

**4**

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

**THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(1999-2000)**

**FOURTH REPORT**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*March, 2000/Phalgun, 1921 (Saka)*

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	6
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	12
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	13
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	14

### APPENDICES

I. Extracts of the Minutes of the 5th Sitting of the Committee held on 7.3.2000 .....	16
II. Highlights of completed Projects under Technology Development, Extension & Training (TDET) Scheme .....	19
III. Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 22nd Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha) .....	23

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 Chirumayanand Swami
10. Prof. Kailasho Devi
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri Vijay Goel
13. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
14. Shri R.L. Jalappa
15. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
16. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
17. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
18. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
19. Shrimati Rance Narah
20. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
21. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
22. Shri Chandresh Patel
23. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
- \*24. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam

---

\*Nominated w.e.f. 24.1.2000

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

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R. Kothandaraman — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

## INTRODUCTION

1. 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 Fourth Report on Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-Second Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Twelfth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)

2. The Twenty-Second Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 2nd August, 1999.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 7th March, 2000.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 22nd Report of the Committee (Twelfth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix-III.

NEW DELHI;  
15 March, 2000  
25 Phalgun, 1921 (Saka)

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

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twenty-Second Report on 'Demands for Grants (1999-2000)' of the Department of Wastelands Development (erstwhile Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment now renamed as Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha 22nd April, 1999.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 14 recommendations contained in the 22nd Report which have been categorised as follows:—

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

Para Nos.            2.11(i), 2.11(iii), 2.11(iv), 2.16, 3.3, 3.5,  
3.8, 3.11, 3.14 and 3.18.

(ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue:—

Para No.            NIL.

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

Para No.            2.11(ii).

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

Para Nos.            2.3, 2.14 and 2.18.

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

4. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of the recommendations.

#### A. Mapping of category-wise extent of wastelands in the country

##### Recommendation (Para No. 2.3)

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that even if the updated data, in respect of the districts for which mapping has been completed by NRSA *i.e.* 290 districts is taken into account, they feel that very little progress has been made since 1996-97. They feel that realistic data with regard to category-wise extent of wastelands is the pre-requisite for making planning in this regard. In view of it, they would like to recommend that earnest efforts should be made to complete the mapping in the remaining districts at the earliest.”

6. The Government in their reply have stated as under:

“The matter is being pursued with the National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad to complete the district-wise mapping of wastelands for the remaining districts by September '99.”

7. While hoping that the mapping in the remaining districts would have been finalised by now, the Committee would like to be apprised of the present position in this regard.

B. Coordination amongst various Ministries and Programmes involved in the development of wastelands

##### Recommendation [Para No. 2.11(i)]

8. The Committee had recommended as under:

"It is noted that the budgetary allocation of the Department *i.e.* Rs. 100 crore annually is just a token amount when compared with the total demand of Rs. 6,000 crore annually required for the purpose. Further it is also found that funds are allocated under the different schemes/programmes under different Departments/Ministries...."

"...that the different schemes/programmes under different Ministries/Departments should be brought under one umbrella. This will not only ensure the coordination amongst various sectors but will also solve the problem of funds."

9. The Government in their reply have stated as noted below:

"All area development programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development viz. Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programmes (IWDP) have been brought under the erstwhile Department of Wastelands Development. The name of the Department has been changed to "Department of Land Resources" *w.e.f.* 9.4.1999. The work related to 'Land Reforms' has also been entrusted to the newly created Department of Land Resources. As regards unification of all schemes/programmes of Watershed Development under different Ministries/Departments under one umbrella, a decision is to be taken by the Cabinet Secretariat."

10. The Committee appreciate the merging of all area development programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development under the Department of Land Resources. They would like to be apprised of the final position with regard to the unification of all programmes/schemes under different Ministries/Departments.

**C. Perspective Plans to develop the wastelands in a time-bound programme.**

#### **Recommendations [Para No. 2.11(ii)]**

11. The Committee had recommended as under:

"...that proper planning at the national and State level has to be made. After getting the realistic data about the extent and category-wise



wastlands in the country, the States should be directed to finalise their perspective plans. Based on the States plans, national action plan to cover the entire wastlands in the country within 10-15 years should be chalked out.”

12. The Government in their reply have stated as noted below:

“The State Governments have already been requested to prepare Perspective Plans for 10-15 years for the development of all wastlands in their States. Minister of State (IC) for Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (now Ministry of Rural Development) has also written to the Chief Ministers of various States in this regard.”

13. The Committee note with concern that even after more than 50 years of Independence, the Government are yet to chalk out a perspective plan for the development of wastlands in the country. They would, therefore, like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for proper planning at the national and State level so that the future priorities and targets could be fixed for the development of entire wastlands.

#### **D. Coordination with the Research Institutes in the Country**

##### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)**

14. The Committee had recommended as under:

“While appreciating the steps taken by the Department to coordinate with the research institutes in the country, the Committee would like that all the districts should be attached to scientists on the ICAR institutes and State Agricultural Universities.”

15. The Government in their reply have stated as under:

“The matter is being pursued with the ICAR and State Agricultural Universities to attach their scientists in the remaining districts for providing technical backup and scientific inputs to the wastlands development programme in the country.”

**16. The Committee would like to be apprised of the response of ICAR and State Agriculture Universities on the suggestion of attaching all the districts to the scientists of the ICAR institutes & State Agriculture Universities.**

**E. Implementation of the Report of High Level Committee**

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.18)**

**17. The Committee earlier recommended as under:**

“While noting that some of the recommendations made by the High Level Committee have finally been accepted by the Government, they recommend that these should be implemented expeditiously.”

**18. The Government in their reply have stated as under:**

“This Department has already requested all the concerned Ministries/ Departments of the Central Government and State Governments to implement the recommendations of the High Level Committee chaired by Shri Mohan Dharia. Further the Minister of State (IC) for Rural Areas and Employment (now Ministry of Rural Development) has also written to Chief Ministers of various States for implementing the recommendations of the HLC. The matter is being pursued with the State Governments.”

**19. The Committee would like to know about the final decision taken in respect of the implementation of the High Level Committee's recommendations by the State Governments.**

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### Recommendation [Para Nos. 2.11(i), (iii) and (iv)]

It is noted that the budgetary allocation of the Department *i.e.* Rs. 100 crore annually is just a token amount when compared with the total demand of Rs. 6,000 crores annually required for the purpose. Further it is also found that funds are allocated under the different schemes under different Departments/ Ministries. Besides State Governments are also providing funds under their different schemes. The Committee observe that taking together all the above mentioned Central and State Sector Schemes, huge funds are allocated annually. It is found that there is not only scarcity of resources, but there is systematic failure as acknowledged by the Secretary himself. Observing the scenario, the Committee strongly recommends that:

- (i) The different schemes/programmes under different Ministries/ Departments should be brought under one umbrella. This will not only ensure the coordination amongst various sectors but will also solve the problem of funds.
- (iii) Not only the funds under the Department of Wastelands should be enhanced, but the Department should be ready with the projects to ensure 100% utilisation of funds
- (iv) The respective States should be requested to take the benefit of the work done by the experts like Anna Hazare in the field. Seminars, workshops should be organised where the representatives of the implementing agencies and the experts should be invited.

### Reply of the Government

- 2.11(i) All area development programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development viz. Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) have been brought under the erstwhile Department of Wastelands Development. The name of the Department has been changed to "Department of Land Resources" w.e.f. 9.4.1999. The work related to 'Land Reforms' has also been entrusted to the newly created Department of Land Resources. As regards unification of all schemes/programmes of Watershed Development under different Ministries/Departments under one umbrella, a decision is to be taken by the Cabinet Secretariat.
- (iii) All out efforts are being made to utilise 100% funds under various schemes of the Department. The Planning Commission has also been requested to suitably enhance the allocation for the Department.
- (iv) The Department organises National/Regional level workshops/seminars from time to time wherein representatives of the Central Government, State Governments, reputed NGOs, Training Institutions and experts in the field of Watershed Development are invited for deliberations. The success stories in the Watershed Development programme are also highlighted during these workshops for replication.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

### Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para No. 10 for the Recommendation 2.11(i) of Chapter-I of the Report]

### Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)

The Committee feel that Rs. 3.00 crores earmarked for imparting training to various level functionaries is not sufficient. It is urged that the adequate funds should be provided to different Training Institutes as training is the basic input for the successful implementation of different projects.

### Reply of the Government

In this connection it is pointed out that under the common guidelines for Watershed Development, there is an in-built provision for imparting training to watershed functionaries. 5% of the project cost is earmarked for training. In addition, the Department propose to fund State Level Training Institutions viz. SIRDs, ETCs, SAUs etc. for imparting training to various levels of functionaries involved in the Watershed Development Programme. An amount of Rs. 3.00 crores has been kept under the head 'Communication' for this purpose. Every effort is being made to address the training needs satisfactorily.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.3)

The Committee take serious note of the fact that the slow implementation of one of the flagship scheme of the Department of Wastelands Development is the main reason for cut imposed by Planning Commission at RE stage during 1997-98. While recommending for higher outlay under the scheme, the Committee recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the implementation of the scheme so as to ensure 100% utilisation of the allocated money.

### Reply of the Government

In order to speed up the implementation of the IWD Projects, the Department is taking several steps. Physical and financial progress of the projects is being monitored periodically by obtaining (i) Quarterly Progress Reports (ii) Utilisation Certificates (iii) Audited Statement of Accounts from various DRDAs. Wherever, these documents show slow progress of a project, the concerned DRDA is instructed to speed up the progress by taking remedial steps. Further projects are also got evaluated by independent evaluators. Observations/shortcomings pointed out by these evaluators in implementation of the projects are communicated to concerned DRDAs for taking remedial steps.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

### **Recommendation (Para No.3.5)**

It is noted that one of the reasons for the slow progress of IWDP is the inadequate implementing machinery. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should review the position of the implementing machinery in all the States. As suggested by the Department, necessary guidelines should be issued for periodical meeting of State Watershed Programme Implementation and Review Committee. Not only that, the Department should also monitor the position in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

The existing guidelines provide for holding periodical meetings of the State level Watershed Development Implementation and Review Committees. In April, 1998 the States were requested to set up and activate such committees. The State Governments have again been requested on 23rd July, 1999 that meetings of such Committees be held periodically. The Department maintains close liaison with the State Secretaries for ensuring timely implementation of the projects. Mid term evaluations are also being conducted to ascertain the progress of the projects.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)**

While appreciating the steps taken by the Government to implement the scheme through CAPART, it is recommended that the implementation should be strongly monitored. To bring transparency, it is recommended that some sort of coordination should be maintained between CAPART & Gram Panchayats. Necessary guidelines in this regard should be made and issued to all the State Governments & CAPART.

### **Reply of the Government**

To have transparency in the implementation of the scheme, under the guidelines formulated by CAPART for Watershed Conservation and Development Programmes, selection of villages for Watershed Development itself requires a Resolution from the Gram Panchayat and the Watershed Community at the

primary stage. Atleast 3/4 of the members of the Gram Sabha/Watershed have to sign the initial project proposals that every one knows about the proposal in the interest of transparency. Further, the Watershed Committee is responsible for coordination and liaisoning for Gram Panchayat. In addition to this, in all sanctioned projects, copies are endorsed to the District Administration and Panchayats.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.11)**

The Committee note the various features of the restructured scheme. They find that the outlay earmarked for the scheme during 1999-2000 *i.e.* Rs. 2 crore is too meager to make any impact. It is, therefore, recommended that adequate outlay should be provided for the restructured scheme.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The outlay of Rs. 2.00 crores earmarked for implementation of Investment Promotional Scheme for 1999-2000 is fairly adequate. The Scheme after restructuring was re-introduced in August 1998 is slowly picking up. Under this scheme, the central promotional subsidy is at the rate of 25% of the total project cost is provided to most of the promoters and 60% of the subsidy is released in the first year of the project.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 3.14)**

The Committee note that the Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme is being implemented since 1994-95. They also note that the financial achievement of the scheme, during 1997-98 was not satisfactory. They would like to be apprised of the reasons for non-satisfactory performance of the scheme during 1997-98.

Further, they also note that the scheme has completed four years of its existence. They would like to know how far the objectives set for the scheme have been achieved.

### Reply of the Government

As a follow up action on the recommendations of Expert Committee constituted by Department of Land Resources, a pilot project for reclamation of waterlogged and saline soils was to be launched during 1997-98 under TDET Scheme. An amount of about Rs. 300 lakhs was earmarked and kept for the same pilot project. However, the project could not be sanctioned due to delay in submission of additional information and revised project proposal from the concerned State Government. Therefore, the complete budgetary provision could not be utilised during 1997-98 under the scheme.

As regards to the achievements made under TDET Scheme during the last four years, it is submitted that some projects have already been completed under the scheme. Highlights of the completed projects are enclosed at Appendix-II.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

### Recommendation (Para No. 3.18)

The Committee note that the financial achievement of WDTF Scheme was not satisfactory as only Rs. 63.62 lakh has been spent during 1998-99 out of the Budget Estimate of Rs. 1 crore. They also note that the Planning Commission has increased the implementation period for another three years *w.e.f.* 1.4.99. Further they also note that the BE 1999-2000 has been kept to Rs. 1 crore. They therefore, recommend the Government to take necessary steps to utilise the entire available funds during this year, to achieve the physical targets fixed for the scheme.

### Reply of the Government

The Department have utilised the entire Budget provision of Rs. 100 lakhs during the financial year 1998-99.

^

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]



### 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 GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

#### Recommendation [Para No. 2.11(ii)]

It is noted that the budgetary allocation of the Department *i.e.* Rs. 100 crore annually is just a token amount when compared with the total demand of Rs. 6,000 crores annually required for the purpose. Further it is also found that funds are allocated under the different schemes under different Departments/ Ministries. Besides State Governments are also providing funds under their different schemes. The Committee observe that taking together all the above mentioned Central and State Sector Schemes, huge funds are allocated annually. It is found that there is not only scarcity of resources, but there is systematic failure as acknowledged by the Secretary himself. Observing the scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that:

Proper planning at the national and State level has to be made. After getting the realistic data about the extent and category-wise wastelands in the country, the States should be directed to finalise their perspective plans. Based on the States plans, national action plan to cover the entire wastelands in the country within 10-15 years should be chalked out.

#### Reply of the Government

The State Governments have already been requested to prepare Perspective Plans for 10-15 years for development of all wastelands in their States. Minister of State (IC) for Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (now Ministry of Rural Development) has also written to the Chief Ministers of various States in this regard.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

#### Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para No. 13 of Chapter-I of the Report]

## **CHAPTER V**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.3)**

The Committee note that even if the updated data, in respect of the districts for which mapping has been completed by NRSA *i.e.* 290 districts is taken into account, they feel that very little progress has been made since 1996-97. They feel that realistic data with regard to category-wise extent of wastelands is the pre-requisite for making planning in this regard. In view of it, they would like to recommend that earnest efforts should be made to complete the mapping in the remaining Districts at the earliest.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The matter is being pursued with the National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad to complete the district-wise mapping of wastelands for the remaining districts by September, 1999.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

[Please *see* Para No. 7 of Chapter-I of the Report]

#### **Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)**

While appreciating the steps taken by the Department to coordinate with the Research Institutes in the country, the Committee would like that all the districts should be attached to scientists on the ICAR institutes and State Agricultural Universities.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The matter is being pursued with the ICAR and State Agricultural Universities to attach their scientists in the remaining districts for providing technical backup and scientific inputs to the wastelands development programme in the country.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

**Comments of the Committee**

[Please see Para No. 16 of Chapter-I of the Report]

**Recommendation (Para No. 2.18)**

While noting that some of the recommendations made by the High Level Committee have finally been accepted by the Government, they recommend that these should be implemented expeditiously.

**Reply of the Government**

This Department has already requested all the concerned Ministries/ Departments of the Central Government and State Governments to implement the recommendations of the High Level Committee Chaired by Shri Mohan Dharia. Further the Minister of State (IC) for Rural Areas & Employment (now Ministry of Rural Development) has also written to Chief Ministers of various States for implementing the recommendations of the HLC. The matter is being pursued with the State Governments.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. G-33011/2/99-IFD dated 02.8.99]

**Comments of the Committee**

[Please see Para No. 19 of Chapter-I of the Report]

NEW DELHI;  
15 March, 2000  
25 Phalgun, 1921 (Saka)

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

## APPENDIX I

### COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1999-2000)

#### EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, THE 7 MARCH, 2000

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Gecce—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behra
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Prof. Kailasho Devi
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Vijay Goel
10. Shri R. L. Jalappa
11. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
12. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato

14. Shrimati Ranee Narah
15. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
16. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
17. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Prcmajam
18. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
19. Shri Maheshwar Singh
20. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
21. Shri D. Venugopal
22. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

*Rajya Sabha*

23. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
24. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
25. Shri C. Apok Jamir
26. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
27. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
28. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
29. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
30. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
31. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
3. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee.

**Consideration of draft Action Taken Reports**

3.	**	**	↑	**
4.	**	**		**
5.	**	**		**
6.	**	**		**

---

\*\*Verbatim proceeding relating to other subject has been kept separately.

7. The Committee then considered Memorandum No. 9 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-Second Report of the Committee (12th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Wastelands Development of the then Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. After some discussion, the Committee adopted the draft action taken Report.

8. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the draft action taken Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries/ Departments and to present the same to Parliament.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX II

### HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLETED PROJECT UNDER TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION & TRAINING (TDET) SCHEME

*1. Role of Mycorrhiza in enhancing the Biomass yield of fuelwood species on wastelands.*

The project was implemented by Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi in 50 ha. area of non-forest wastelands. The project has reported the success and effectiveness of a operational Research Model by which the mycorrhizal technology inoculating the seed and soils with VAM fungi for the wastelands development in Gurgaon district of Haryana. The study has confirmed that using this technology, the soil fertility could be improved, salinity reduced and the survival rate of saplings in the wastelands enhanced. This is found best suited for saline and waterlogged areas.

*2. People's participation Project on Development of non-forest wastelands*

The peoples' participatory Demonstration Project on Development of Non-Forest wastelands in 500 ha. implemented by Tamil Nadu College of Engineering Coimbatore in Coimbatore District of Deccan Nilgiris region, has shown that the soil moisture regime could be improved and the artificial recharge to the ground water induced in a significant way. The depletion of ground water table of 1 Meter depth in the every year, has been halted. Significant decrease in temperature by 2° C in the treated area, as compared to adjacent region has been recorded. The establishment of multi-tier/multi-layer plants under the project has improved the ecology of the project area. This study has shown confidence that even the badly degraded area with single blade grass and both hills and gullies could be restored with the help of location specific conservation structures combined with local grass, shrubs and trees.



### 3. *Operational Research Project on Agro-Forestry with special emphasis on Duck, Geese and Fisheries*

The Tamil Nadu University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences (TANUVAS), Chennai had demonstrated successfully, the Agro-Forestry Model integrating domesticated birds, such as, ducks, geese, turkeys and guinea fowls in 225 ha. area of non-forest wastelands. These birds and fish were fed with the grasses, weeds, vegetation & residuals of Trees and Horticultural Corps. Using the channels dug out in all the 4 sides of the paddy field and pre-fabricated circular tanks, pisciculture was grown.

They have reported employment generation through out the year. Three-fold increase in the income of the farmers to the tune of Rs. 6,000 per ha. has been reported.

### 4. *Land use Development of Cherrapunji*

DOLR in collaboration with National Bureau of Soil Survey & Land Use Planning ICAR, Nagpur undertook a study and a report was prepared on the feasibility of improving the availability of surface water in Cherrapunji area, (Meghalaya State) having the highest cumulative annual rain fall in the world with about 6000 m.m. This region suffers from drinking water supply in February to June months every year. The project report pointing out the causative factors such a water scarcity has suggested corrective measures; the same report is proposed to be examined for undertaking a major project with massive funding support from external agency which on completion, will enable to provide remedial measures for irrigation & drinking water supply to the area around Cherrapunji.

### 5. *Pilot Bio-Pesticides Feedstock Model*

The project undertaken in the 100 ha. of acute drought-prone area of Dharmapuri District of Tamil Nadu on the development of neem as an Agro-Forestry System by Dr. M.S. Swaminathan Foundation for Agricultural Research, Chennai, had shown the success of the Agro-Forestry Model using neem as main plantation with inter-cropping of oil-seeds, fodder and leguminous crops.

The best variety of neem was found as a bio-pesticide feed-stock in about 100 ha. The importance and utility value of all parts of neem were demonstrated to the villagers around the project area. VAM Fungi was introduced with neem. Six Land-User groups involving 300 house-holds were formed. Landless women were given tree-pattas and more than Rs. 1 lakh was mobilised from the land user groups for ploughing in the project area and for promotional aspects.

6. *Propagation of selected medicinal plants of Aravali through Tissue culture method*

Gyan Bharati Trust, Udaipur, Rajasthan has developed and standardised technology for propagation of 35 medicinal and aromatic plants in Aravalli Hills through tissue culture method. Under this project, the marginal and tribal farmers of Nayakheda and Choti Villages in Udaipur District were involved. Awareness has been created among the community for development of wastelands and generate income through cultivation of medicinal plants.

7. *Development of wastelands through Agro-Forestry System*

Choudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hissar have demonstrated 4 models of agro-forestry in 236 ha. area of shifting sand dunes areas of Haryana. The models include silvi-horticulture, silvi-pasture, agri-silviculture and agro-horticulture. One of the findings of the project is that the silvi-horticulture model was most accepted one by the farmers and the agro-forestry model with agriculture component was not favoured by the farmers as the same was not found suitable for the area. The farmers mostly accepted the multi-purpose trees for fuel, fodder and fruits. The project also generated employment to the local people.

8. *Harmonisation of different data sets on wastelands*

Under the project entitled "Harmonisation of data on wastelands", the National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Hyderabad and National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning (NBSSLUP), Nagpur have jointly develop a data base for 6 districts using remote sensing and GIS techniques. The data

base provides information on degree of soil degradation and extent of wastelands in these districts. This information is being used by the National Informatics Centre (NIC) Delhi for development of computer based GIS model for watershed development.

9. *Development of computer based GIS Model for Watershed Management*

NIC Delhi has developed the computer based GIS model for watershed development using remote sensing technology superimposing spatial and non-spatial data for Kodarnala Watershed in Raipur District, Madhya Pradesh. NIC has recommended to use this model for watershed management in other areas where remote sensing data is available with the help of GISNIC Software of NIC available at most of the district centres of NIC in the country.

### APPENDIX III

[*Vide* Para 4 of the Introduction]

#### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 22ND REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (12TH LOK SABHA)

I. Total number of recommendations	14
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	10
Para Nos. 2.11(i), 2.11(iii), 2.11(iv), 2.16, 3.3, 3.5, 3.8, 3.11, 3.14 and 3.18	
Percentage to the total recommendations	(17.43%)
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	NIL
Para No. NIL	
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	1
Para No. 2.11(ii).	
Percentage to the total recommendations	(7.14%)
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	3
Para Nos. 2.3, 2.14 and 2.18	
Percentage to the total recommendations	(21.43%)