

TWELFTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMAND FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 24 April, 2000

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 24 April, 2000



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2000/Vaisakha, 1922 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1999-2000)

Corrigenda to the 12th Report
(13th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
17	3.20	9 from bottom	0.42	.042
23	3.37	11 from top	Nagland	Nagaland
27	-	5 from bottom Row 15	81.86	81.66
28	-	8 from top Row 5	332.46	332.45
28	-	10 from top Row 16	Delete 1.00 from Row 16 Add 1.00 in Row 17	
32	-	3 from top Row 15	Delete 78.87 from Row 15 Add 78.87 in Row 16	
32	-	6 from bottom Row 3	South Sikkim-IV	South Sikkim-V
42	2.19	15 from bottom	Stipulatd	Stipulated

N-reports/corrigenda

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	
ABBREVIATIONS	
INTRODUCTION	

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory
CHAPTER II	An overall analysis of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
CHAPTER III	Scheme-wise evaluation of programmes

APPENDICES

I.	Category-wise wastelands of India
II.	Statement showing the 8th and 9th Plan outlays and corresponding expenditure from 1997-98 to 1999-2000
III.	Details of IWDP Projects of North-Eastern States
IV.	Details about the changes made in the revised guidelines of Central Sector Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) for development of non-forest wastelands
V.	Minutes of the Eighth sitting of the Committee held on 27th March, 2000
VI.	Minutes of the Thirteenth sitting of the Committee held on 6th April, 2000

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri A. Brahmaniah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
10. Prof. Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
13. Shri R.L. Jalappa
14. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
15. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
16. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
17. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
18. Shri Punnulal Mohale#
19. Shrimati Raneer Narah
20. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
21. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
22. Shri Chandresh Patel
23. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
24. Prof. (Smt.) A.K. Premajam*

Nominated *w.e.f.* 6.4.2000 *vice* Shri Vijay Goel

* Nominated *w.e.f.* 24.1.2000

(iv)

25. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
26. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
27. Shri Maheshwar Singh
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agni Raj@
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri C. Apok Jamir
36. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat*
37. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal§
39. Dr. Mohan Babu*
40. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
41. Shri N. Rajendran
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
44. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

@Nominated *w.e.f.* 16.3.2000

*Ceased to be a member of the Committee *w.e.f.* 2nd April, 2000 consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha

§ Died on 13.1.2000

ABBREVIATIONS

ASSOCHAM	—	Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry
BE	—	Budget Estimates
CAPART	—	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CII	—	Confederation of Indian Industries
DDP	—	Desert Development Programme
DoLR	—	Department of Land Resources
DoWD	—	Department of Wastelands Development
DPAP	—	Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
ETC	—	Extension Training Centre
FICCI	—	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
HLC	—	High Level Committee
ICAR	—	Indian Council for Agricultural Research
IPS	—	Investment Promotional Scheme
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
JRY	—	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana
NABARD	—	National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development
NCWT	—	National Committee for Watershed Training
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation

(vi)

NIRD	—	National Institute of Rural Development
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
NTO	—	National Training Organisation
ODI	—	Overseas Development Institute
PHDCCI	—	Punjab, Haryana and Delhi Chambers of Commerce and Industry
PIA	—	Project Implementation Agency
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SAUs	—	State Agricultural Universities
SIRD	—	State Institute of Rural Development
SRA & ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	—	Technology Development, Extension and Training
UT	—	Union Territory
VA	—	Voluntary Agency

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twelfth Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. Demand for Grants has 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 (Ministry of Rural Development) on the 27th March, 2000.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 6th April, 2000.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2000

29 Chaitra, 1922 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments (i) Department of Rural Development; (ii) Department of Land Resources; and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

1.2 The Department of Land Resources implements schemes to increase bio-mass production, creation of rural employment, training and research etc. through development of non-forest wastelands, desert and drought prone areas in the country through people's participation. Besides, the Department provides quality inputs such as land reforms and betterment of revenue system as well as the maintenance of land records. The name of the Department was changed to Department of Land Resources *w.e.f.* 9.4.1999 and all area development programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development *viz.* DPAP, DDP, IWDP have been brought under it. In addition, the subject of 'Land Reforms' has also been entrusted to it.

1.3 The Department of Land Resources implements the following *important* programmes:

- (i) Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
- (ii) Technology Development, Extension and Training
- (iii) Support to NGOs/Voluntary Agencies
- (iv) Wastelands Development Task Force
- (v) Investment Promotional Scheme
- (vi) Drought Prone Areas Programme
- (vii) Desert Development Programme
- (viii) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
- (ix) Computerisation of Land Records

1.4 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for 2000-2001 is for Rs. 900 crore.

1.5 The Demand for Grants of the Department was presented to Parliament under Demand No. 71.

1.6 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on 9th March, 2000.

1.7 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the programmes/schemes that are being implemented by the Department, in the context of the Demand for Grants 2000-2001.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERALL ANALYSIS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

Extent of Wastelands in the Country

2.1 As per the written information the survey assigned to NRSA to know the extent of wastelands in the country has been completed. When asked about the latest position with regard to National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) study for identification of wastelands in the country, the Government in their written reply have stated that the total extent of wastelands has been quantified as 63.85 m.ha. It has been stated further that the Wastelands Atlas of India depicting the district level information on 13 categories of degraded lands is likely to be released shortly. The statement showing the category-wise wastelands is given at *Appendix I*.

2.2 When asked about the planning of the Government to develop 63.85 million hectares of land as estimated by NRSA, the Government have replied that out of 63.85 million hectares of wastelands, the extent of forest and non-forest wastelands is as follows:

Category	Area	% age
Forest	14.065	22.03
Non-Forest	49.787	77.97
Total	63.852	100

The development of non-forest wastelands comes under the jurisdiction of Department of Land Resources. The wastelands categorised as "Barren/rock/stony waste/sheet rock area" (6.458 million hectares) and "Snow covered and/or glacial area" (5.579 million hectares) are unfit for cultivation. However, while there may be some intermittent patches even in these categories, which can be developed, it may not be feasible to develop the entire wastelands at reasonable costs. Thus, it can be safely concluded that out of the total non-forest wastelands and such forest

wastelands, which form part of non-forest wastelands, an area approx. of 40 million hectares, can be taken up gradually for development. The Department of Land Resources proposes to sanction projects covering 40 m.ha. of area as under:

Plan Period	Area proposed to be sanctioned for development
IX Plan (remaining 2 years)	5.0 m.ha
X Plan	15.0 m.ha
XI Plan	20.0 m.ha
Total	40.0 m.ha

The projects covering a total area of 40 m.hectares would thus be sanctioned by the end of 11th Plan and these projects are likely to be completed by the end of 12th Plan period. The above estimate is, however, subject to availability of Plan allocations.

2.3 When asked about the quantum of wastelands, developed so far by the Department, the secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted as below:

“We are, at present, working through various schemes under the three programmes regarding IWDP, DDP and DPAP in about 52 lakh hectares. That is the quantum of wastelands that we are currently tackling.”

2.4 Further as per Performance Budget, the proposed physical targets under IWDP, one of the biggest scheme of the erstwhile Department of Wastelands Development are to cover 1,36,750 ha. during 1999-2000.

Comparative position of outlay sanctioned during 8th and 9th Plan

2.5 The comparative position of the outlay of the schemes/ programmes of the Department are given at Appendix II.

From the data given in Appendix II, the following, in essence, emerge:

Item	Rs. in crore
Outlay during 8th plan	1337.28
Expenditure made during 8th plan	1229.44
Proposed outlay during 9th plan	6542.45
Outlay as agreed to by the Planning Commission	1353.93
Outlay spent during the first three years of Ninth plan	857.27

It has been submitted by the Government that the outlay earmarked for 9th plan would not be sufficient to fulfil the objectives and targets fixed under the respective schemes.

Role of Private Sector to develop wastelands

2.6 When asked whether the Government have ever consulted the corporate sector to involve in the development of wastelands in the country, the Government in their written note have stated that to mobilise financial resources from corporate bodies, financial institutions including user industries and other entrepreneurs for development of non-forest wastelands, the Department of Land Resources, earlier, has had consultation with the representatives of various Paper Mills and Plywood-based industries, Nationalised Banks, State Forest Development Corporations, PHD Chambers of Industries and Commerce, National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development (NABARD), Agriculture Finance Corporations, etc.

2.7 Thereafter, the operational guidelines for implementing the Central Sector Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) were formulated and revised guidelines for the restructured programme had become operational in August 1998. With regard to raising of captive plantations for Paper Mills and Plywood based Industries, it was suggested that a rational nexus between farmers and industries need to be established. It was also suggested that the industrial houses should arrange good planting materials with known-genetic characters along with the support for necessary inputs for ensuring good productivity of plantations. The issue of leasing of government lands was also considered and the participants were suggested to approach State Governments as the subject of allotment of lands falls under their purview.

The cost of developing wastelands per hectare

2.8 As per the Performance Budget, an overall cost of developing IWDP project is Rs. 4000/- per hectare.

Annual data regarding employment under IWDP

2.9 When asked about the data yearwise of persons who have actually been provided employment under IWDP, it has been submitted in the written note that the thrust of the projects is on watershed development and not on wage employment. As per Mohan Dharia Committee Report the programme of degraded wastelands have the potential to generate employment for millions of families in rural areas. Besides the newly generated huge assets would provide additional employment opportunities through agro based industries and service sector.

2.10 The Committee note that whereas only half a million hectares of wastelands have been developed thus far, primarily in desert and drought-prone areas, with a mere one lakh hectares being treated as of now under the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme, Government have set for themselves the laudable but ambitious objective of raising the half million hectares covered over the last decade and a half to five million hectares in the remaining two years of the IX Plan, followed by 15 m. hectares and 20 m. hectares in the next two Plans so as to reclaim a massive 40 m. hectares by the end of the XII Plan. The Committee are of the view that this missionary zeal may end up as a dream unless adequate resources are mobilised and implementation vastly improved, based essentially on the involvement of local communities through the panchayats or other democratic institutions, and the participation of the voluntary sector and the corporate sector both for private profit and larger national goals. The Committee, however, note that the Plan and budget allocations constitute a minuscule proportion of the minimum requirement as evidenced by:

- (a) the IX Plan allocation of a mere Rs. 1354 crore in relation to the requirement of over Rs. 6542 crore projected by the Ministry to the Planning Commission; and

- (b) the persisting shortfall notwithstanding the welcome decision to allot more budgetary grants to land resources, including wastelands development, in the current year than the expenditure in the last three years combined.

2.11 The Committee seriously view the inadequate attention paid to the participation of the panchayats, the NGOs and the private sector, and the potential of operating on a mission mode for quick results. Accordingly, the Committee urge high-level coordination between the Government, the Planning Commission, the State Governments and the panchayats or other legally authorised local bodies and NGOs, as well as the corporate sector as a whole, to prepare a detailed action plan for the attainment of the stated goals.

Allocation to North Eastern States

2.12 As per Ministry of Finance instructions, 10% of the total allocation of the Department *i.e.* Rs. 90 crore has been provided exclusively for North Eastern States. It has been clarified by the Government that this 10% of the allocation is part of the total allocation for the year 2000-2001. The details of projects under IWDP in North Eastern States State-wise and district wise are given in Appendix III. As regards the implementation of DDP and DPAP projects in North Eastern States, it has been stated by the Government in their written note that there is no DDP and DPAP Block in North Eastern States and therefore new projects under these two programmes cannot be sanctioned in these States.

2.13 While appreciating the initiative taken by the Government to earmark 10% of the total allocation to North Eastern States, the Committee hope that the Government would strengthen the absorption capacity of these States so as to ensure 100% utilisation of scarce resources. The Committee would like to recommend that in the case of North-Eastern States, the unutilised outlay should go to non-lapsable pool.

Matching Contribution by States under the different schemes of the Department

2.14 The following is the change in the funding pattern in the schemes of the Department of Land Resources based on watershed guidelines:

Scheme	Previous position Central + State share (percentage)	Present position Central + State share (percentage)
IWDP	100 (Central)	100 (Central)
DPAP	50 (Central) 50 (State)	75 (Central) 25 (State)
DDP (Sandy arid areas)	100 (Central)	
DDP (Cold arid areas)	100 (Central)	75 (Central) 25 (States)
DDP (Non-sandy areas)	75 (Central) 25 (States)	
Other schemes of the erstwhile Department of wastelands. (TDET, IPS, support to NGOs/VAS, WDTS)	100 (Central)	100% on Community Land 60% on private land under TDET. State share is not involved.

2.15 When asked whether State Governments have been consulted before switching on to the existing pattern of matching provision, the Government have clarified that switch over to uniform funding pattern of 75:25 for the two programmes, namely, DDP and DPAP does not entail much of difference. However, switch-over in the case of these two programmes was made alongwith the switch-over to uniform pattern of 75:25 in respect of all other schemes of the erstwhile Department of Rural Employment and Poverty alleviation in consultation with the State Governments.

2.16 The Committee feel that since the revised pattern of matching contribution by States for various schemes of the Department implemented on watershed guidelines, has been evolved in consultation with the States, the States may not, in future, find any difficulty in providing their contribution.

2.17 As regards North Eastern States, the Committee recommend that the Government should consider of providing 100% Central allocation for the schemes of the Department keeping in view the financial and other problems being faced by these States.

Unification of different Area Development Programmes

2.18 A new Department of Wastelands Development was created by the Government in the Ministry of Rural Development on 2.7.1992. On 9.4.1999, the name of the Department was changed to the Department of Land Resources and all area development programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development *viz.*, DPAP, DDP, IWDP have been brought under it. In addition the subject of 'Land Resources' has also been entrusted to it. It has been submitted by the Government that though different Area Development Programmes of Ministry of Rural Development (*viz* DPAP, DDP, IWDP etc.) have been brought under the Department of Land Resources, the unification of all schemes/programmes of Watershed Development Programme undertaken by different Ministries/Department is yet to be comprehensively undertaken. The Government have also submitted that a proposal for transfer of watershed and soil conservation related activities to the Department of Land Resources is under consideration.

2.19 While appreciating that different programmes being implemented in the Ministry of Rural Development for the development of wastelands including the schemes/programmes based on watershed guidelines have been brought under one umbrella, the Committee hope that the final decision for the unification of all schemes/programmes of wasteland development would be taken within a stipulated time frame.

Training for Watershed Development

2.20 As per the written note, allocation of Rs. 2 crore has been made under a sub-head 'communications' to meet the expenditure for ongoing programmes, seminars, workshops on the schemes as well as through SIRD etc. During 1999-2000, Rs. 3 crore was allocated under

the head 'communication'. However, as per the replies furnished by the Government, 29.06% of the allocation has been shown as utilised. When asked as to how the Department would ensure 100% utilization of funds in view of the poor performance during 1999-2000, the Government have replied that out of Rs. 3 crore, so far Rs. 1.02 crore as lump sum grant at the rate of Rs. 3 lakh each in respect of 34 SIRDs/ETCs/Training institutions have been released. An amount of Rs. 1.54 crore has been released to SIRD/ETC etc. for organising courses/workshops/seminars on watershed development. This accounts for utilization of 85.3% of the allocated funds. They further replied that most of the SIRDs/ETCs have already been given the one time grant, the allocation during the year 2000-2001 has been reduced from Rs. 3 crore to Rs. 2 crore.

Watershed Training Committee

2.21 As per the written note, to give a boost to capacity building, a national Committee under the Chairmanship of DG, NIRD, for Watershed Training has been set up on 22-3-2000. The main functions of the NCWT would be as under:—

- (a) coordinate and advise the Ministry of Rural Development on training and capacity building in watershed development;
- (b) consider all aspects of training including development of training material and strengthening of capacity building measures at all levels in the area of watershed development;
- (c) guide the National Training Organisation (NTO) for formulation of a National Training Plan; and
- (d) organise seminars and workshops and evaluate performance of various training organisations at all levels.

2.22 The Committee are concerned to note that adequate attention is not being paid to training which is the essential pre-requisite for the success of the programmes implemented under watershed guidelines. They are surprised to note that the meagre allocation of Rs. 3 crore provided for the purpose during 1999-2000 has been reduced to Rs. 2 crore during 2000-2001. They urge that substantial allocation should be made for training to supplement the grants of SIRD/ETCs etc. to ensure the success of the said programme.

Maintenance of Watershed Project

2.23 As per written note, a Watershed Development Fund is created for each micro-watershed for post project maintenance. When asked who allocates funds for Watershed Development Fund, it has been stated in the written note that no allocation of fund is made for Watershed Development Fund. However, under the on-going IWD projects sanctioned under the guidelines for watershed development *w.e.f.* 1.4.1995, the contributions of villagers/beneficiaries are deposited directly into the Watershed Development Fund. This fund is operated upon by the Watershed Committee/Watershed Association for the operation and maintenance of the assets created under the project.

2.24 When asked whether sufficient funds are available under Watershed Development Fund to take care of the post development maintenance, it has been stated in the written note that as regards DDP, an amount of Rs. 1-2 lakhs will be available under Watershed Development Fund in each DDP Watershed Project for taking care of post project maintenance. This fund is to be maintained in high yielding fixed deposits. Initially as immediate maintenance costs will be negligible after completion of the project, these funds are sufficient to take care of maintenance needs in the project area from time to time.

2.25 It has further been mentioned that so far as DPAP projects are concerned, the first batch of DPAP Watershed Projects was sanctioned in 1995-96 for a period of 5 years. These projects are likely to be completed soon. The issue of post-project maintenance will arise after completion of the projects. For this purpose adequate financial provision has been made in the form of a Watershed Development Fund to be operated by the Watershed Committee for post-project maintenance.

2.26 The Committee find that keeping in view the fact that most of the projects are still continuing, the problem of post-project maintenance may not be so acute, at present, but feel that as the time passes and projects are completed, it will emerge as a stupendous task. In view of this, the Committee hope that the Government, while planning, would give careful consideration to the practicality of placing the entire responsibility for maintenance on local bodies without ensuring the financial health of the elected local authorities and their precise relationship to wastelands development projects falling in their geographical domain.

CHAPTER III

A. SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES UNDER WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

3.1 The Integrated Wastelands Development Programme is a main scheme of the erstwhile Department of Wastelands Development. The scheme has been under implementation since 1989-90. From April 1, 1995, the scheme is being implemented on watershed basis under the common guidelines for the watershed development.

3.2 The budget estimates for the programme during 1999-2000, was Rs. 82 crore which has been increased to Rs. 480 crore this year. Thus, during 2000-2001, the proposed outlay for IWDP has been increased by Rs. 398 crore over the outlay of 1999-2000. This includes Rs. 350 crore for ongoing EAS watersheds.

3.3 As per the written information, the physical and financial targets and achievement under IWDP during the first three years of Ninth Plan of the Department are as follows:

The Physical and Financial Targets and Achievements

Ninth Plan Period	Physical (in Ha)		Financial (Rs. in Crores)	
	Target	Achievement	Outlay	Releases/ Exp.
1997-98	1,27,000	90,000 (70.87%)	74.50	53.95 (72.42%)
1998-99	1,37,000	1,03,000 (75.18%)	82.10	62.00 (75.51%)
1999-2000	1,36,750	94,303 (68.96%)	82.00	57.49 (70.11%) (upto 22.2.2000)

3.4 When asked about the reasons for under-spending during the first three years of Ninth Plan, the Department have replied that under the new guidelines for watershed development a very high level of community participation is envisaged for planning, implementation, monitoring and maintenance of assets created. The community organisations and development of institutional mechanism is a time consuming process causing delay in the commencement of projects. This requires a lot of efforts on the part of Project Implementing Agencies/DRDAs.

IWDP Projects

3.5 As per written note the completion reports in respect of IWDP projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.1995 are still awaited. When asked about the gestation period of a project, the Government have replied that gestation period of the project is five years. However, due to participatory mode, the projects take more time to complete and the PIA/DRDAs seek extension for completion of the projects. When asked about the present status of these projects, the Department have replied that DRDAs have not yet submitted the project completion report. These reports are to be sent by the DRDAs, who take considerable time to respond.

3.6 The Committee note that the increase in outlay under IWDP during 2000-2001 is only due to merging of watershed component of EAS under IWDP for which an amount of Rs. 350 crore have been allocated. It is found that after deducting outlay for ongoing projects under EAS, the net increase under IWDP is just 48 crore, which is very marginal. They urge that substantial allocation should be made under the IWDP to achieve the set targets.

3.7 The Committee are concerned at the transfer of a vast component of the Employment Assurance Scheme to the IWDP, not because IWDP is not in need of additionality but because the thrust of the IWDP, as stated by the Department, is on watershed development and not on wage employment. Wastelands development is an excellent objective in itself but need not be pursued at the expense of assuring employment to poor people desperately in search of work.

3.8 While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee are concerned to note the underutilisation of funds, spilling over of targets and the defective monitoring system not designed to provide feedback on the progress of physical achievements, they observe that only a small part of the magnitude of the problem is being addressed under the scheme, with very low achievements. It is desired that adequate attention should be paid to the implementation of the projects under the IWDP to ensure the timely completion of projects to achieve the set targets. The Committee are concerned to note that DRDAs do not bother even to send the completion reports in time to the Department. They take serious note of it and would like that the necessary instructions should be issued to DRDAs and monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened. The casual approach of DRDA towards one of the flagship scheme of the Department underlines the need for re-orienting the IWDP to be essentially Panchayat-based, with the primary responsibility for planning and implementation to vest in Panchayats and other legally authorised local bodies with the full involvement of the Gram Sabhas in the selection of projects and the monitoring of implementation.

Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDE&T)

3.9 A Central Sector Scheme of Technology, Development, Extension and Training (TDET) was launched during 1993-94 to develop suitable technologies for the reclamation of wastelands for sustained production of food, fuelwood, fodder etc. This scheme is being implemented through Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR), State Agricultural Universities, District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs), and Government Institutions. When asked as to whether the Government have ever made an in-depth evaluation of TDET Scheme, they have replied that the projects are completed over a period of 3 to 4 years. Only 20 projects out of a total of 77 sanctioned under the Scheme have been completed. As the Scheme is comparatively new, it has not been evaluated, so far.

3.10 As per the written information, the physical and financial targets and achievement under TDET Scheme during 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 of the Department of Land Resources are as follows:—

Year	Physical		Financial	
	Targets (in ha.)	Achievements	Targets	Achievements
1998-1999	3000	3000	8.00	8.0495
1999-2000	3000	2000	8.00	4.7546
2000-2001	4000	—	12.00	—

3.11 When asked for the reasons for underspending during 1999-2000, the Government have replied that the expenditure has been reported upto February 2000. However, the complete budget provision of Rs. 8 crore would be spent and physical target achieved during the current financial year. When asked as to how the Department propose to utilise the enhanced outlay of Rs. 12 crore during 2000-2001, they have replied that it is proposed to take up new projects in special problem areas such as salt affected, water logged, mine spoils, ravines etc. and the enhanced outlay of Rs. 12 crore will be fully utilized during 2000-2001.

3.12 While hoping that the outlay for 1999-2000 would have been spent fully by now and the new projects are taken up during 2000-2001 to ensure 100% utilisation of the outlay, the Committee like that the scope of the scheme should further be increased.

Support to NGOs/VA Scheme

3.13 As per the written information, the physical and financial targets and achievement under support to NGOs/VAs during 1997-98, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 of the Department are as follows:—

Year	Physical (ha.)		Financial (cr.)	
	Target	Achievement	Allocation	Expenditure
1997-98	5300	3441	4.00	2.60
1998-99	2650	2471	2.00	2.02
1999-2000	2650	467	2.00	0.35
2000-2001	2650	—	1.00	—

When asked for the reasons for shortfall in achievements during the first three years of Ninth Plan and poor utilization of funds under this scheme during 1999-2000, the Government have replied that since the scheme has already been transferred to CAPART, the Department does not require more funds. Release of funds for on-going projects is being met by the Department and for the current year all the funds have been utilized. As new projects are not being sanctioned by this Department, enhancement of allocation is not needed. CAPART will be meeting the requirements of funds for new projects from its own allocations.

3.14 As per Annual Report, new projects under the scheme are now being sanctioned by CAPART. The Department has transferred all fresh applications and ongoing projects under the scheme to CAPART except 75 cases which are being implemented by Cooperatives and Trusts etc. When asked about the immediate requirement of outlay to complete the ongoing projects of the Department, it has been submitted by the Government that the immediate requirement of funds of these projects varies on year to year basis depending upon utilization of funds by the concerned DRDAs/ZPs. Out of the total allocation under various programmes, normally 60% funds are taken to be spent on on-going projects. As per the recent arrangement of the Department, the scheme of support to NGOs/VAs will now be operated by CAPART.

3.15 The Committee find that when asked about the requirement of outlay to complete the ongoing projects, the Government instead of addressing the specific issue, have furnished a vague reply. The Committee view it seriously and direct the Government to furnish a detailed reply on the said issue.

Wasteland Development Task Force

3.16 As per recommendation of working group of Planning Commission, the Watershed Development Task Force has been discontinued in the 9th Plan. The Scheme is being wound up during the current financial year. The Department of Land Resources has no proposal to launch projects in different States under Wastelands Development Task Force. The Task Force raised from ex-servicemen has already been disbanded.

3.17 When asked for the reasons for discontinuing the scheme, it was clarified by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence:

"It is not any task force at any permanent place that we are winding up, this was the name given to a single project under implementation in the part of Madhya Pradesh. It was called by that name."

3.18 While accepting the reasons for disbanding a specific task force in Madhya Pradesh, the Committee urge that the Government should think of further launching such projects in other States with a view to availing of the experience, expertise and excellence of ex-servicemen especially during the post-Kargil period.

Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS)

3.19 The scheme was launched in 1994-95 in order to stimulate involvement of the Corporate Sector/Financial Institutions etc. to pool in resources for development of non-forest wastelands and has been restructured to make it more popular and broad based, for being implemented during Ninth Plan and circulated to all States and other concerned organisations during August, 1998. The details about the changes made in the revised guidelines of IPS are given at Appendix IV.

3.20 Financial and Physical Achievement under IPS

Year	Physical (in ha.)		Financial (Rs. in crore)	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
1998-99	100	21	1.60	0.42
1999-2000	600	—	2.00 †	0.03
2000-2001	150	—	.5	—

3.21 When asked for the reasons for shortfall in financial achievement during 1999-2000, it has been stated in the written replies that the revised guidelines of the restructured programme were circulated during August, 1998. Due to lack of publicity/awareness, more number of projects could not be taken up and therefore there is a shortfall in financial achievements *viz-a-viz* budget provision during

1999-2000. Further it has been mentioned that in order to publicise the scheme and raise awareness among the farmers, one National workshop at New Delhi and two Regional workshop in Tamil Nadu and Mizoram had already been organised. Few more National and Regional workshops are proposed to be organised during next year in various States involving the representatives from Nationalised/Scheduled Commercial Banks, NABARD, Industrial/Corporate House and State Governments.

3.22 As regards shortfall in achievement of physical targets, it has been submitted by the Department in the written note that so far during 1999-2000, funds under this scheme were released only for ongoing projects. Therefore, physical achievement has not been indicated during 1999-2000. However, few new projects would be sanctioned and physical target will be fully achieved during 1999-2000.

Budget Estimates 2000-2001

3.23 As per Performance Budget, the outlay for 2000-2001 for the Scheme is Rs. 0.5 crore. When asked whether this outlay will be sufficient to meet the target under the newly restructured Scheme, the Government in their written replies have stated that efforts will be made to sanction more projects during 2000-2001 and if required, necessary reappropriation will be made under this Scheme to meet the target.

3.24 The Committee find that the scope of implementation of IPS is very limited. They emphasise that keeping in view the resource constraints with the Government there is an urgent need to involve private sector to achieve the set goals. To attain the laudable objectives of developing 40 m. hectares by the end of 11th Plan, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to take the following steps to involve and attract private sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country:

- (i) the Government should interact with the federations of industry and commerce, such as CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, who have not been involved in the National and Regional Workshops organised thus far;

- (ii) the Government should widen the approach to industry which has thus far been restricted regionally to the PHD Chamber and industry-wise to the pulp and paper industry, besides being concentrated on plantations to the virtual exclusion of other methods of land reclamation;
- (iii) the possibility of harnessing the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, at the highest level, to stimulate corporate sector involvement should be examined;
- (iv) the Government should request the Ministry of Finance to examine the possibility of providing fiscal incentives which would exponentially raise the level of corporate sector participation in wastelands development; and
- (v) a high-level review, in consultation with the Finance Ministry and the RBI, of the role of financial institutions and scheduled banks in the implementation of schemes of the Department should be made by the Government.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)

3.25 DPAP is an area development programme designed to tackle the problem of drought with a long-term perspective based on strategy of optimum utilisation of land, water and human resources. This is a centrally sponsored scheme, which was funded on a matching basis by the Centre and States. However, with effect from 1st April, 1999 the allocation is shared on 75:25 basis between the Centre and State Government in respect of new projects sanctioned during 1999-2000.

3.26 The tentative Central allocation for the programme for the 8th Five Year Plan was Rs. 500 crore and the final allocation was Rs. 448.26 crore. The tentative allocation for the Ninth Five Year Plan is Rs. 700 crore. Year-wise allocation is as below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Allocation
1997-98	115.00
1998-99	95.00
1999-2000	95.00
2000-2001	190.00

3.27 The programme was started in 1973-74. It covers 947 blocks in 155 districts of 13 States spread over 7.45 lakh sq. km. When asked about the total area in the country to be covered under DPAP and the planning on the part of the Government to cover the total blocks in the country, the Government have replied that on the basis of rainfall and irrigation status and moisture index, 947 blocks in 155 districts of 13 States are identified as drought prone, all of which are covered under DPAP.

No. of ongoing projects	6057
Unspent balances as on 1.4.1999	112.80 crore
Central Release	54.48 crore
State release	54.48 crore
Total availability of funds	221.77 crore
Expenditure	52.23 crore
percentage of expenditure to total available funds	23.55%

During 1999-2000, 2278 of these ongoing projects are likely to be completed.

3.28 When asked about the steps being taken to contain the huge unspent balances, the Government have stated that in order to ensure that unspent balances are restricted to the minimum, the criteria for release of subsequent instalment has been made stricter. As per this criteria, the subsequent instalment is released only when the opening balance as on 1st April of the year and at least 50% of the last release is fully utilised.

3.29 When asked about the reasons for such a dismal financial progress of the programme, the Government have stated that between 1995-96 to 1998-99, a total of Rs. 802.32 crore was released to DPAP districts as Central and State share against which Rs. 667.31 crore was reported as spent. This works out to an expenditure level of 83.17%. The figures on unspent balances, releases and expenditure indicated above pertain to 1999-2000 upto 31.1.2000 and do not reflect the true picture for the whole year. The percentage of 83 is likely to show an improvement by the end of March, 2000.

Proposal by the Ministry and allocation by the Planning Commission for annual plans during 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Year	Proposal	Allocation
1997-98	240.00	70.00
1998-99	130.00	90.00
1999-2000	85.00	85.00
2000-2001	268.00	135.00

3.34 While noting that the allocation during 2000-2001 has been enhanced from Rs. 85 crore to Rs. 135 crore, the Committee would like to know the details of efforts being made to ensure 100% utilisation of outlay.

B. Scheme-wise evaluation of Programmes Under Land Reforms Division

Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

3.35 As per the written information the funds released during the 9th Plan are as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Release of funds
1997-98	18.80	18.80	18.83
1998-99	8.80	8.80	9.05
1999-2000	10.00	10.00	8.08 (as on 22.2.2000)
2000-2001	25.00		

3.36 When asked as to why the 9th Plan allocation for the scheme has not been finalised so far, the Government have replied that the 9th Plan allocation for the scheme of SRA and ULR was tentatively fixed at Rs. 40.00 crore. However, the Department has requested the Planning Commission to enhance the allocation.

3.30 The Committee are concerned to note the huge underspending under the programme and would like to be apprised about the position of unspent balances in each of the DPAP project. It is urged that the Government should review the implementation of the programme and try to critically analyse the reasons for underspending in the respective blocks.

Desert Development Programme (DDP)

3.31 D.D.P. aims at controlling desertification and to conserve, develop and harness land, water and other natural resources for restoration of ecological balance in the long run and also to raise the levels of production, income and to generate employment through irrigation, afforestation, dry land farming etc. From 1995-96, desert areas have been identified under three categories, namely Hot Sandy Arid Areas, Hot Arid Areas and Cold Arid Areas. Allocation is shared on 75:25 basis between the Centre and the States in case of projects sanctioned after 1.4.1999.

3.32 As per the written information, the Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actual expenditure during 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 under this programme of the Department are as follows:—

Year	B.E.	R.E.	Expenditure
1998-99	90.00	80.00	80.00
1999-2000	85.00	85.00	31.11 (Jan. 2000)
2000-2001	135.00	—	—

3.33 When asked for the reasons for reduction of outlay at RE stage during 1998-99, the Department have stated that an overall financial cut was made in the Budget of the Ministry as a whole. On this account, allocation of DDP was reduced by Rs. 10 crore at RE stage in 1998-99. As per the written information, total allocation for 8th Plan, tentative Central Allocation for 9th Plan and allocation approved by Planning Commission are as follows:—

	(Rs. in crore)
Tentative Central Allocation for 8th Plan	500.00
The total year-wise allocation made during 8th Plan	410.00
Tentative Central Allocation for 9th Plan	1430.00

Proposal by the Ministry and allocation by the Planning Commission for annual plans during 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Year	Proposal	Allocation
1997-98	240.00	70.00
1998-99	130.00	90.00
1999-2000	85.00	85.00
2000-2001	268.00	135.00

3.34 While noting that the allocation during 2000-2001 has been enhanced from Rs. 85 crore to Rs. 135 crore, the Committee would like to know the details of efforts being made to ensure 100% utilisation of outlay.

B. Scheme-wise evaluation of Programmes Under Land Reforms Division

Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

3.35 As per the written information the funds released during the 9th Plan are as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Release of funds
1997-98	18.80	18.80	18.83
1998-99	8.80	8.80	9.05
1999-2000	10.00	10.00	8.08 (as on 22.2.2000)
2000-2001	25.00		

3.36 When asked as to why the 9th Plan allocation for the scheme has not been finalised so far, the Government have replied that the 9th Plan allocation for the scheme of SRA and ULR was tentatively fixed at Rs. 40.00 crore. However, the Department has requested the Planning Commission to enhance the allocation.

3.37 As per the written note, in Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Nagaland and UT Administration of Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep, there are no proper land records. When asked what steps are being taken for creating land records for the above mentioned State/UTs, it has been submitted that the Government of India is providing financial assistance to the States/UTs including North-Eastern States where no land records exist for updating of land records under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). Under this scheme funds have also been provided to the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Nagaland and UT Administration of Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep to take up survey and settlement operations for proper maintaining of their land records.

3.38 The Committee are concerned to note that the Government do not have the data of the districts where land records have been updated so far. The Committee express their grave apprehensions about the efficacy of the Government in completing the task of updating land records when they do not even possess the upto date data in respect of those districts where the Government have claimed that they have completed the updating work, since the correction and updating of land records would be crucial to preparing the proposed Central Scheme on the Consolidation of Landholdings, with a view to proposing it to the Planning Commission for the required financing in the Xth Plan, the Committee urge that the Department establish a mission mode to expeditiously prepare the crucial statistical data and other inputs needed to undertake this vitally needed national requirement which has the potential of transforming the prospects for agriculture, rural development and poverty alleviation.

3.39 While noting the poor position of land records in most of the North Eastern States, the Committee hope that earnest action would be taken in this regard and 10% of the total allocation made under the scheme would be of help in this regard. They also recommend that the Government should pay more attention to complete survey/re-survey and settlement in the North Eastern States where these are overdue.

Computerisation of Land Records

3.40 A Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records is under implementation. This is a 100% grants-in-aid scheme. So far, 544 districts have been brought under the computerisation programme in the country and the scheme has been operationalised in 1557 Tehsils/Taluka/Mandals in the country.

3.41 As per the written replies, 8th Plan outlay for the scheme was Rs. 48 crore and outlay for 9th Plan is Rs. 150 crore. So far (upto 2000-2001) a total of Rs. 133 crore has been allocated. Thus there is a balance of Rs. 17 crore for the last year of 9th Plan. The year-wise allocation and expenditure for the first three years of Ninth Plan are as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997-98	20.00	20.00	20.19
1998-99	30.00	25.00	24.75
1999-2000	33.00	33.00	30.11 (as on 22.2.2000)
2000-2001	50.00		

3.42 When asked about the achievement of the programme it has been stated in the written note that computerisation of land records in 544 districts of the country are at various stages of implementation. In addition, funds have also been provided to States for operationalisation of the scheme in 1557 Tehsils/Taluks. During the year 2000-2001, the scheme of computerisation of land records will be operationalised in the remaining tehsils of the country. Also more pilot projects on digitisation of cadastral survey maps will be taken up and additional funds will be released for the on-going 544 project districts.

3.43 The Committee find that the allocation made during the 9th Plan is not adequate as out of the proposed allocation, Rs. 17 crore only is left for the next year. In view of this, they urge that the allocation of funds for the 9th Plan should be reviewed so as to provide adequate allocation during next year.

Consolidation of Lands Holdings

3.44 Finance Minister in his budget speech for the 1999-2000 has stated that fragmentation of agricultural land holdings undermines productive use of land. As such, he promised to provide special financial assistance to those States which undertake this programme. Accordingly, all the State Governments were requested to furnish information on various aspects of consolidation of holdings in their States and also furnish the amounts of financial assistance required for continuing or restarting the consolidation of land holdings programme. But no State has shown any interest in the programme except Uttar Pradesh. Keeping this aspect in view, a token provision of Rs. 1.00 crore has been made for this programme under BE 2000-2001.

3.45 As per the written note, in 14 States/UTs, consolidation of land holdings has not been done so far. When asked as to whether any assessment has been done regarding the outlay required for consolidation of land holdings in the above mentioned States/UTs, Department have stated that no assessment has been done in this regard. It is however added that a National Committee on consolidation of holdings has been set-up under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to look into the various aspects of consolidation of land holdings and give suitable recommendations in this regard. A sub-Committee has also been constituted to suggest the main features of the proposed Centrally Sponsored Scheme on consolidation of land holdings. The sub-committee has since commenced its work and is likely to visit a few States to gather first hand information on the subject, the assessment relating to financial requirement would be available only after the Committee has submitted its report.

3.46 The Committee would like to be apprised of the findings of the National Committee set-up to look into the various aspects of the consolidation of land holdings and the progress made in this regard.

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2000

29 Chaitra, 1922 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

Category-wise Wastelands of India

Sl.No.	Category	Total Wastelands (Area - sq.km.)	% to total Geographical Area covered
1.	Gullied and/or Ravinous land	20553.35	0.65
2.	Land with or without scrub	194014.29	6.13
3.	Waterlogged and Marshy land	16568.45	0.52
4.	Land affected by salinity/alkalinity coastal/inland	20477.38	0.65
5.	Shifting Cultivation Area	35142.20	1.11
6.	Under utilised/degraded notified forests land	140652.31	4.44
7.	Degraded pastures/grazing land	25978.91	0.82
8.	Degraded land under plantation crop	5828.09	0.18
9.	Sands-Inland/Coastal	50021.65	1.58
10.	Mining/Industrial wastelands	1252.13	0.04
11.	Barren rocky/stony waste/sheet rock area	64584.77	2.04
12.	Steep sloping area	7656.29	0.24
13.	Snow covered and/or glacial area	55788.49	1.76
Total Wasteland Area		638518.31	20.17

Source: 1:50,000 scale wasteland maps prepared from Landsat Thematic mapper/IRS LISS II/III Data.

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

APPENDIX II

Department of Land Resources

Statement showing the 8th and 9th Plan Outlays and Corresponding Expenditure from 1997-98 to 1999-2000

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan Outlay		1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-2001	
		Outlay	Exp.	pro- posed	As agreed to by Planning Commission	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp. Upto 20.3.2000	Outlay Pro- posed	BE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	PLAN															
	Commitment of Schemes of Erstwhile NWDB	6.42	6.42	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
1.	I.W.D.P.	206.75	216.16	3360.00	361.95	74.50	50.00	53.95	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	82.00	81.86	*642.50	*480.00
2.	Support o NGOs/VAs	13.35	13.75	165.00	10.63	4.00	4.00	2.60	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	0.35	2.00	1.00
3.	T.D.E & T	7.50	8.28	105.00	37.65	8.00	7.50	5.60	8.00	8.00	8.06	8.00	8.00	5.82	10.00	12.00
4.	Investment Promotional Scheme	6.00	0.22	1.00	6.04	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.03	2.00	0.50
5.	Wastelands Development Task Force	5.00	1.76	3.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.79	0.05	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
6.	Communications	1.45	1.04	102.00	10.78	4.00	1.50	1.42	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	0.87	2.00	2.00	
6.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	1.45	0.14	19.00	3.19	1.00	0.30	0.04	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.17	1.00	1.00	
8.	Board Secretariat	5.48	4.89	##	8.69	1.50	1.50	1.27	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.53	2.50	2.50	
9.	Promotional & Critical Support Services	1.50	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	
10.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	448.26	442.36	700.00	465.00	115.00	100.75	100.75	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.00	357.00	190.00	
11.	Desert Development Programme	410.00	375.89	1430.00	255.00	70.00	70.00	70.00	90.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	65.72	268.00	136.00	
12.	Computerisation of Land Records	48.00	69.42	332.46	150.00	20.00	20.00	20.19	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	30.79	110.00	50.00	
13.	SRA & ULR	175.00	98.23	325.00	40.00	18.80	18.80	18.97	8.80	8.80	9.05	10.00	10.00	8.57	30.00	26.00	
14.	Consolidation of Land Holdings													0.00	1.00		
Total Plan		1336.16	1228.56	6542.45	1353.93	318.80	275.55	275.79	324.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	290.30	784.55	420.00	
NON-PLAN																	
1.	Secretariat Economic Services	1.12	0.88	1.61*	N.A.	0.20	0.19	0.14	0.25	-0.24	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.13	0.90	0.90	
				*upto 2000-01													
Total Plan & Non Plan		1337.28	1229.44*	6542.45	1353.93	319.00	275.74	275.93	324.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	290.43	785.45	420.90	

Expenditure under Board Secretariat was proposed to be transferred to Non-Plan side during Ninth Plan

* This includes Rs. 350.00 crores for ongoing watershed projects under EAS

APPENDIX III

Details of IWDP Projects of North Eastern States

Sl. No.	State	Name of the District	Project Period	Total Cost (Rs. in Lakhs)	Total Area (in ha)	Release 91-92	Release 92-93	Release 93-94	Release 94-95	Release 95-96	Release 96-97	Release 97-98	Release 98-99	Release 99-2000	Total Releases
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
ARUNACHAL PRADESH															
1.	AR	West Kameng	98-99 to 01-02	60.00	1500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	0.00	9.00
Sub-Total				60.00	1500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00	0.00	9.00
ASSAM															
1.	AS	KARBI ANGLONG	97-98 to 00-01	245.20	6130.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.78	24.52	48.80	110.10
2.	AS	Nagaon	99-2000 to 03-04	500.00	12500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	75.00
3.	AS	Hailakandi-I	99-2000 to 03-04	265.96	6649.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.89	39.89
Sub Total				1011.16	25279.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.78	24.52	163.69	224.99

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
MEGHALAYA															
1.	MG	W. Khasi Hills	94-95 to 97-98	117.39	1800	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.51	0.00	36.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.42
2.	MG	West Garo Hills	99-00 to 03-04	200.60	5015.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.09	30.09
Sub Total				317.99	6815.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.51	0.00	36.91	0.00	0.00	30.09	87.51
MANIPUR															
1.	MN	Imphal	91-92 to 96-97	202.20	2200.00	0.00	0.00	83.66	34.12	29.70	13.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	161.06
2.	MN	Imphal (West)	97-98 to 00-01	267.00	6675.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.75	53.40	0.00	120.15
3.	MN	Senapati	97-98 to 00-01	55.72	1393.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.35	16.72	0.00	25.07
4.	MN	Senapati II	97-98 to 00-01	400.00	10000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	60.00
5.	MN	Tamenglon	98-99 to 00-01	500.00	12500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	50.00	125.00
6.	MN	Imphal (West)-II	98-99 to 01-02	440.00	11000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.00	44.00	110.00
7.	MN	Ukhrul	98-99 to 01-02	496.00	12400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	74.40	49.60	124.00
Sub Total				2360.92	56168.00	0.00	0.00	83.66	34.12	29.70	13.58	135.10	285.52	143.60	725.28
MIZORAM															
1.	MZ	Aizawl	92-93 to 96-97	359.95	4500.00	0.00	67.20	105.00	129.75	30.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	351.95
Sub Total				359.95	4500.00	0.00	67.20	105.00	129.75	30.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	351.95

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
NAGALAND															
1.	NG	Kohima-I	93-94 to 97-98	216.14	3055.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	37.00	89.20	44.13	0.0	20.81	0.00	216.14
2.	NG	Kohima II	93-94 to 97-98	516.00	9050.00	0.00	0.00	57.25	47.00	200.00	102.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	406.44
3.	NG	PHEK	93-94 to 97-98	362.53	6658.00	0.00	0.00	37.92	93.16	93.37	85.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	309.94
4.	NG	Zunobuto	95-96 to 98-99	100.00	2500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	30.00	0.00	55.00	0.00	100.00
5.	NG	Wokha	96-97 to 99-00	480.00	12000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72.00	48.00	96.00	96.00	312.00
6.	NG	Mokochung	97-98 to 00-01	480.00	12000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72.00	144.00	0.00	216.00
7.	NG	Tuensang	98-99 to 01-02	500.00	12500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	50.00	125.00
8.	NG	MON	98-99 to 01-02	500.00	12500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	00.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	50.00	125.00
9.	NG	Dimapur	99-00 to 03-04	500.00	12500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
Sub Total				3654.67	82763.00	0.00	0.00	120.17	177.16	397.57	333.81	120.00	465.81	246.00	1860.52
SIKKIM															
1.	SK	E. Sikkim-I	92-93 to 94-95	71.26	1345.00	0.00	38.57	25.38	7.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	71.26
2.	SK	S. Sikkim	93-94 to 96 -97	18.49	350.00	0.00	0.00	8.18	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.18

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
3.	SK	S. Sikkim-I	93-94 to 95-96	77.81	1595.00	0.00	0.00	37.42	31.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.35	0.00	77.81
4.	SK	S. Sikkim-II	93-94 to 95-96	92.04	1760.00	0.00	0.00	37.51	39.95	0.00	1.41	0.00	0.00	78.87	
5.	SK	S. Sikkim III	94-95 to 97-98	89.62	1770.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.58	43.17	22.78	5.09	0.00	0.00	89.62
6.	SK	S. Sikkim IV	94-95 to 97-98	93.09	1860.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.48	32.91	13.00	13.74	11.96	0.00	93.09
7.	SK	N. Sikkim	94-95 to 98-99	155.55	3513.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.97	47.54	35.00	35.08	6.96	0.00	155.55
8.	SK	W. Sikkim	96-97 to 99-00	220.00	5500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.82	0.00	34.18	44.00	99.00
9.	SK	E.Sikkim II	94-95 to 98-99	333.66	7425.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.43	92.57	103.01	35.00	57.65	0.00	333.66
10.	SK	East Sikkim-III	97-98 to 00-01	222.76	5669.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.41	0.00	0.00	33.41
11.	SK	N. Sikkim-II	97-98 to 00-01	480.00	12000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72.00	48.00	96.00	216.00
12.	SK	East Sikkim-IV	98-99 to 01-02	476.00	11900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	8.00
13.	SK	South Sikkim-IV	99-00 to 02-03	448.00	11200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.20	67.20
14.	SK	West Sikkim II	99-00 to 02-03	362.40	9060.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	54.36	54.36
Sub Total				3140.68	74947.00	0.00	38.57	108.49	198.76	216.19	196.02	194.32	176.10	261.56	1390.01
TRIPURA															
1.	TP	S. Tripura	94-95 to 96-97	145.44	1792.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34.58	0.00	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	134.58
Sub Total				145.44	1792.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34.58	0.00	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	134.58

APPENDIX IV

Details about the changes made in the revised guidelines of Central Sector Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) for development of non-forest wastelands

Old Guidelines	Revised Guidelines
1. Quantum of Subsidy	
<p>(a) General Category including small and Marginal Farmers</p> <p>— Rs. 25 lakhs or 25% of the total cost of the project as firmed up by financial institutions/banks, whichever is less.</p>	<p>(a) General Category (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— 25% of on-farm development activities or Rs. 25 lakhs, whichever is less</p> <p>(b) Small Farmers (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— 30% of on-farm development activities or Rs. 25 lakhs, whichever is less</p>
<p>(b) SCs/STs Farmers</p> <p>— 50% of the total project cost subject to a ceiling of Rs. 50,000/- per project.</p>	<p>(c) Marginal Farmers (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— 50% of on-farm development activities or Rs. 25 lakhs, whichever is less.</p> <p>(d) SC/ST farmers without any limit in the area of holding (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— 50% of on-farm development activities or Rs. 25 lakhs, whichever is less.</p>
2. Promoters Contribution	
<p>(a) General Category including small and marginal farmers.</p> <p>— 25% of the total cost of the project as firmed up by the financial institution/bank.</p>	<p>(a) General category (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— Atleast 25% of the project cost</p> <p>(b) Small Farmers (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— Atleast 10% of the project cost.</p>

Old Guidelines	Revised Guidelines
(b) SCs/STs — NIL —	<p>(c) Marginal Farmers (Individual/Group)</p> <p>— Nil, however, at the time of execution of the project, the family labour should be involved to provide self-employment ensuring participation.</p> <p>(d) SC/ST Farmers without limit in the area of holding (Individual/Group).</p> <p>— Nil, however, at the time of execution of the project, the family labour should be involved to provide self-employment ensuring participation.</p>
3. Financial Institutions/Banks	
— Nationalised Banks only.	
4. Other Changes	<p>— Nationalized Banks, Scheduled Commercial Banks, Regional Rural Banks, Land Development Banks and Co-operative Banks.</p> <p>(a) In case an independent Agency/organisation/NGO assists in mobilising the group of farmers and linking them with the concerned banks/financial institutions, it would be paid 3% of the project cost for the purpose and this amount shall be paid by the bank/financial institutions to the Agency/Organisation/NGO from within the Central Promotional subsidy of DOWD admissible to individual/group of farmers.</p> <p>(b) The average project cost for on-farm development activities is restricted to around 20,000 per ha.</p> <p>(c) To ensure viability of the project, a minimum area of 4 ha. should be considered with a minimum project period of five years.</p> <p>(d) The support in the form of subsidy is given only for Agro forestry projects.</p>

APPENDIX V

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 27TH MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri P.R. Kyndiah — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
4. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Vijay Goel
7. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
8. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
9. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
10. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
11. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
12. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
13. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
14. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
15. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri S. Agni Raj
17. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
18. Shri C. Apok Jamir
19. Prof. A Lakshmisagar
20. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
21. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

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

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. Shri Arun Bhatnagar | — | Secretary |
| 2. Shri Rangan Dutta | — | DG, CAPART |
| 3. Shri C.S. Rao | — | Addl. Secy. & FA |
| 4. Shri Mohan Kanda | — | Addl. Secretary |

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri P.R. Kyndiah to act as Chairman for the sitting under rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed representatives of the Department of Land Resources in the Ministry of Rural Development to the sitting. He also drew the attention of the witnesses to the Provision of Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 6TH APRIL, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1610 hrs. in Committee Room
'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri A. Brahmanaiah
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
6. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
7. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
8. Prof. Kailasho Devi
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
11. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
12. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shrimati Raneer Narah
15. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar

17. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
18. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
19. Shri C. Apok Jamir
20. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
21. Shri N. Rajendran
22. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R. Kothandaraman | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. The Committee then adopted the Report on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Department of Land Resources with certain modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the Report after getting it factually verified from the Department concerned and present the same to the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of the Minutes dated 6.4.2000)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1	4	—	—	<p><i>after the last line, add the following:</i></p> <p>“Further as per Performance Budget, the proposed physical targets under IWDP, one of the biggest scheme of the erstwhile Department of Wastelands Development are to cover 1,36,750 ha. during 1999-2000.”</p>
2.	6&7	2.9, 2.10 & 2.11	—	<p>For Paras 2.9, 2.10 and 2.11</p> <p><i>Read the following:</i></p> <p>“2.10 The Committee note that whereas only half a million hectares of wastelands have been developed thus far, primarily in desert and drought-prone areas, with a mere one lakh hectares being treated as of now under the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme, Government have set for themselves the laudable but ambitious objective of raising the half million hectares covered over the last decade</p>

1

2

3

4

5

and a half to five million hectares in the remaining two years of the IX Plan, followed by 15 m. hectares and 20 m. hectares in the next two Plans so as to reclaim a massive 40 m. hectares by the end of the XI Plan. The Committee are of the view that this missionary zeal may end up as a dream unless adequate resources are mobilised and implementation vastly improved, based essentially on the involvement of local communities through the panchayats or other democratic institutions, and the participation of the voluntary sector and the corporate sector both for private profit and larger national goals. The Committee, however, note that the Plan and budget allocations constitute a minuscule proportion of the minimum requirement as evidenced by:

- (a) the IX Plan allocation of a mere Rs. 1354 crore in relation to the requirement of over Rs. 6542 crore projected by the Ministry to the Planning Commission; and
- (b) the persisting shortfall notwithstanding the welcome decision to allot more budgetary grants to

1	2	3	4	5
				land resources, including wastelands development, in the current year than the expenditure in the last three years combined.
				2.11 The Committee seriously view the inadequate attention paid to the participation of the panchayats, the NGOs and the private sector, and the potential of operating on a mission mode for quick results. Accordingly, the Committee urge high-level coordination between the Government, the Planning Commission, the State Governments and the panchayats or other legally authorised local bodies and NGOs, as well as the corporate sector as a whole, to prepare a detailed action plan for the attainment of the stated goals.
3	8	2.13	—	For the existing para, <i>read</i> the following: “While appreciating the initiative taken by the Government to earmark 10% of the total allocation to North Eastern States, the Committee hope that the Government would strengthen the absorption capacity of these States so as to ensure 100% utilisation of scarce resources. The Committee would like to

1	2	3	4	5
				recommend that in the case of North-Eastern States, the unutilised outlay should go to non-lapsable pool."
4	10	2.19	—	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>"While appreciating that different programmes being implemented in the Ministry of Rural Development for the development of wastelands including the schemes/programmes based on watershed guidelines have been brought under one umbrella, the Committee hope that the final decision for the unification of all schemes/programmes of wasteland development would be taken within a stipulated time frame."</p>
	12	2.26	—	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>"The Committee find that keeping in view the fact that most of the projects are still continuing, the problem of post-project maintenance may not be so acute, at present, but feel that as the time passes and projects are completed, it will emerge as a stupendous task. In view of this, the Committee hope that the Government</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>while planning would give careful consideration to the practicality of placing the entire responsibility for maintenance on local bodies without ensuring the financial health of the elected local authorities and their precise relationship to wastelands development projects falling in their geographical domain."</p>
6	14	3.6	—	<p><i>After para 3.6, insert the following:</i></p> <p>"The Committee are concerned at the transfer of a vast component of the Employment Assurance Scheme to the IWDP, not because IWDP is not in need of additionality but because the thrust of the IWDP, as stated by the Department, is on watershed development and not on wage employment. Wastelands development is an excellent objective in itself but need not be pursued at the expense of assuring employment to poor people desperately in search of work."</p>
7	14 & 15	3.7	—	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>"While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee are concerned to note the underutilisation of funds,</p>

1

2

3

4

5

spilling over of targets and the defective monitoring system not designed to provide feedback on the progress of physical achievements, they observe that only a small part of the magnitude of the problem is being addressed under the scheme, with very low achievements. It is desired that adequate attention should be paid to the implementation of the projects under the IWDP to ensure the timely completion of projects to achieve the set targets. The Committee are concerned to note that DRDAs do not bother even to send the completion reports in time to the Department. They take serious note of it and would like that the necessary instructions should be issued to DRDAs and monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened. The casual approach of DRDA towards one of the flagship scheme of the Department underlines the need for re-orienting the IWDP to be essentially Panchayat-based, with the primary responsibility for planning and implementation to vest in Panchayats and other legally authorised local bodies with the full involvement of the Gram Sabhas in the selection of projects and the monitoring of implementation."

1	2	3	4	5
8	17	3.12	—	<p><i>After para 3.12, insert the following:</i></p> <p>"As per Annual Report, new projects under the scheme are now being sanctioned by CAPART. The Department has transferred all fresh applications and ongoing projects under the scheme to CAPART except 75 cases which are being implemented by Cooperatives and Trusts etc. When asked about the immediate requirement of outlay to complete the ongoing projects of the Department, it has been submitted by the Government that immediate requirement of funds of these projects varies on year to year basis depending upon utilization of funds by the concerned DRDAs/ZPs. Out of the total allocation under various programmes, normally 60% funds are taken to be spent on on-going projects. As per the recent arrangement of the Department, the scheme of support to NGOs/VAs will now be operated by CAPART."</p>
9	17	3.13	—	<p><i>For the existing para, read the following:</i></p> <p>"The Committee find that when asked about the requirement of outlay to complete the ongoing projects, the Government instead of addressing the specific issue, have furnished a vague reply. The Committee view it seriously and direct the Government to furnish a</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				detailed reply on the said issue.
10	18	3.16	14	for "employing" read "availing of the experience, expertise and excellence of."
11	18	—	—	After para 3.16, insert the text as shown in Enclosure 'A'.
12	24	3.30	—	after omitting "." at the end, add "since the correction and updating of land records would be crucial to preparing the proposed Central Scheme on the Consolidation of Landholdings, with a view to proposing it to the Planning Commission for the required financing in the Xth Plan, the Committee urge that the Department establish a mission mode to expeditiously prepare the crucial statistical data and other inputs needed to undertake this vitally needed national requirement which has the potential of transforming the prospects for agriculture, rural development and poverty alleviation."
13	24	3.31	—	Add at the end— "They also recommend that the Government should pay more attention to complete survey/ re-survey and settlement in the North Eastern States where these are overdue."

Enclosure 'A'

(See item 11 of Annexure to Minutes)

Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS)

3.19 The scheme was launched in 1994-95 in order to stimulate involvement of the Corporate Sector/Financial Institutions etc. to pool in resources for development non-forest wastelands and has been restructured to make it more popular and broad based, for being implemented during Ninth Plan and circulated to all States and other concerned organisations during August, 1998. The details about the changes made in the revised guidelines of IPS are given at Appendix IV.

3.20 Financial and Physical Achievement under IPS

Year	Physical (in ha.)		Financial (Rs. in crore)	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
1998-99	100	21	1.60	.042
1999-2000	600	—	2.00	.03
2000-2001	150	—	.5	—

3.21 When asked for the reasons for shortfall in financial achievement during 1999-2000, it has been stated in the written replies that the revised guidelines of the restructured programme were circulated during August, 1998. Due to lack of publicity/awareness, more number of projects could not be taken up and therefore there is a shortfall in financial achievements *vis-a-vis* budget provision during 1999-2000. Further it has been mentioned that in order to publicise the scheme and raise awareness among the farmers, one National Workshop at New Delhi and two Regional Workshops in Tamil Nadu and Mizoram had already been organised. Few more National and Regional Workshops are proposed to be organised during next year in various States involving the representatives from Nationalised/Scheduled Commercial Banks, NABARD, Industrial/Corporate Houses and State Governments.

3.22 As regards shortfall in achievement of physical targets, it has been submitted by the Department in the written note that so far during 1999-2000, funds under this scheme were released only for ongoing projects. Therefore, physical achievement has not been indicated during 1999-2000. However, few new projects would be sanctioned and physical target will be fully achieved during 1999-2000.

Budget Estimates 2000-2001

3.23 As per Performance Budget, the outlay for 2000-2001 for the Scheme is Rs. 0.5 crore. When asked whether this outlay will be sufficient to meet the target under the newly restructured Scheme, the Government in their written replies have stated that efforts will be made to sanction more projects during 2000-2001 and if required, necessary reappropriation will be made under this Scheme to meet the target.

3.24 The Committee find that the scope of implementation of IPS is very limited. They emphasise that keeping in view the resource constraints with the Government there is an urgent need to involve private sector to achieve the set goals. To attain the laudable objectives of developing 40 m. hectares by the end of 11th Plan, the Committee strongly recommend to the Government to take the following steps to involve and attract private sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country.

- (i) the Government should interact with the federations of industry and commerce, such as CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, who have not been involved in the National and Regional Workshops organised thus far;
- (ii) the Government should widen the approach to industry which has thus far been restricted regionally to the PHD Chamber and industry-wise to the pulp and paper industry, besides being concentrated on plantations to the virtual exclusion of other methods of land reclamation;

- (iii) the possibility of harnessing the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, at the highest level, to stimulate corporate sector involvement should be examined;**
- (iv) the Government should request the Ministry of Finance to examine the possibility of providing fiscal incentives which would exponentially raise the level of corporate sector participation in wastelands development; and**
- (v) a high-level review, in consultation with the Finance Ministry and the RBI, of the role of financial institutions and scheduled banks in the implementation of schemes of the Department should be made by the Government.**