee were also given to understand that where good governance was prevailing in the implementation, convergence was taking place on the field level. It also came out during the evidence that very often the structures for watershed development in the field do not conform to the contours and were made without any consideration of technical parameters. In several watersheds, such structures had been washed away or have broken down, as observance of technical & engineering aspects had not been up to the mark. In some cases, structures had been washed away after just a few inches of rainfall.

The Committee were of the view that merely formulating the guidelines does not relieve the Department of its responsibility. It was also the bounden duty of the Department to see that the guidelines were implemented in letter and spirit at the ground level so that the convergence on the field was achieved. The Committee were also of the view that water conservation should be the focal point of attention under the watershed development programmes. Water conservation should be done at all places. If water conservation and management was not done even in high rainfall areas, there was likelihood of water scarcity for agriculture as well as for drinking purposes in lean seasons. The Committee recommended the Government to look into the above issues seriously and initiate corrective steps.

19. The Department in their action taken reply have stated as under:-

“Water conservation is one of the main activities undertaken in the watershed programmes of the Department of Land Resources. As recommended by the Hon’ble Committee, continuous focus on this vital aspect is being given in all watershed projects implemented by the Department.

Regarding convergence, department is emphasizing the States for having convergence with related schemes right from planning stage itself and that Detailed Project Report (DPR) should clearly spell out activities to be undertaken with IWMP fund & activities planned for taking up with convergence.”

20. The Committee note that water conservation is one of the main activities undertaken in the watershed programmes of the Department. Besides, the Department are emphasizing the States for having convergence with related schemes right from the planning stage itself. The Committee are astonished at the fact that till date, nothing tangible has come out either in relation to water conservation or convergence of watershed development works with related schemes especially the MGNREGA. Moreover, the Committee have not been given any information on the ground work initiated or proposed to be undertaken for ensuring the construction of watershed structures on the basis of established technical parameters that can withstand the climatic conditions and/or unscheduled wear and tear. Keeping in view the urgent requirement of convergence and water conservation in the watershed development programmes, concrete and result-oriented efforts should be made by the Department under intimation to the Committee.

Chapter II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Serial No. 1 & 2, Para No. 2.1 & 2.2)

The Committee take note that the Rule 331 G of the Rules Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha relating to examination of Demands for Grants by the Departmentally Related Standing Committees (DRSCs) was suspended by the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha due to rescheduling of the Financial Business in Lok Sabha to pass the Demands for Grants for the year 2011-12 during the Seventh Session of Fifteenth Lok Sabha without being referred to the DRSCs concerned. However, the Committee have examined the Demands for Grants and made report thereon. Since the Budget for the year 2011-12 has already been passed by the Parliament, the Committee endorse the same. Nevertheless, the Committee feel that the suggestions and recommendations of the Committee would help the Department of Land Resources, Ministry of Rural Development in analyzing their performance and implementation of various Schemes/Projects during the current year, which happens to be the terminal year of the 11th Plan period. The Observations/Recommendations of the Committee are given in the succeeding paragraphs.

The Department of Land Resources act as a nodal agency for Land Resource Management. The Demand for Grants (2011-12) of the Department with a plan component of Rs. 2700 crore and non-plan component of Rs. 6.20 crore was laid on the table of Lok Sabha on 11.3.2011. The outlay for the year 2011-12 is Rs. 40 crore higher than that of the previous year. The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that during the financial year 2010-2011, there was 28 percent increase in the allocation of funds under IWMP, whereas, during this year, the increase is only 3 percent. In spite of the Committee's recommendations made in their Second and Seventh Reports (15th Lok Sabha) the need for higher allocation for National Land Records Modernisation Programme (NLRMP), the funds for NLRMP have actually been reduced by 25 percent for the year 2011-12. Similarly, funds for other Schemes including Rehabilitation & Resettlement Policy have been reduced by 50 percent. The Committee take strong exception to reduction in funds allocation for these vital schemes in spite of their repeated recommendations for enhancing the allocation. The Committee recommend that the work programmes for these schemes should be revised vis-à-vis availability of funds and necessary funds may be sought wherever necessary.

Reply of the Government

In so far as NLRMP is concerned, up-to 31st December, 2011, 39 districts have been covered against the target of 40 districts. More districts are proposed to be covered in the remaining period of the financial year. So, no extra funds are required for achieving the physical targets this year.

In case of Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy Rs. 0.50 lacs has been kept as the budget provision. As the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill, 2011 is still being considered by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development, no extra funds are required on this account.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 3, Para No. 2.3)

The Committee's examination has revealed that the unspent funds under various schemes with the States were over Rs. 3000 crore at the end of December 2010. The Committee have been informed by the Department that under Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), funds are released in the individual project accounts and the next installment is released when more than 50 percent of the funds have been utilized which is one of the reasons for huge unspent balances under these programmes. The Committee are of the view that regular audit and monitoring of the projects through monthly progress reports instead of present system of quarterly progress reports and releasing the funds to the Panchayats for utilizing the same for watershed development will not only empower the people at the grass root level but will also help in minimizing the unspent balances. The Committee would also like the Department to review the project Planning/Monitoring system of various bodies and organizations under its administrative control and ensuring better co-ordination with State Governments with a view to improving the utilization of funds so as to ensure that funds are utilized evenly during the year. This would ensure proper utilization of funds and also help in achieving the physical targets set for various Schemes.

Reply of the Government

Based on the experience of implementation of DPAP, DDP & IWDP fund release system has been changed under Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP). Accordingly, central funds are now released in lump sum to SLNAs and SLNAs are releasing funds to projects for their effective implementation.

Unlike pre-IWMP projects (DPAP, DDP & IWDP), under IWMP the central funds towards 2nd installment comprising of 50% of the project cost are being released on 60% expenditure of 1st installment funds and submission of utilization certificate etc., and 3rd installment of 30% project cost will be released on 75% expenditure of the total funds released and submission of utilization certificate etc.

Further 1% of project funds have been earmarked for Planning & Detailed Project Report (DPR) preparation and 1% of project cost for monitoring purpose under IWMP for effective planning and monitoring. An online MIS has been made operational and data entry is under progress. This will enable to get real-time data about physical & financial progress of projects at all levels.

Under IWMP, funds are released to Watershed Committee's (WCs) which is either a sub-Committee of Gram Panchayat or a Committee constituted by Gram Sabha including members from SHGs, UGs SC/ST, landless and Women. WCs are implementing project activities at field level with the technical support & supervision of Project Implementing Agency (PIA).

The above measures are expected to help in real time monitoring of progress, flexibility to utilize funds by SLNA in more efficient manner by minimizing unspent balances with the projects at a given point of time.

Further, the issue of unspent balances has been taken up with State Government's in various fora like Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development's progress review with States, Steering Committee meetings, Regional Review meetings, SLNA meetings held at State level and Department officials visit to States. The States are advised to expedite implementation of projects and minimize unspent balances.

*[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources
(Ministry of Rural Development)]*

Recommendation (Serial No. 4, Para No. 2.4)

IWDP has been under implementation since 1989-90 and was transferred to the Department of Land Resources alongwith National Wasteland Development Board in July 1992. From 1 April 1995, the Scheme is being implemented on a watershed basis in accordance with the guidelines for watershed development. Presently, IWDP is being implemented in 470 Districts in 28 States. The projects under the programme are sanctioned in the Blocks not covered by Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP). During the period from 1995-96 to 2006-07, 1877 projects were sanctioned under the Scheme. The Committee were also informed by the Department that during the period from 2007 to 2010, no new projects were sanctioned. Of the 1877 sanctioned projects, only 748 have been completed so far and 85 projects have been closed.

The Committee have been informed that upto 31.12.2010 Rs. 4141.14 crore were released by the Government for the programme. Prior to 31.03.2000, projects under the programme were sanctioned at the cost norm of Rs 4000 per hectare funded entirely by the Central Government. The cost norm for the projects sanctioned after 1.4.2000 has been revised to Rs. 6000 per hectare. The funding of the projects is shared between the Centre and the States in the ratio of Rs. 5500 and Rs. 500 per hectare respectively. However, the projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.2000 continue to be funded entirely by the Central Government at the cost norm of Rs. 4000 per hectare. The Committee appreciate the upward revision in the cost per hectare for IWDP. However, the Committee fail to understand as to why the cost of the projects which were sanctioned prior to 1.4.2000 and not completed till date has not been revised. The Committee are of the view that not increasing the cost of the earlier projects will make them unviable. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to revise the cost of the earlier projects (sanctioned prior to 1.04.2000) also so that the objectives of the projects for which it was conceived are achieved in real sense.

Reply of the Government

As per the policy decision taken by the Department, no central assistance is being released in any pre-Hariyali project (sanctioned from 1995-96 to 2002-03) after 31.03.2011 (except for those projects in snow covered areas where a grace period of three years beyond the cut-off date has been allowed).

Since there is no ongoing project sanctioned prior to 01.04.2000 in the snow covered areas of Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Jammu & Kashmir, the requirement of increasing the rates does not arise.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 8 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Para No. 2.5)

The Committee note that an impact assessment study carried out by the National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) in 12 ecologically and economically disadvantaged Districts of 9 States on 837 watershed projects sanctioned during the period from 1.04.1998 to 31.03.2002 has rated 700 of them as 'average' and the remaining 137 as 'poor'. None of the projects had 'above average' performance. The study was based on 26 parameters *inter-alia* change in land use pattern, increase in cropping intensity, ground water increase, run off reduction, soil erosion reduction, surface water increase, decrease in waste lands, improvement in vegetative cover, increase in man days, increase in crop yield, etc. The study also revealed that there was an enhancement in cropping intensity by 24 percent, range being 2 percent to 50 percent due to implementation of IWDP and this resulted in enhancement of yields of cereals by 49 percent and cash crops by 28 percent. As regards to increase in income of rural households, the study observed that man days increased by 43 per annum per head, ranging from 25 to 68 days, because of better production systems due to implementation of IWDP.

In the context of NIRD study, the Department informed the Committee that the projects on which the study was carried out were old i.e. sanctioned between 1.4.1998 to 31.3.2002 and according to the Parthasarthy Committee Report (2005), these projects were suffering from some bottlenecks which have been addressed while formulating the common guideline of IWMP. The Committee feel that the Department should not take solace in proclaiming that the projects were old and suffering from some bottlenecks. The Committee are of the strong opinion that the Department should have acted swiftly and have wedged the gaps in implementation/execution of the projects long before the constitution of the Parthasarthy Committee. The Committee, therefore, urge the Department to be pro-active in formulation/planning/implementation of the projects. Considering the fact that the earlier study related to projects completed prior to March, 2002, the Committee would like the Government to appoint another Expert Committee to assess the impact of implementation of projects during the last five years.

Reply of the Government

The Standing Committee of Rural Development in its 2nd Report on Demands for Grants (2009-10) of the Department of Land Resources has inter-alia recommended that the Department of Land Resources should undertake a comprehensive study to ascertain the impact of watershed development activities on areas like agriculture, employment, increase in ground water recharge etc. Accordingly, National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad has been requested in 2010 to undertake a Comprehensive Study of Impacts of Investments in 947 micro-Watershed Projects, sanctioned and completed between 1.4.2002 to 31.03.2005, spread over 28 States. The report of is awaited from NIRD.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Para No. 2.7)

The Central funds released under DPAP programme from 1995-96 to 2010-11 upto 31.12.2010 is Rs. 3912.42 crore. The Committee observe that during 2010-11, under the DPAP, Rs. 221.84 crore has been released to different States. However, to the States of Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal, no funds were released during 2010-2011. The Committee were informed that from 1.4.1999, the fund sharing pattern between the Centre and State has been changed from 50:50 to 75:25. Also, with effect from

1.4.2000 uniform cost norm at Rs. 6000 per hectare has been introduced, but the pre-revised norm in respect of projects sanctioned up to 1999-2000 is still continuing.

Upto 31.3.2011, Rs. 340.45 crore was un-utilized funds with different DPAP States. Explaining the reasons for unspent balances the Committee were informed by the Department that the next installment of funds for the project is released when the unspent balance is less than 50% of the funds and it does not lapse at the end of the year but rolls over to the next year. The Department also informed the Committee that in order to check the unspent balances, the account of each project is audited every year and submission of audit report has been made mandatory for the release of next installment. The Committee would like the Department to utilize this mechanism for monitoring the progress of projects so as these are completed within approved cost and time frame.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Hon'ble Committee on auditing of accounts for each project is being followed and all efforts are being made to complete ongoing projects within approved cost & timelines fixed by the Department i.e. December 2012.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 8, Para No. 8)

The Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started in the year 1977-78, both in the hot deserts in Rajasthan, Gujarat and Haryana and the cold desert areas of Jammu & Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh. Later on, the coverage of the programme was extended to another six Districts of Karnataka and one District in Andhra Pradesh also. From 1995-96 onwards, DDP is being implemented on a watershed basis in 235 Blocks of 40 Districts in 7 States of the country. The Committee find that out of the total identified desert area of 45.7949 million hectare, the total project area is 7.873 million hectare only. The Department has informed that under the revised programme of IWMP, the 'identified DDP areas' have been given due priority while selecting the projects for implementation. Under the programme, 15746 watershed projects covering an area of 7.873 million hectare were sanctioned upto 2010-11, out of these 8977 projects have been completed/closed. The Committee are dismayed to note that out of the 8977 completed projects, only 2518 projects were completed in time and 6459 projects were completed beyond the scheduled time i.e. only 28 percent of the projects were completed in time and a staggering 72 percent of the projects got delayed. The Committee expect the Department to give data relating to area covered under the completed projects for proper analysis. It appears that the Department did not pay any importance to the programme otherwise most of the projects would have been completed in time. The Committee also strongly recommend that Government should review and strengthen their monitoring mechanism so that projects are completed in time.

The Committee have been informed that from 1.4.1999 onwards the total cost shared between the Centre and the State has been revised to 75:25 for all the projects. However, the projects sanctioned before 1.4.1999 continue to be funded on the old pattern i.e. 75:25 shared between Centre and State for Hot Arid (Non Sandy) Areas and for hot Arid (Sandy) and cold areas, 100 percent Central assistance has been provided. The Committee have also been informed that the funds under the scheme are directly released to DRDAs/ZPs for implementation of the programme both by the Central and State Governments. The Committee also find it amazing that the funding pattern of projects which have been sanctioned prior to

1.4.1999 have not been revised. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Department to revise the funding patterns of all sanctioned projects so that they do not suffer for want of funds.

Reply of the Government

So far 11,489 DDP projects covering an area of 5.74 m.ha. have been completed. The Department is closely monitoring the implementation of the programme through Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development's progress review with States, Steering Committee meetings, Regional Review meetings, SLNA meetings held at State level and Department officials visit to States. The States are advised to complete all on-going DDP projects as per the timelines set by the Department i.e. December, 2012 except the projects in snow bound areas of Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir, wherein a grace period of 3 years beyond the cut of date has been allowed.

In order to give emphasis on completion of ongoing projects under DDP, Department had not sanctioned any new projects w.e.f. 2007-08 onwards. The department has reviewed the implementation of ongoing projects and taken a conscious decision to complete them by fixing time lines. As a result of the various initiatives of the department on completion of the projects, a total of 8767 projects have been completed during 2007-08 to 2011-12 (as on 31.12.2011).

Regarding revision in the funding pattern, it is submitted that the projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.1999 were at different stages of implementation; therefore, the revised funding pattern was not applied to these projects. However, at present, no DDP project sanctioned prior to 1.4.1999 is ongoing.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Para No. 2.9)

IWMP was launched in 2009-10 by merging the programmes of DPAP, DDP and IWDP. These programmes were implemented on a watershed basis from the year 1995-96 on the recommendations of Prof. Hanumantha Rao Committee (1994). In 2005, after careful appraisal of the programmes, Parthasarthy Committee found that the aforesaid programmes of DPAP, DDP & IWDP were implemented in a fragmented manner without well designed plans. The Department has also admitted that there were lack of dedicated institutions at various levels under the previously run programmes. In different States, various Departments of State Governments with multiple responsibilities were supervising the implementation of the programmes. The Parthasarthy Committee has pointed out various critical issues in the previously run programmes like low cost norms, lack of cluster approach, lack of dedicated institution, too many installments, varying funding patterns, low emphasis on capacity building, monitoring, evaluation and Planning.

The Department has assured the Committee that the bottlenecks of the earlier programmes have been done away with in the new programme guidelines of IWMP. The Committee are of the view that the physiographic and demographic dynamics of the country is constantly changing and any change in the guidelines which appear to be relevant today may not be relevant in future. The Committee, therefore,

recommend the Department to be proactive to the needs of the people while formulating any programme/guidelines. The Committee are of the view that dedicated institutions, emphasis on capacity building and stringent monitoring and evaluation can help in achieving the desired objectives of this new programme of IWMP. The Committee urge the Government to take the desired steps and apprise the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

As recommended by the Hon'ble Committee, the department has amended the Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects, 2008 in the month of October, 2011 for smooth and effective implementation of the IWMP and circulated to all the implementing agencies at state level.

For effective implementation of IWMP, dedicated institutions with multi-disciplinary professional support have been established at State and District levels. Further keeping the need of stringent Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and adequate capacity building of various stakeholders in view, 1% of project cost each for M&E & 5% of project cost for capacity building activities have been earmarked in Guidelines of the programme. In addition, Department of Land Resources has given direction to all States to prepare a capacity building plan for conducting capacity building activities for various stakeholders starting from village level to State level under IWMP. The progress of these activities is reviewed in the Steering Committee meetings, Regional Review meetings, SLNA meetings held at State level and Department officials visit to States. An online MIS has been made operational and data entry is under progress. This will enable to get real-time data about progress of projects at all levels.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Para No. 2.10)

The Committee note that with the objective of removing inherent flaws in the existing land records system and bringing efficiency, transparency and easy accessibility to the system of Land Records, the centrally sponsored scheme on Computerization of Land Records (CLR) was launched in 1988-89. Initially, the pilot-projects were initiated in 8 Districts of 8 States. The Scheme was subsequently extended to rest of the country. Upto 2007-08, 583 Districts in the country were covered under the programme.

The Committee have been informed that since inception of the scheme, the Ministry has released Rs. 586.60 crore till 31.3.2008 for the programme out of this, utilization of funds by the States is Rs. 431.35 crore which is approximately 74 percent of the total funds released. Funds were also provided for setting up Data Centers. So far, Computer Data Centres have been set up in 4434 Tehsils/Talukas, 1045 sub-Division and 392 Districts of the country. The Committee note from the aforesaid information that the performance of the programme has been abysmally low. The Committee are of the view that although land is a State subject and switch over from manual system to a computerized environment requires different kinds of activities involving establishment of hardware, creation of appropriate software, digitization of maps, data entry/re-entry, capacity building, etc. twenty years is too long a time to achieve the desired goals. The Committee have been informed that the programme has been merged with NLRMP from 2008-09 onwards. The Committee feel that merging/renaming/ reframing the programme would not serve the purpose unless

there is a strong will from the Government, which, in this area, seems lacking. Regular monitoring, audit and capacity building exercise should be done with more vigour and renewed approach to achieve full computerization of land records across the country. Besides, corrective action with regard to the implementation of the programme should be taken urgently so as to achieve the objective of computerization of land records in all the States/UTs within the stipulated time frame.

Reply of the Government

All the States and UTs except A&N Islands have implemented the CLR scheme, which has yielded good results, but not consistently across the country. The progress of different States/UTs in this regard is indicated at **Appendix-I**. The CLR has been merged with another scheme of this Department, i.e., Strengthening Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records (SRA &ULR) and a new and enhanced scheme in the form of the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) was launched in the year 2008-09. It includes the new components of Computerization of Registration and interconnectivity between revenue offices and between registration and revenue offices, so that we can have real time, up-to-date records. So far 243 districts have been covered under the NLRMP. All the districts are proposed to be covered by the end of the 12th Plan. The capacity building is an important component of the NLRMP. NLRMP Cells are being established at Administrative Training Institutes/ Survey Training Institutes/ Patwar Training Schools in the States/UTs where comprehensive training on various components of the NLRMP will be given. NIC has prepared an MIS for online monitoring of the NLRMP. States/UTs are being requested to keep this MIS up-to-date. Interim and final evaluation is also an integral part of the NLRMP. Further corrective action will be taken from time to time based on feedback. The Core Technical Advisory Group (CTAG) has also made important recommendation improving the scheme including the following:

- (a) NLRMP should be implemented at State level by a State Level Society, also to be known as Project Management Unit (PMU). The PMU will further allocate funds to the District level on the basis of project prepared by the District Collectorate for activities to be taken up under NLRMP in the District.
- (b) District-level projects will be prepared after a baseline survey of status of computerization and requirements to provide a stated level of service, so as to provide adequate flexibility to meet hardware connectivity and other resource requirements.
- (c) Training institution building and capacity enhancement at local level would be a key component.
- (d) The State PMU would be responsible for coordinating the preparation and implementation of the district-level projects.
- (e) The State PMU would also be funded additionally for training, institution building, software development, capacity enhancement at State-level.
- (f) The approach would be a demand-driven close ended project to incentivize States who show commitment to implement the project quickly and effectively. Concurrent and final evaluation would be embedded in the project.

- (g) The project funding would be linked to sector reform with respect to systems, processes, human resource commitment etc. A separate portal would track the progress of key parameters and updating of the data would be a key prerequisite to continued funding.
- (h) The project should be treated as a Central Flagship project and linked to the ultimate objectives of Conclusive Titling. Processed spatial and non spatial data required for use by stakeholders at Central level (including Agriculture, Urban Development, Coal, Mines, Roads and Railway Ministries, Planning commission, etc.) needed to be specified as outputs to be made available by States as per a standard meta data nomenclature, through appropriate Central portal architecture.
- (i) At Central level, an institution needs to be created under DoLR which can set standards for Land Administration including citizen services and data provision to stakeholder. This institution can also advise State PMUs on various issues relating to data management (including spatial data) survey technologies (including satellite data), training and HR development etc. The institution could also facilitate creation of roadmap for Conclusive Titling and for development of mechanism for coordinated land use planning keeping in view needs of industry, urbanization, infrastructure, agriculture, forestry, etc.”

The matter is under consideration.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 17 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 11, Para No. 2.11)

With the objective of helping the States in updating and maintenance of land records, strengthening and modernizing revenue machinery, carrying out survey and settlement operations and strengthening training infrastructure, SRA & ULR was initiated in 1987-88. Funding under the scheme was shared between Centre and State in the ratio of 50:50. The Union Territories were provided full central assistance under the programme. Upto 31.3.2008, funds to tune of Rs. 475.36 crore were released to the States/UTs. The Committee find that with the expenditure of Rs. 349.30 crore which is about 73 percent of the total releases, the Department has been able to construct 1366 record rooms, 4311 office-cum-residence of Patwari/Talathi, 412 Tehsil Kacharies and 64 Training Institutes. The Committee also find that there are 19 States/UTs where no record rooms have been constructed. Similarly, in 20 States/UTs no office-cum-residence of Patwari/Talathi have been constructed, in 29 States/UTs no tehsil kacheries have been constructed and there are 14 States/UTs where no training institutes have been constructed/renovated/upgraded. It goes beyond saying that the performance of the programme has not been up to the mark. Infrastructure development and capacity building are very critical in the success of this programme and these aspects are lagging far behind. The Committee recommend the Government to take corrective action and strengthen the infrastructure in a time bound manner.

Reply of the Government

The SRA & ULR scheme was a demand driven scheme. Funds under this were released as per the proposals of the States/UTs. The progress so far under the programme is indicated at **Appendix-I**. The SRA & ULR has been merged with another scheme of this Department, i.e., CLR and a new and enhanced scheme in the form of the National Land Records Modernization Programme (NLRMP) was launched in the year 2008-09. It includes the new components of Computerization of Registration and interconnectivity between revenue offices and between registration and revenue offices, so that we can have real time, up-to-date records. The capacity building is an important component of the NLRMP. NLRMP Cells are being established at Administrative Training Institutes/ Survey Training Institutes/ Patwar Training Schools in the States/UTs where comprehensive training on various components of the NLRMP will be given. However, the CTAG has recently made important recommendations (as mentioned in the reply to recommendation at Sl. No. 10, Para 2.10) with regard to capacity building which is under consideration.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 17 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 12, Para No. 2.12)

The two schemes of computerization of Land records and updating of Land Records & Strengthening of revenue administration were merged into a single scheme of NLRMP in 2008-09. The Committee were informed that in the previous run programmes of CLR and SRA & ULR, the choice of activities were left to the States and UTs most of them opted for activities that strengthened revenue administration but not necessarily helped in updation of Land Records. The Committee were also informed that this 'hamper-of-activities' approach led to eddying, each activity was goal in itself rather than a step in systematic ladder like approach towards achieving updated Land Records. The Committee were also given to understand that the way the Schemes were framed, the exit modes were not defined, nor were technology options for survey firmed up. The system of monitoring was not emphatically spelt out and both the schemes of CLR and SRA & ULR excluded inter-connectivity. The Committee fail to understand as to why it took the Department nearly 20 years to reach to these conclusions in the aforesaid two programmes. The Committee are of the view that these problems should have been identified long back by the Department and corrective steps would have been taken.

The Committee were informed that for Capacity Building the Department propose to setup a National institute of Land Administration (NILAM), but it is still in the process of getting sanction from the Planning Commission. The Committee also find that upto 31.3.2011, the Department had set up 15 NLRMP cells in different States of the country and according to their assessment, each State and UT needs at least one such cell. The Committee are of the view that Capacity Building is an integral and vital part of NLRMP and therefore, urge the Department to take the issue of training and capacity building more seriously and expedite the process of consultation with the Planning Commission to get the sanction for NILAM without further loss of time.

Reply of the Government

EFC for the NILAM has been prepared and circulated to the concerned Ministries/ Departments for suggestions/ comments. The suggestions/ comments have been received on this EFC. Now a meeting of the EFC is proposed to consider this proposal. Capacity building is an integral part of the NLRMP and the Department is giving adequate focus on this aspect. So far funds have been sanctioned for the establishment of the 26 NLRMP Cells in 21 States/UTs. MIS has been made online for effective monitoring of the NLRMP. Exit mode has also been well defined in the Guidelines of the NLRMP. Change from the age old method of the manual system of land records management is an ambitious project and the technology has also undergone a sea change in recent years. Accordingly the NLRMP was launched in the year 2008-09 incorporating the lessons learnt from the earlier schemes of the CLR and SRA & ULR and the technology developments in the related fields. Based on a review of progress of NLRMP, the CTAG has made a number of recommendations for improving the scheme, including the mandate for the proposed NILAM, and the matter is under consideration.

*[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources
(Ministry of Rural Development)]*

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 17 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 13, Para No. 2.13)

The Committee were informed by the Department that under NLRMP from 2008-09 to 2010-11, Rs. 538.18 crore have been released for the programme but the utilization reported by the States/UTs is merely Rs. 22.34 crore which is just 4.1 percent of the total amount released. The Committee also find from the information provided by the Department that while no funds were released to the States like Goa, Tamil Nadu and Delhi, funds were only utilized by the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Andaman & Nicobar Island, Dadra & Nagar Haveli. The Committee recommend the Department to look into the causes of low utilization or 'Nil' utilization of funds by the States/UTs and take corrective measures. As land is a State subject, the Committee would like the Government to work with the States with better coordination so as to achieve the ultimate goal of NLRMP.

Reply of the Government

So far funds to the tune of Rs. 48.54 crores have been utilized under the NLRMP. The details are at **Appendix II**. The Department is actively engaged with the States/UTs to usher in this modern system of land records management. The vital issue of the capacity building is being addressed with the establishment of the NLRMP Cells. So far funds have been sanctioned for the establishment of the 26 NLRMP Cells in 21 States/UTs. Dedicated Project Management Units (PMUs) are also being established in the States/UTs so that the efforts of various Departments handling different components of the land records, e.g. Registration, Revenue, Consolidation, and Survey etc. could be coordinated effectively.

*[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources
(Ministry of Rural Development)]*

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 17 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 14, Para No. 2.14)

During the Study Tour to Mangalore in June, 2011, the Committee were apprised by the officials of Karnataka Government that they have fully computerized their Land Records and they do not need any financial assistance or the programme/project from the Central Government. The Committee recommend that the Government should study the model adopted by the Karnataka Government for computerization of Land Records. Such study would help the Department to modify/expedite their computerization programme. Needless to emphasize that this process will go a long way in helping the farming community/ common man in a big way. This will also help in greater transparency and expedient service to the common man.

Reply of the Government

The Karnataka State has done a lot of work under the modernization of the land records management system. The land records data base has been integrated with the registration process. Land Acquisition process has also been integrated with the land records data base. These good practices are being shared with other State Governments also. Karnataka is also a member of the CTAG, along with the States of Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat and practices are identifies in CTAG for adoption, and improvement in the scheme itself are also recommended from time to time.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 15, Para No. 2.15)

The Department of Land Resources administers the Land Acquisition Act 1894 and is the nodal agency for National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation. The Committee were informed that in order to give statutory backing to the National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy, 2007, 'the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill, 2007' and 'the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 2007', were introduced in the winter session of 2007 of the Parliament. The Bills were considered and passed by the Lok Sabha in its sitting held on 25 February, 2009 and referred to the Rajya Sabha for consideration. However, the Bills lapsed due to dissolution of the 14th Lok Sabha. Again, the 'Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill, 2009' and the 'Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill 2009' were drafted by the Department in consultation with the Ministry of Law and Justice. The Cabinet in its meeting held on 23.7.2009 approved the introduction of bills in Lok Sabha.

The Committee are disappointed to note that even after the lapse of 2 years since the approval of introduction of Bills in Parliament by the Cabinet, the Bills have not yet been introduced. The Committee feel that with the increasing number of litigations in Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation across the country and the discontentment in the farming community at large in the process of land acquisition, it is high time the Government should come up with a comprehensive Land Acquisition Act and Rehabilitation &

Resettlement Act, taking into account the grievances of the affected persons and the recent Supreme Court observations/judgments in the cases of land acquisition. The Committee recommend the Government to come up with the Bills in the current session of Parliament itself.

Reply of the Government

The Department has decided to replace the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 with a single integrated Bill, namely the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill, 2011 which incorporates the provisions of rehabilitation and resettlement also. The Cabinet in its meeting held on 05.09.2011 has approved the introduction of the aforesaid Bill. The Bill has been introduced in the Lok Sabha on 7.9.2011 and has been referred by the Hon'ble Speaker Lok Sabha to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development for examination and report to the Parliament. The Standing Committee has started the process of examination of the Bill.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Chapter III

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

- NIL -

Chapter IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para No. 2.6)

In order to address the specific problems of drought prone areas, DPAP is being implemented on watershed basis from 1995 onwards. The programme is being implemented in 195 Districts of 16 States. The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that out of 74.5913 million hectare that has been identified under the DPAP programme. The project area is limited only to 13.7195 million hectare which comprises of 27439 projects. The Committee are astonished to find that no new projects have been sanctioned under this programme from 2007-08 onwards. Out of 27439 sanctioned projects, 6859 projects are still ongoing and the Department propose to complete these projects by 2012. The Committee are further concerned to find that there are as many 1008 projects sanctioned during 2003-04 which are still ongoing i.e. even after seven years of sanction.

The Drought prone areas are amongst the most backward areas of the country and of the total identified area as drought prone in 16 States, the project area is only 13.7195 million hectare i.e. 18.39 percent of the total drought prone area. The Committee are perturbed to note that after 16 long years of operation, the proposed coverage of the projects is only 18.39 percent of the total drought prone area. The Department has informed that under the revised programme of IWMP, priority will be given to identified areas. Though it is too early to comment on the progress of the new programme, the Committee recommend the Department to complete the ongoing projects of the existing programme on priority basis. The Committee would like to be apprised of the actual area covered vis-à-vis completed projects. Close monitoring including regular visits by the project implementing authorities at the project sites involving people in the planning and implementation process and stringent monitoring will help the Department to complete the projects in time. The Committee also desire that the concept of accountability and fixing responsibility should be in built in project planning and implementation process.

Reply of the Government

So far 16,323 DPAP projects covering an area of 8.16 m.ha. have been completed. The recommendation of Hon'ble Standing Committee regarding close monitoring including regular visits by the project implementing authorities at the project sites is being followed through State Governments. The Department is also closely monitoring the implementation of the programme through Hon'ble Minister for Rural Development's progress review with States, Steering Committee meetings, Regional Review meetings, SLNA meetings held at State level and Department officials visit to States. The States have been advised to complete all on-going DPAP projects as per the timelines set by the Department i.e. December, 2012.

Unlike pre-IWMP projects, under IWMP Guidelines, there is an inbuilt mechanism of evaluating the projects by independent agencies after completion of each phase of activities of the projects i.e. preparatory phase, works phase and consolidation phase. The next installment of central fund is released on receipt of evaluation report and action taken on the recommendations of the evaluating agency.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 11 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 17, Para No. 2.17)

It emerged during the discussion with the representatives of the Department of Land Resources that Watershed development activities of the Department can be merged with the MGNREGA activities of the Department of Rural Development. During the evidence, the Secretary agreed with the views expressed by the Committee and informed that the Department have made it compulsory for every State Government to converse watershed development works with the MGNREGA works and guidelines have also been prepared for the convergence. The Committee were also given to understand that where good governance is prevailing in the implementation, convergence is taking place on the field level. It also came out during the evidence that very often the structures for watershed development in the field do not conform to the contours and are made without any consideration of technical parameters. In several watersheds, such structures have been washed away or have broken down, as observance of technical & engineering aspects have not been up to the mark. In some cases, structures have been washed away after just a few inches of rainfall.

The Committee are of the view that merely formulating the guidelines does not relieve the Department of its responsibility. It is also the bounden duty of the Department to see that the guidelines are implemented in letter and spirit at the ground level so that the convergence on the field is achieved. The Committee are also of the view that water conservation should be the focal point of attention under the watershed development programmes. Water conservation should be done at all places. If water conservation and management is not done even in high rainfall areas, there is likelihood of water scarcity for agriculture as well as for drinking purposes in lean seasons. The Committee recommend the Government to look into the above issues seriously and initiate corrective steps. They would also like to be apprised about the same.

Reply of the Government

Water conservation is one of the main activities under taken in the watershed programmes of the Department of Land Resources. As recommended by the Hon'ble Committee, continuous focus on this vital aspect is being given in all watershed projects implemented by the Department.

Regarding convergence, department is emphasizing the States for having convergence with related schemes right from planning stage itself and that Detailed Project Report (DPR) should clearly spell out activities to be undertaken with IWMP fund & activities planned for taking up with convergence.

[O.M. No. Z-18013/9/2011-GC dated 27 January, 2012, Department of Land Resources

(Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No 20 of Chapter I of the Report)

Chapter V

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Serial No. 16, Para No. 2.16)

As the basis of all economic activity, land can serve as an essential asset for a country to achieve economic growth and social equity. India at independence inherited a semi-feudal agrarian system. The ownership and control of land was highly concentrated in the small group of landlords and intermediaries whose main intention was to extract maximum rent from tenants. Land related problems such as tenancy rights and access to land for subsistence farming continue to challenge the country. The importance of land issue may be inferred from the fact that, notwithstanding the decline in the share of agriculture in the GDP, more than half of Indian population is dependent on agriculture for livelihood. From an economic perspective, the question of land is linked to critical issues of agricultural productivity, agrarian relations, industrial uses, infrastructure development, employment opportunities, housing and other related issues, each one of these aspects is crucial for enhancing economic growth, food security, goods for export and so on. Apart from its economic functions, land ownership has a more profound social function. The Committee appreciate the return of land reforms to the Government list of priorities which is evident from the fact that the Government has formed two high level bodies; One, "Committee on State Agrarian Relations and the Unfinished Task in Land Reforms" under the Chairmanship of Minister of Rural Development, and the other "National Council for Land Reforms" under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister. The Committee were also informed that the composition, terms of reference etc. of the Committee and the Council were notified in the official Gazette on 9.1.2008 and the Committee has submitted its report for consideration to the National Council. The Committee also note that the recommendations of the aforesaid Committee are being considered by the Committee of Secretaries (COS) and five meetings have been held so far. Since the process has already taken more than 3 years, the Committee strongly recommend the Government to move expeditiously in the matter and come out with a comprehensive long term policy in this regard. The final decision taken in the matter may be intimated to the Committee.

Reply of the Government

The "Committee on State Agrarian Relations and the Unfinished Task in Land Reforms" has submitted its Report for consideration of the Hon'ble Prime Minister. In the meantime, it has been decided that the recommendations of the committee may be examined by an appropriate Committee of Secretaries (CoS) before they are placed for consideration of the "National Council for Land Reforms". The CoS has submitted its recommendations on the Report which are being placed before the Council. The decisions of the Council will be intimated to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
21 March, 2012
1 Chaitra, 1934 (Saka)

SUMITRA MAHAJAN
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development

**Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
(SRA&ULR)**

(As on 10.01.2012)

S.No.	State/UT	Record rooms constructed	Office-cum-residence of Patwari/Talathi/RI constructed	Tehsil Kacharies constructed	Training Instituted renovated/upgraded/constructed
1	Andhra Prd.	4			1
2	Arunachal Prd.				1
3	Assam				1
4	Bihar	12			2
5	Chhattisgarh	10	484		
6	Gujarat		61		1
7	Goa				
8	Haryana	17	50		2
9	Himachal Prd.	48	244		1
10	J & K	2	288	5	2
11	Jharkhand				
12	Karnataka				2
13	Kerala	331	183		1
14	M.P.	232	545	10	13
15	Maharashtra	258	1025	252	7
16	Manipur				
17	Meghalaya				
18	Mizoram				
19	Nagaland				2
20	Orissa	3	2		2
21	Punjab	4	165		
22	Rajasthan	6	73	10	8
23	Sikkim				
24	Tamil Nadu				2
25	Tripura	32	46	85	1
26	Uttar Pradesh	74			11
27	Uttaranchal		840		1
28	West Bengal	331	267	50	3
29	A & N Islands		38		
30	Chandigarh				
31	D & N Haveli				
32	Delhi				
33	Daman & Diu				
34	Lakshdweep	2			
35	Pondicherry				
	Total	1366	4311	412	64

FINANCIAL PROGRESS (Release of Funds and Utilisation reported) under the NLRMP 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 (31.12.2011)

Appendix II

Sl. No.	States/UTs	Year								Total		Utilisation Reported	Unspent balance
		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Funds released	Districts covered		
		Funds released	Districts covered	Funds released	Districts covered	Funds released	Districts covered	Funds released	Districts covered				
1.	Andhra Prd.	3356.60	5			117.64				3474.24	5	18.75	3455.49
2.	Arunachal Prd.					48.6	1			48.60	1		48.60
3.	Assam			1806.12	20	329.625	7			2135.75	27	1747.69	2135.745
4.	Bihar	748.48	2	720.80	3	744.428	5	998.23	5	3211.94	15	156.625	1464.25
5.	Chhattisgarh			553.86	2	414.705	3			968.57	5	1055.436	811.94
6.	Gujarat	715.445	3			5527.24	12			6242.69	15		5187.249
7.	Goa									0.00	0	1024.00	0.00
8.	Haryana	285.06	2	1374.94	8	2101.48	11			3761.48	21		2737.48
9.	Himachal Prd.	488.95	3	326.82						815.77	3		815.77
10.	J & K	65.625	2			235.28		589.05	7	889.96	9		889.96
11.	Jharkhand					162.25	4	2227.66	16	2389.91	20		2389.91
12.	Karnataka									0.00	0		0.00
13.	Kerala			700.79	3					700.79	3		700.79
14.	M.P.	1266.33	5	4168.04	15	3031.83		1276.10	7	9742.30	27		9742.30
15.	Maharashtra	3693.01	6	788.78		117.64	10			4599.43	16	166.61	4432.82
16.	Manipur	168.53	4							168.53	4		168.53
17.	Meghalaya	431.43	3	192.32	2					623.75	5		623.75
18.	Mizoram					323.72	1	39.2		362.92	1		362.92
19.	Nagaland	58.97	2			181.625	2	574.54	2	815.14	6	58.97	756.165
20.	Orissa	924.27225	4	1467.22	3	147.05				2538.54	7		2538.5425
21.	Punjab	814.17	2			585.613	3			1399.78	5		1399.783
22.	Rajasthan			3901.94	4	235.27				4137.21	4		4137.21
23.	Sikkim	9.36	3			65.70	1			75.05	4		75.06
24.	Tamil Nadu							281.14	2	281.14	2		281.14
25.	Tripura	271.68	4			385.653		117.63		774.96	4	87.96	687.00
26.	Uttar Pradesh	1346.50	5	70.86		435.128	3			1852.49	8	25.99	1826.50

27.	Uttarakhand					40.00		77.5		117.50	0		117.50
28.	West Bengal	3991.55	10	3264.54	9			235.28		7491.37	19	436.36	7055.01
29.	A & N Islands	25.71	1	28.39		12.15		6.00		72.25	1	51.40	20.85
30.	Chandigarh									0.00	0		0.00
31.	D & N Haveli	24.29	1	33.68		33.68				91.65	1	24.29	67.36
32.	Delhi					40.00		77.5		117.50	0		117.50
33.	Daman & Diu			103.72	2					103.72	2		103.72
34.	Lakshdweep			4.21	1	162.20				166.41	1		166.41
35.	Pondicherry	190.00	2	36.93				117.64		344.57	2		344.57
Total All States/UTs		18875.96225	69	19543.96	72	15478.50	63	6617.47	39	60515.89	243	4854.08	55661.81
						70				925			825

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2011-2012)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY,
THE 22 FEBRUARY, 2012

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan - *Chairperson*

MEMBERS
LOK SABHA

32. Shri Gajanan D. Babar
33. Shri Maheshwar Hazari
34. Shri P. Kumar
35. Dr. Ratna De (Nag)
36. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy

RAJYA SABHA

37. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
38. Shri Hussain Dalwai
39. Shri P. Rajeeve
40. Shri Mohan Singh
41. Smt. Maya Singh
42. Miss Anusuiya Uikey

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Brahm Dutt - Joint Secretary
2. Shri A.K. Shah - Additional Director
3. Shri Raju Srivastava - Deputy Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee to the sitting convened to discuss
X X X X consideration and adoption of draft Action Taken Reports on action taken by the
Government on recommendations of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2011-12) in respect of X X X,
X X X and Department of Land Resources.

3. X X X X X X X X X X X X X

4. Thereafter, the Committee considered draft Action Taken Reports on action taken by the Government on
recommendations contained in X X X, X X X, and 21st reports of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2011-
12) of the X X X, X X X and Department of Land Resources respectively. After
detailed discussion, the Committee adopted draft Reports without any modifications. The Committee also authorized
the Chairperson to finalize the Reports and present the same to Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

X Relevant portion of the Minutes not related with the subject have been kept separately

APPENDIX IV

[Vide Introduction of Report]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE TWENTY-FIRST REPORT (15TH LOK SABHA) OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

I.	Total number of recommendations:	17
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government :	
	Serial Nos.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15	
	Total:	14
	Percentage:	82.35 %
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies :	
	Total:	0
	Percentage:	0 %
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Serial Nos: 6 and 17	
	Total:	02
	Percentage:	11.77 %
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited : Serial No. 16	
	Total:	01
	Percentage:	5.88 %