

47

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2003)**

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2003-2004)

FORTY-SEVENTH REPORT



Presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 2003

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22nd April, 2003

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

REPORT

CHAPTER I Introductory

CHAPTER II Analysis of the overall allocation of the
Department of Land Resources
(Ministry of Rural Development)

CHAPTER III Scheme-wise Analysis/Evaluation

APPENDICES

- I Statement showing 9th Plan outlay, Actual expenditure during 9th Plan, 10th Plan allocation as proposed, and as agreed to by Planning Commission,
- II Statement showing 9th Plan outlay, corresponding expenditure year-wise and 10th Plan outlay and outlay for 2002-2003
- III Category-wise Wastelands of India.
- IV Findings of the impact assessment studies in various States regarding watershed programmes.
- V State-wise progress in implementation of IWDP projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed

- VI State-wise progress in implementation of DPAP projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed
- VII State-wise progress in implementation of DDP projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed
- VIII EAS Watershed releases (State-wise)
- IX Release and utilisation of funds towards Central share
Under the Centrally sponsored scheme of SRA&ULR

- X Resolution passed in the Conference of Revenue Ministers of the States held on 19th and 20th August, 2002 at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi

- XI Minutes of the Seventh sitting of the Committee held on 25th March, 2003

- XII Minutes of the Fifteenth sitting of the Committee held on 4th April, 2003

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)**

Shri Chandrakant Khaire - *Chairman*

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
4. Shri Ranen Barman
5. Shri Padmanava Behera
6. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Shriram Chauhan
9. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
10. Shrimati Hema Gamang
11. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
12. Shri Jaiprakash
13. Shri Hassan Khan
14. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
15. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
16. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
17. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
18. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
19. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
20. Shri Chandresh Patel
21. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
22. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
23. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy

24. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
25. Shri Maheshwar Singh
26. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
27. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
28. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
36. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
37. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
38. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
39. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah
40. Shri Harish Rawat
41. Shri Man Mohan Samal
42. Shri Rajnath Singh
43. Shri G.K. Vasani

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary - Additional Secretary
2. Shri N.K. Sapra - Joint Secretary
3. Shri K. Chakraborty - Deputy Secretary

4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - Under Secretary

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

CLR - Computerisation of Land Records

CSIR - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research

DDP - Desert Development Programme

DFID - Department for International Development

DoLR - Department of Land Resources

DoWD - Department of Wastelands Development

DPAP - Drought Prone Areas Programme

DRDA - District Rural Development Agency

EAS - Employment Assurance Scheme

ICAR - Indian Council for Agricultural Research

IPS	-	Investment Promotional Scheme
IWDP	-	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
NABARD	-	National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development
NIC	-	National Informatics Centre
NIRD	-	National Institute of Rural Development
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRSA	-	National Remote Sensing Agency
NWDB	-	National Wastelands Development Board
PIA	-	Project Implementation Agency
PRIs	-	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	-	Revised Estimates
SGRY	-	Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana
SGSY	-	Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SGHs	-	Self-Help Groups
SRA & ULR	-	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	-	Technology Development Extension and Training
UGs	-	User Groups

UT	-	Union territory
ZP	-	Zilla Parishad

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2003) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Forty-seventh Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 25 March 2003.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 4 April 2003.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
21 April, 2003
1Vaisakha, 1925(Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development

REPORT
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 National Wasteland Development Board (NWDB) was established under the Ministry of Environment and Forests in the year 1985 mainly to tackle the problems of degradation of land, restoration of ecology and to meet the growing demand of fuelwood and fodder at the national level. In the year 1992, the Department of Wastelands Development (DoWD) was created under the Ministry of Rural Development and NWDB was transferred to its jurisdiction for development of non-forest wasteland. In April 1999, the Department was renamed as Department of Land Resources (DoLR).

1.3 The Department of Land Resources implements schemes for development of non-forest wastelands and degraded lands and other area development programmes such as Integrated Wastelands Development Programme, Desert Development Programme and Drought Prone Areas Programme to increase bio-mass production as also creation of opportunities for providing rural employment. It also implements schemes for Technology Development and Training. Besides, the Department monitors the implementation of land reforms and betterment of revenue system and land records.

1.4 The Department of Land Resources comprises two divisions, namely the Wastelands Development Division and the Land Reforms Division and implements the following important programmes under these divisions:

1. Integrated Wastelands Development Programme;
2. Drought Prone Areas Programme;
3. Desert Development Programme;
4. Modernisation of Revenue and Land Administration
 - (a) Computerisation of Land Records; and
 - (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records.
5. Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme;
6. Investment Promotional Scheme.

1.5 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for the year 2003-2004 are Rs.1053.66 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.6 The Demand for Grants of the Department was presented to Lok Sabha under Demand No.78.

1.7 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on 11th March, 2003.

1.8 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 2003-2004.

CHAPTER II

Analysis of the overall allocation of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)

The information regarding 9th Plan outlay, actual expenditure during 9th plan, 10th Plan allocation proposed and as agreed to by Planning Commission, BE RE and actual during 2000-2001, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 (actual expenditure upto 28th February, 2003), proposed outlay 2003-2004 and allocation made during 2003-2004 over all as well as Scheme-wise under plan and non-plan head has been indicated at *Appendix I*. Besides, the data with regard to BE, RE and actuals in each of the years of 9th Plan, Scheme wise, has been given in *Appendix – II*.

2.2 The comparative analysis of the outlay earmarked during 8th plan, 9th plan and proposed and earmarked outlay during ongoing 10th plan is as below :-

(Plan + Non Plan)	(Rs. in crore)
8 th Plan outlay	Rs.1337.28
Expenditure	Rs.1229.44
Underspending	Rs.107.84
9 th Plan outlay	Rs.1801.89
Expenditure	Rs.1617.56
Underspending	Rs.184.33
Proposed 10 th Plan outlay	Rs.5600.00
10 th Plan outlay agreed to by Planning Commission	Rs.6526.00
Expenditure (as on 15.3.2003)	Rs.805.28
BE 2001-2002	Rs.900.99
RE 2001-2002	Rs.850.97
Actual Expenditure	Rs.817.06
Underspending	Rs.33.91
BE 2002-2003	Rs.1003.81
RE 2002-2003	Rs.953.62

Actual Expenditure	Rs.755.70 (upto 28.2.2003)
BE 2003-2004	Rs.1053.66

2.3 While analyzing the data as given in the preceding para, the following can be observed:

- (i) there is underspending amounting to Rs.107.84 crore and Rs.184.33 crore during 8th and 9th Plan respectively;
- (ii) during 10th Plan, the Department has been allocated Rs.926 crore more than proposed allocation under plan and non-plan heads;
- (iii) while analysing the data given in Appendix – I, the Committee find that under the scheme ‘New Initiative’ Rs.1,000 crore has been provided;
- (iv) As regards the performance during the year 2001-02, there is underspending of Rs.33.91 as compared to RE of that year;
- (v) during the year 2002-03, Rs.755.70 crore, out of Rs.953.62 crore, provided at RE stage, could be utilized upto 28th February, 2003;
- (vi) there is reduction of around Rs.50 crore during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 at RE stage;
- (vii) as regards the enhancement in outlay since 2001-02, the Committee find that during the year 2002-03, there was enhancement of 102.82 crore as compared to BE of previous year. During the year 2003-04, the enhancement in outlay as compared to previous year, is around to Rs.50 crore;

2.4 When asked for the underspending under the different heads, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that during the year 2002-03, there was cut of Rs.50 crore by the Ministry of Finance. As regards the expenditure position as compared to revised estimates excepting North-East, 94.58% is the utilization. But in case of North-East utilization position is 28%.

Overall scenario of wastelands in the country.

2.5 The National Remote Sensing Agency was assigned a project entitled identification of wastelands in India. Under this project, District – level data of wastelands covering the whole country has been generated. This mapping has been accomplished on the basis of categorization of wastelands into 13 different types (*Appendix - III*). The project has been

completed and as per the report, 20.17% of the total geographical area that is 63.85 million hectare is wastelands. Out of these, 23.02 per cent i.e. 14 million hectare is forest wastelands and the balance of about 50 million hectares is non-forest wastelands.

2.6 The development of non-forest wastelands comes under the jurisdiction of Department of Land Resources. As per the overall planning of the Government in this regard, 5 million hectares were required to be covered by the end of the 9th Plan. Another 15 million hectares, during 10th plan and the remaining 20 million hectares are to be covered during 11th plan (refer para 2.11 of 33rd Report).

2.7 The Tenth Plan allocation of DoLR for the schemes being implemented on the basis of Watershed Management viz. IWDP, DPAP, DDP is Rs.4400 crore against the proposed sum of Rs.4700 crore under the three programmes. The allocations in the first two years of the Tenth Plan are Rs.822 crore and Rs.895 crore respectively.

2.8 When asked about the strategy of the Government regarding the coverage of around 180 lakh hectares area during 10th Plan, it has been stated that to achieve the target of sanction of new projects covering 180 lakh hectare during Tenth Plan, it was proposed to allocate Rs.4700.00 crore against which Rs.4400.00 crore was sanctioned by the Planning Commission. The actual performance, however, depends upon the Annual Plan allocations made on year-to-year basis, which may be less or more than total Approved Five Year Plan allocations. For the first year (2002-2003) of the Tenth Plan, it has been possible to sanction new projects for treatment of 21.20 lakh hectare. For the year 2003-2004, a tentative target of sanction of new projects for treatment of 30 lakh hectares has been fixed.

2.9 When asked how the Department, would bridge the gap between the required outlay and the available Government funding, the Department has stated that to supplement treatment of land under DPAP, DDP and IWDP, additional area is also being taken up under externally aided programmes. At present, two projects, assisted by DFID are being implemented in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. Under these two programmes, 574 watershed projects of 500 hectare each have been sanctioned since 2000-2001 for treatment of 2.87 lakh hectare.

2.10 When asked about the State-wise position with regard to the wastelands area developed, the representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence stated that they are updating Atlas of the year 2000 and when the updated version will come, they will

be able to find out the progress done in each of the State with regard to the development of wastelands.

Conversion of treated land under different schemes again converting into wastelands or barren land

2.11 When enquired whether Government have ever come across the cases, where once developed land under wastelands projects again reconvert into wastelands and, if so, what steps are being initiated to ensure proper post project maintenance so that the land once developed do not reconvert into barren land, it has been stated by the Department that on the recommendation of a High Level Technical Committee (Hanumantha Rao Committee, 1994), all the three wastelands development programmes of the Department of Land Resources are being implemented on watershed basis since April, 1995. Most of the projects, taken up from 1995-96 to 1997-98 have been completed and projects sanctioned thereafter are still under various stages of implementation. In case of completed projects, which have been evaluated, no instances have been noticed where wastelands treated under the programmes have re-converted again into barren lands. On the contrary, positive impact in terms of increased water availability, improved land productivity, etc. has been observed in most of the cases. In order to ensure that the completed watershed projects are maintained properly, the Guidelines have been revised in 2001 to provide for an Exit Protocol that would define a suitable mechanism to take care of post project maintenance of assets created, at the planning stage itself.

2.12 When asked whether any evaluation in terms of the objectives of the Scheme has been made, the Department in the written note has stated that impact assessment studies by independent professional agencies made so far does not show conversion of treated land into wasteland. These studies have been carried out to assess, if the objectives of the scheme have been met. The reports, indicate that, where watershed projects have been implemented, the overall productivity of land has increased, the water table has gone up, and there has been a positive significant impact on overall economic development in the project areas. The availability of fuel and fodder has also increased in the watershed area. The studies also revealed that the green vegetative cover has also improved, which has a positive impact in checking soil erosion by wind and water.

2.13 The Committee find that with regard to the Government funding under the different schemes of the Department, Planning Commission has agreed to around Rs.900 crore more than what was proposed for 10th Plan, which means that the Ministry of Finance has accorded priority to the different schemes of the Department. Now the need of the hour is to ensure meaningful utilization of the resources earmarked to the Department for different schemes. They would like that the Department should impress upon the Planning Commission to allocate outlay under the different annual plans commensurating with the overall allocation made during 10th Plan.

2.14 The Committee further note that the Ministry of Finance has imposed a cut of Rs.50 crore during the year 2002-03. They feel that once the Budget estimates are sanctioned and outlay earmarked, no further cut should be imposed at the Revised Estimates stage. They would like that the Department should convey the feelings of the Committee in this regard to the Planning Commission. While recommending for strictly adhering to whatever allocation has been made under 10th Plan under different schemes, the Committee feel that to get the adequate allocation from Planning Commission, the Department has to ensure 100 per cent utilization of the resources earmarked under different schemes. As stated by Secretary, the underspending is basically in the outlay earmarked for North-East. While this issue has been dealt with in detail in the succeeding paras of the Report, the Committee would like to emphasize here that the Department should find out ways and means by chalking out detailed action plan for the proper utilisation of resources earmarked exclusively for the development of North-Eastern Region.

2.15 The Committee further find that Rs.1,000 crore for 'New Initiatives' have been allocated during 10th Plan. The Committee would like to know the details of the schemes which are proposed

under ‘New Initiatives’ of the Department during the 10th Plan. They would also like to be apprised about the detailed planning made by the Department to ensure the proper utilization of the aforesaid outlay. Besides, the Committee would like that before making allocation, the Department should have the proper strategy to ensure that the money earmarked is meaningfully utilised during a financial year. The Committee would like that while furnishing the information before them with regard to new schemes to be launched by the Department, the Committee should be apprised about the details well in advance so as to enable them to analyse and suggest changes, if required, to ensure proper implementation of the scheme.

Conversion of wastelands into agricultural lands

2.16 When asked whether any data has been maintained with regard to conversion of wastelands into agricultural land, it has been stated as under:-

“Department of Land Resources addresses the task of developing wastelands and degraded lands in non forest areas through various area development programmes by improving the productivity of wastelands to grow appropriate bio-mass specially fuel wood and fodder and also prevent further degradation. Hence, agricultural production is generally not feasible on such land at the first stage of development. Therefore, no data is being maintained with regard to conversion of wasteland into agricultural land. However, under various programmes/schemes of the DoLR, projects have been sanctioned to develop approximately 160 lakh hectares area till date.”

2.17 The findings of the impact studies in various States with regard to different water shed programmes of the Department have been given in *Appendix – IV*. It could be seen there from that the impact of different programmes viz. IWDP, DPAP and DDP is very encouraging. The study has also indicated the increase in area under various crops in the States of Orissa, Karnataka, Haryana, Tamil Nadu, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

2.18 The Committee find that with regard to the issue of conversion of wastelands into agricultural lands, they have been apprised by the Department that agricultural production is

generally not feasible on developed land under different schemes in the first stage of development and as such, no data in this regard is being maintained. While appreciating that agricultural production is not possible at the first stage of development, the Committee feel that once the project is completed, it should result in increase in net sown area. Further, they also find that one of the components of impact studies made by the Department is increase in net sown area as could be seen from Appendix-IV. While analysing the impact studies, the Committee find that net sown area has increased in almost all the States. The Committee would like that in view of the position as given above, the Department should maintain data with regard to the impact of different schemes on net sown area by covering wastelands into agricultural land.

Providing employment under different schemes

2.19 As per the material furnished by the Department one of the objectives of the three important schemes of the Department i.e. IWDP, DDP and DPAP is that these schemes would provide employment. It is also furnished by the Department that about 60% of the expenditure in the execution of watershed projects is towards wage employment. However, no specific study has been conducted so far to assess the impact of watershed schemes on employment. Similarly, the Department also does not maintain specific data concerning employment generation through watershed Development schemes. When asked why the Department could never feel the necessity of making a study to find out the impact of such schemes on employment, keeping in view the substantial outlay earmarked for the purpose and also the fact that it is one of the objectives of the schemes, it has been stated that the primary objective of Watershed Projects is poverty alleviation through land development. There are other schemes primarily for employment generation being implemented by Department of Rural Development such as SGSY and SGRY. The impact assessment for watershed projects do cover the aspect relating to economic upliftment and employment generation.

2.20 The findings of impact assessment studies have, inter-alia, highlighted the extent of increase in mandays, increase in annual income of the beneficiaries, etc. For example, the impact assessment study in Orissa in respect of IWDP and DPAP (the State does not have DDP Blocks) has indicated annual income increase of 38% per beneficiary. A total of 32.97 lakh mandays of employment was generated. In Karnataka, the study indicated generation of 34.23 lakh mandays under the three schemes. In case of Maharashtra, the study indicated 20% of increase in mandays.

2.21 The Committee are happy to note the findings of the impact studies, according to which, the programmes of wastelands development have very positive impact with regard to employment generation. Not only that, the income of the beneficiaries have substantially increased in different States. Keeping in view the positive trends available, the Committee would like that an overall analysis of the findings of various studies, when the studies from the remaining States are also available, should be made, and the Committee apprised accordingly. They further note that the programmes on wastelands development, being run under different schemes, can play a major role in solving the problem of unemployment in the country. In this scenario, the Committee would recommend to further gear up the implementing mechanism of the various schemes to successfully implement the different programmes. Besides, the positive trends as available by the impact studies should be brought before the Planning Commission to persuade them to increase the allocation under different schemes. Apart from this, the scope of each of the schemes of wastelands development should be further widened.

2.22 The Committee would further like to be apprised about the name of the agencies to whom the impact studies have been awarded for different schemes. They would also like to be apprised, when the study in the remaining States is expected to be completed.

Bringing all the programmes relating to wastelands under one umbrella

2.23 As stated in the written note of the Department, the watershed approach has been accepted as a means to increase agricultural production, while arresting ecological degradation in rainfed and resources poor areas. It would, at the same time, improve the level of living of the poor by providing more sustainable employment. Yet, the implementation of this programme by different departments/agencies has been based on different approaches. This has resulted in problems at the field level.

2.24 The Committee for the last four or five years have repeatedly been recommending to bring all the schemes/programmes for the development of wastelands run by different Ministries/Departments under one umbrella, but the decision in this regard is yet to be taken, as could be seen from the information furnished by the Department. When asked about the latest position in this regard, it has been stated by the Department that a note for the Cabinet on setting up of a National Mission for Land and Watershed Development in the Department of Land Resources (DoLR) and transfer of watershed and Soil Conservation related activities to DoLR, has been submitted to the Cabinet Secretariat on 17th January, 2003. The matter is under consideration of the Government.

2.25 When asked whether any coordinated approach with regard to the efforts made and results achieved under different schemes run by the different Ministries is being made, and whether any planning has been done to cover the total wastelands in the country, it has been stated by the Department that the three programmes of Department of Land Resources, viz. DPAP, DDP and IWDP were brought under the Common Guidelines for Watershed Development with effect from 1st April, 1995. Other major programmes of watershed development are the “National Watershed Development Project in the Rainfed Areas (NWDPA)” and the “Watershed Development in Shifting Cultivation Areas (WSDCA)” of the Ministry of Agriculture. An effort has also been made to implement these programmes under the Common Guidelines of Watershed Development. All watershed development programmes being implemented by different Ministries are being considered to be brought under a National Mission for Land and Watershed Development in the Department of Land Resources.

2.26 When asked for the total financial requirement for the development of total wasteland in the Country, the Department has stated that no integrated planning has been made to cover all wastelands in the country through a common approach and, therefore, the total financial requirement for the purpose is not available.

2.27 With regard to the status of converging of the schemes under one umbrella, the Secretary, during the course of oral evidence submitted that in this regard, they have submitted a Cabinet note but it is being presented to the Committee of Secretaries. He added that all efforts were being made to ensure that all the activities related to wastelands development are brought under one Department. He also stated that excepting the Department of Land Resources, other Departments are not so interested. Besides, he also informed that Prime Minister's Office, Planning Commission, all want that there should be one Department for the purpose.

2.28 The Committee have, for the last four or five years, been recommending strongly to the Department to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands at present being run by different Ministries of the Government of India under one umbrella. They fail to understand that when Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and Prime Minister's office have all accepted the proposal in principle, why the decision in this regard is getting delayed. They further note that other concerned Ministries of the Government of India, dealing with the problem of wastelands development, are not showing much interest in the implementation of related schemes. Therefore, the Committee are of the view that all such schemes with regard to wastelands development should be brought under the purview of a single Department/Ministry rather than allocating the responsibility for implementation of such schemes to a number of Departments/Ministries. They would like that their concerns in this regard should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat so that the decision could be taken expeditiously.

Harjali – New Initiative

2.29 As per the material furnished by the Department, a new initiative 'Haryali' intending to strengthen the technical capabilities of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) for implementing the existing watershed development programmes, like Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) has been launched on 27th January, 2003 by the Hon'ble

Prime Minister. All new watershed development projects under the aforesaid schemes would be implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions. Gram Sabha would replace the Watershed Association and Gram Panchayat would execute the watershed project with technical support from the Block Panchayat/Zilla Panchayat, who would act as the Project Implementing Agency (PIA) for all watershed projects in a particular block. In case Block/Zilla Panchayat has no technical staff to support the Gram Panchayats, a suitable Government Line Department/Autonomous Agency may be identified for the purpose. A reputed NGO with adequate technical expertise and experience may also be identified to act as the Project Implementing Agency (PIA).

2.30 When asked, who will decide that a particular project would be implemented by Panchayati Raj Institutions or a NGO, it has been stated by the Department that under the new initiative Hariyali, it is proposed that the ZP/DRDA shall be the nodal authority for implementation of the Watershed Development Programmes at the district level. At the village level, the watershed project would be implemented by the Gram Panchayat under the guidance of the Gram Sabha. The technical guidance and supervision will be provided by the Intermediate Panchayat/Panchayat Samiti. In case the Intermediate Panchayat is not adequately equipped, either the Zilla Panchayat itself or a suitable Line Department, an agency of the State Government may provide technical support and oversee the project implementation by the Gram Panchayat. Failing these options, the ZP/DRDA may consider appointing a reputed Non-Government Organization (NGO) in the district with adequate experience and expertise in the implementation of watershed projects or related area development works for this purpose.

2.31 The Department has also informed that at the time of sanctioning new projects under Hariyali, the ZP/DRDA would be required to indicate the location of the proposed watershed projects in terms of the block, village, area of watershed and the implementing agencies.

2.32 The on-going projects are being implemented and will be completed under the existing Guidelines for Watershed Development. These Guidelines will cease to exist after completion of the on-going projects. The provisions under Hariyali would apply to all the new watershed projects that would be sanctioned in future. Under Hariyali, while the essence of most of the provisions of the earlier Guidelines is likely to be retained, the PRIs will be fully empowered to plan, implement and maintain the projects. As such, the possibility of confusion in respect of Guidelines may not arise.

2.33 When asked whether any initiatives have been taken for the capacity building of the Panchayats to enable these institutions to implement different programmes, it has been stated that Capacity building is an important aspect for successful implementation of watershed development projects. 5% of the total project cost is earmarked for this purpose.

2.34 As per the material furnished by the Department, the detail procedure for involving Gram Sabha is being worked out. When asked what is the overall planning of the Department with regard to the role of Gram Sabha in the new initiative 'Haryali' it has been stated that under the new initiative "Haryali", the Department has proposed a major role for Gram Sabha in implementation of Watershed Programmes. It will approve the Watershed Development Plan, monitor and review the progress of implementation from time to time.

2.35 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence further submitted that as desired by the Committee in their respective Reports, it has been decided that under the new initiative Haryali, watershed work which was being attended to by the Watershed Associations and Watershed Committees, will now be looked after by the Gram Sabha. Besides, it has also been decided that in bigger States like West Bengal and Orissa, where the Panchayats are very big, in such Panchayats, the Ward Committee will be looking after the Watershed Programme.

2.36 The Committee are pleased to note that their persistent pursuance has led the Government to take a final decision in this regard and finally the work relating to Watershed Development, which was being attended to by the parallel bodies like Watershed Association and Watershed Committees, will now be looked after by the Gram Sabha. While they appreciate the said move of the Department, they note that detailed procedure for involvement of Gram Sabha is being worked out. As regards the proposal of the Department in this regard, they also note that the Department has proposed a major role for Gram Sabha, i.e. to approve the Watershed Development Plan, monitor and review the progress of implementation of the same from time to time. The Committee would like that the guidelines in this regard should be finalised expeditiously and the Committee apprised accordingly.

2.37 The Committee further note that 5 per cent of the total project cost has been earmarked for capacity building of Panchayats. They find it a laudable move of the Government and would like a similar initiative to be taken under the other Schemes of the Department.

2.38 The Committee would like that before taking a project for the wasteland development under the respective schemes of the Department, i.e. IWDP, DDP and DPAP, sufficient attention should be given towards publicity, so that the people at the grassroot level are made aware of the details of the projects and their involvement, which is a pre-requisite for the success of a project, is ensured. Besides, they also feel that training is the basic input for the success of a scheme or programme. The Committee would like that the officials involved in implementation of the project, PRIs and NGOs, who are responsible for implementation of the project, should be imparted proper training to ensure the success of the projects.

Role of MPs/MLAs in identification of projects

2.39 The Committee have been informed that the Governing Body of the DRDA would be responsible for identifying watershed projects. In this connection, all the members of the Governing Body which includes Members of Parliament, MLAs and MLCs of the district would provide necessary policy direction, approve Action Plans for watershed projects and also review and monitor the implementation of these projects.

2.40 In addition to the above, the Department of Land Resources have also set up district level and State level Monitoring and Vigilance Committees headed by respective Members of Parliament from the concerned Districts/States to monitor the progress of projects sanctioned under various programmes of the Ministry. These Committees would be monitoring the implementation of the projects from time to time and would be providing inputs for improving their implementation.

2.41 When asked whether any new mechanism for monitoring of projects has been initiated, it has been stated that the existing mechanism for monitoring of watershed projects

would continue under Haryali also. In addition, a new system of Supplementary Observation Mechanism has been introduced by the Department of Land Resources to provide timely and precise inputs regarding the pace and quality of implementation of the projects on a permanent and dedicated basis. Under this, services of identified district-level and State-level institutes will be utilized for establishing a partnership relationship with District Authorities/ State Governments/Government of India. These identified institutes will assist in generating information/feedback based on 'observations' taken on the watershed development projects at prescribed points of time.

2.42 The Committee note that when asked for the role of MPs/MLAs in identification of projects, they have been informed that the Governing body of DRDA would be responsible for identifying the watershed projects. They have also been informed that MPs/MLAs/MLCs are the members of the Governing body. They further find that as given in the preceding para of the Report, the Department has decided for a major role for Gram Sabha under new initiative Haryali, whereby the works relating to identification, approval of Watershed Development Plans and monitoring etc. would be looked after by the Gram Sabha. The Committee find that they are not able to understand the role of DRDAs vis-a-vis MPs/MLAs/MLCs in the new initiative Haryali and would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard.

2.43 The Committee note that the meetings of DRDAs of which MPs are members, are usually convened when the Parliament is in Session, and as such, MPs are unable to attend the meetings of DRDAs. The Committee would like the Department to give instructions to various State Governments that the meetings of DRDAs should be fixed after getting the convenience of MPs.

2.44 The Committee welcome the step taken up by the Department for constitution of Vigilance and Monitoring Committees at the State and District levels headed by respective Members of Parliament from the concerned Districts/States to

monitor the progress of projects sanctioned under various programmes of the Ministry. They feel that involving the Members of Parliament in the monitoring mechanism would result in optimum utilisation of scarce resources meant for rural poor.

2.45 The Committee urge the Department to circulate a copy of the guidelines of the Department in this regard to all the members of Parliament. They also request the Department to circulate a copy of the guidelines in both Hindi and English versions. This would help the members to know about the rights and duties of Chairman/Vice-Chairman of Vigilance Committee. The Committee also want that all State Governments, UTs and the officers of the State and District administrations should be apprised about the rights of members of Parliament as Chairman/Vice-Chairman of Monitoring and Vigilance Committees to forestall any differences among the District level/State level officers and members of Parliament.

Amendments of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and a draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of project affected persons / families.

2.46 As per the material furnished by Department, Amendments of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation are under consideration of the Government. When asked about the reasons for inordinate delay in finalising the said issues by the Government, it has been stated that the Union Cabinet at its Meeting held on 23rd November, 1998 directed that the proposal relating to amendment of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the Draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Persons/Families, may be first considered by a Group of Ministers (GOM) constituted under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission. The GOM held its first Meeting on 12th March, 1999 and several Meetings took place subsequently. The GOM in the last Meeting held on 22nd November, 2001 directed that the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill be revised in consultation with the Ministry of Law for submission to the Cabinet. As per directions of the GOM, the Ministry sent the Bill to the Ministry of Law for vetting. Subsequently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India directed

that separate provisions be made for acquisition of property of educational institutions of minorities. Further, a specific recommendation was received from the Law Commission of India for amendment of section 6 of the Act. Both these issues were examined in the Ministry and incorporated in the draft Amendment Bill. The draft is under examination in consultation with Ministry of Law.

2.47 With reference to the drafting of a National Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy for project affected persons, the GOM directed this Ministry that a Bill may be drafted on the subject and be brought before the GOM after getting comments of Ministries/Departments. The Ministry drafted a Bill, obtained concurrence of Ministry of Law and sent the same to different Ministries/Departments for their comments. In the meantime, the Standing Committee of Secretaries desired to discuss the Bill. Consequently, a note has been sent for Cabinet Secretariat for consideration of the Standing Committee of Secretaries (SCOS). Thereafter, it will be submitted to GOM for consideration.

2.48 The Committee find that amendment of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of project affected persons/families are under various stages of finalisation. They are distressed that there has been such an inordinate delay in finalizing an issue of vital importance that has impact on the lives of people whose land is acquired in the name of ‘the greater common good’ or who are displaced due to ‘development projects’. They feel that the said two issues are being delayed and would like finalisation of the same within a stipulated time period of six months.

2.49 It is further noted that the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1994), had examined Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and presented a Report (8th Report, 1994-95, 10th Lok Sabha) on 15th December 1994, to Parliament. Besides, an Action Taken Report (24th Report, 1995-96, 10th Lok Sabha) was also presented to Parliament. The Committee hope that while drafting legislation in this regard, the Department would have taken due consideration of the recommendations made by the Committee in the said two Reports.

2.50 The Committee reiterate that the most important component of their recommendation is that in the amendment to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 – rehabilitation and resettlement must become part of the Act itself because this is the only way to ensure that justice is done to those from whom the land is acquired. The Committee also recommend that, to the extent possible, compensation for land, must be in the form of land of the same quality rather than cash in compensation for land. The Committee also desire that a copy of the rehabilitation and resettlement policy is made available to them so that they may make recommendations before it is finalized.

Uniform norms for the development of wastelands under the different schemes of the Department

2.51 As per the revised norms for the development of wastelands, Rs.6000 per hectare will be the cost of development for the projects sanctioned after 1st April, 2000. Pre-revised norms for DPAP Projects were as below:

Sr. No.	Ecosystem Type	Per Ha. Average Cost (Rs.)	Watershed Projects Cost (Rs. in lakh)
1.	Semi Arid Region	4,000	20.00
2.	Dry-Sub-Humid Region	3,000	15.00
3.	Dry Sub-Humid (Hill) Region	4,000	20.00
4.	KBK Districts (Koraput, Bolangir, Kalahandi)	5,000	25.00

2.52 When asked about the justification for uniform norms as the cost of development per hectare of the area, keeping in view the different allocation for different types of land as per the pre-revised allocation, the Department has stated that the rationale of revising the cost norms was two fold. Firstly, to effect an increase to the level, where it may match the increase in price index during the period, and secondly to make it uniform for all type of projects to be implemented in different eco system types so as to ensure and streamline better monitoring of the financial performance of these projects. However, the flexibility of fixing up cost estimates for each work item and project activity on account of variations in the topography, treatment technologies, local materials, wages, etc. in different parts of the country, was left to the States to work out as per Standard Schedule of Rates (SSR) approved by them for representative areas.

2.53 It is further stated that in case of DDP, for three different categories of Eco-system viz. Hot Sandy Arid Region, Hot Arid (Non-Sandy) Region and Cold Arid Region, the project costs were Rs.25.00 lakh, Rs.22.50 lakh and Rs.25.00 lakh respectively. However, in case of IWDP, a uniform cost norm was presented.

2.54 As per the previous cost norms, KBK district, i.e. Koraput, Bolangir and Kalahandi had been categorized separately and were allocated maximum project cost, i.e. Rs.25 lakh. The said category has not been represented in the revised cost norms.

2.55 When asked about the comments of the Department in this regard, it has been stated that the Desert Development Programme is not under implementation under the KBK districts mentioned above. However, Drought Prone Areas Programme is being implemented in some districts with uniform cost norm of Rs.6,000 per hectare. The system of categories and corresponding cost norms has been done away with. The flexibility of fixing up cost estimates for each work item and project activity on account of the specific needs, treatment technologies, local materials, wages, etc. in these districts, is left to the concerned State Government.

2.56 Further, when enquired about the justification of having uniform cost norms keeping in view the peculiar conditions of difficult areas, it has been stated that to maintain uniformity under schemes/programmes, which are being implemented on watershed approach like IWDP, DPAP and DDP, a uniform cost norm of Rs.6,000 per hectare was fixed.

2.57 The Committee note that as per the pre-revised norms, the cost of development per hectare of land under DPAP in different areas was differently earmarked, as could be seen from the preceding para. In this type of arrangement, KBK districts, semi-arid region, dry sub-humid (hill region) had a different place and hence higher allocation was allocated. They further note that as per the revised norms stated by the Department, discretion of fixing of cost estimates for an item and a project has been given to respective State Governments. They find that Rs.6,000 per hectare may be the maximum limit and out of Rs.6,000 per hectare, small adjustments have to be made by the respective State Governments keeping in view the type of project, item etc. They understand that there is no mechanism whereby a cost higher than Rs.6,000 per hectare could be sanctioned for projects in difficult areas. The Committee would like the Department to clarify the said issue.

2.58 The Committee further note that besides the difficult areas, as mentioned in preceding para, the cost per hectare for development in Naxalite and insurgency affected areas is much more higher and they would like that the Department should think of providing higher per hectare allocation in such areas.

North-Eastern States

2.59 As per the material furnished by the Department, 10% of the total allocation of the Department of Land Resources i.e. Rs.100 crore has been earmarked for North Eastern region. In the said region, Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) is the only major scheme in operation. Other two major schemes i.e. the Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) are area specific and no block of North Eastern States has been identified for coverage under the schemes.

2.60 North East allocation during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 was Rs.90 and 95 crore respectively. As regards the achievement in North-East, it has been mentioned in the material submitted by the Department that sufficient proposals for sanctioning of new

projects/release of funds for the ongoing projects were not received and the funds earmarked for North-Eastern region remained unutilised.

2.61 As per the replies furnished by the Department, 7.07 lakh hectares could be covered so far by the Government initiative during 9th Plan under IWDP schemes in North-Eastern States, whereas the total wastelands in such areas is 78.52 lakh hectares. It has further been mentioned, that in the country, during 9th Plan, 10.24 lakh hectares were covered.

2.62 As per the material furnished, by the Department after sanction of the project, the concerned DRDA/ZP and State Government were requested for submission of the Action Plan. The second instalment is released only after receipt of the same for each project. When asked whether any action plan has been chalked out to cover entire area of wastelands in North-Eastern region, it was stated that IWDP is a demand driven scheme. The Department has been making conscious efforts to increase the coverage of the scheme in all the 8 States.

2.63 It was also stated that the progress with regard to action plan in respect of North-Eastern region, where IWDP projects are under implementation, is satisfactory.

2.64 When asked as to what steps are being initiated to ensure that the allocation made for North Eastern region is meaningfully utilised, the reply was that the Department has been interacting with the NE States for expediting the implementation of ongoing IWDP projects. Further, the coverage has been increased every year. With the pro-active role of the Department, IWDP projects are now being implemented in all the NE States. Whereas 17 IWDP Projects, covering 1.48 lakh hectares were sanctioned from 1995-96 to 1998-99, 67, IWDP projects covering 5.59 lakh hectares were sanctioned during the last three years i.e. from 1999-2000 to 2001-2002. This year also, it was stated that the Department is likely to sanction projects to cover the targeted areas of 3 lakh hectares.

2.65 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence brought before the Committee an anomaly with regard to the allocation made to North-Eastern States according to which 10% of the total allocation of the Department has to be earmarked for North-Eastern region. He stated that in North-East, two major watershed programmes of the Department viz. the DDP and DPAP, are not being implemented. This is due to the reason that these programmes are area specific programmes. Only one watershed programme, i.e. IWDP is being implemented in the North-Eastern region. He also stated that as per the status of implementation of programme, only 10% of IWDP allocation should be earmarked for North-Eastern region,

whereas as per the policy of Government of India, 10% of the total outlay of the Department has to be earmarked to North-Eastern States.

2.66 The Committee find from what has been stated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence that the North-Eastern region is getting allocation for three watershed schemes, whereas only one scheme, i.e. IWDP is being implemented in such areas. They feel that this factor has resulted in huge outlay being transferred to non-lapsable pool of resources. As stated earlier in the Report, the utilisation position in North-Eastern States is very poor, i.e. 28 per cent. During the year 2002-2003, they find that scarce resources, after remaining unutilized, are being transferred to non-lapsable pool of resources, whereby the other projects or schemes of the Government are starving for resources. While appreciating the move of the Government to provide exclusive 10 per cent of the outlay of the Ministries/Departments for the all round development of wastelands, the Committee would like in the cases where most of the schemes are not being implemented in such region, 10 per cent of the outlay should be of the schemes/programmes which are applicable in such regions. The Committee would like the Department to convey the feelings of the Committee before the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

Externally aided projects

2.67 The following two externally aided projects are being implemented by the Department of Wastelands:

- (i) Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (APRLP); This project is to be completed by 31st July, 2006.
- (ii) Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP). This project is to be completed by 31st July, 2009.

2.68 When enquired about the post project maintenance of the two aforesaid projects, it has been stated that APRLP envisages taking up 500 new watershed projects in the

programme districts and WORLP envisages taking up 290 watershed development projects. These watershed projects are being implemented on the basis of the Guidelines for Watershed Development, which provide exit protocol for the watershed development projects. Accordingly, the Project authorities, under the guidance of the State Government, are preparing the community for taking over the assets created in the projects for the purpose of operation and maintenance. The Commissioner (Rural Development), Rural Development Department, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh and the Director, Watershed Mission, Agriculture Department, Govt. of Orissa will, ensure that proper arrangements are made for post Project maintenance of the watershed projects completed under APRLP and WORLP respectively.

2.69 As per the information furnished by the Department, the details of these two projects are as follows:-

“The Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (APRLP) was launched in November 1999. It was sanctioned at a cost of Rs.320 crore. It aims at implementation of pro-poor watershed based sustainable rural livelihood programmes in five districts of the States viz. Anantpur, Kurnool, Mehboobnagar, Nalgonda and Prakasham. 500 watersheds, 100 each in the aforesaid five districts having an area of 500 hectares each are to be taken up under the project.”

2.70 Against this target of 500 projects, 50 watershed projects, 10 each in the five districts, were sanctioned during 2000-2001. During 2001-2002, 200 projects, 40 in each district, were sanctioned and during the current financial year, 250 watershed projects, 50 in each district, have been sanctioned. The projects are at various stages of implementation.

2.71 The Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP) was launched during August 2000. It was sanctioned at a cost of Rs.230 crore. The project covers two districts viz. Bolangir (14 Blocks) and Nuapada (5 Blocks). Subsequently, after review, expansion of the project in Kalahandi (6 Blocks) and Bargarh (4 Blocks) is to be considered. Under the project, 290 watershed projects of an area of approx. 500 hectares each in 29 blocks of 4 district of the State are to be taken up during a period of four years and within a block, 10 watershed projects are to be taken up for implementation.

2.72 Against the target of 290 projects, as per phasing done under the project document, 4 projects were sanctioned during 2000-01 and 22 projects during 2001-02. During the current financial year, so far 48 projects have been sanctioned.

2.73 When asked as to how people are being involved in the said externally aided projects, it has been stated that the watershed development projects are being implemented as per the Guidelines for Watershed Development. Under these Guidelines, the watershed projects are being implemented by the Watershed Committees and Watershed Association under the guideline of the Project Implementation Agency (PIA). The Action Plans are formulated by the Watershed Committees in consultation with the Watershed Association and then implemented by these bodies. Technical inputs are given by the PIAs. Thus, the Guidelines ensure that people at grass-root level, particularly, the user groups and self-help groups themselves execute the developmental works in the project area, and the PIAs perform only advisory roles.

2.74 When asked about the monitoring mechanism for externally aided projects, it has been stated that for effective implementation and monitoring of the Projects, two High Powered Committees (HPCs), one each for APRLP and WORLP, have been constituted by the Ministry of Rural Development under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Rural Development). Representatives from the State Governments the donor agency viz. Department for International Development (DFID), UK, Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance have been included in the Committees. Meetings of the Committees are organised from time to time. State Governments are also monitoring the projects. The donor agency viz. DFID also conducts reviews of the projects from time to time.

2.75 As per the replies, the Department has received utilization certificates for the amounts of Rs.2322.46 lakh and Rs.65.21 lakh, out of the total release of Rs.4246.08 lakh and Rs.487.23 lakh under APRLP and WORLP respectively. When asked about are the reasons for huge under-spending or late receipt of utilization certificates the following data is furnished in this regard.

Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (APRLP)

2.76

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Year	Funds released
1	2000-01	174.00
2	2001-02	1487.61
3	2002-03	5521.48

Total		7183.09

Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP)

2.77

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Year	Funds released
1	2000-01	26.00
2	2001-02	151.23
3	2002-03	378.52
Total		555.75

2.78 It has further been mentioned by the Department that during the current year, Department has released the entire budgeted amount for APRLP. However, due to cut imposed by Ministry of Finance, there will be a cut of Rs. 4.00 crore in WORLP

2.79 When asked whether any steps are being undertaken to have more such externally aided projects in the field of development of wastelands in the country, it has been stated that in order to mobilise resources for development of wastelands in the country, efforts are being made for obtaining external assistance. Four proposals of external assistance formulated by the State Governments of Andhra Pradesh (3 projects) and Madhya Pradesh (1 project) have been sent by this Department to the Department of Economic Affairs (DEA). Ministry of Rural Development also organises meetings with donor agencies to ascertain their positions in the areas of watershed development.

2.80 From the information furnished by the Department, the Committee note that some more proposals of external assistance formulated by the Governments of Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have been sent by the Department of Land Resource to the Department of Economic Affairs. They hope that the said proposals are cleared expeditiously. They further note that little

progress in this regard in other States has been made. They hope that other States would try to emulate the lead given by Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. The Committee would like that further initiatives should be taken by the Government in this regard to have external funding for the different projects keeping in view the overall resource constraints in the country.

Synergy between National Plans, District Plans and State Plans

2.81 When asked whether State-wise targets are being fixed under different Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department and whether it is being ensured that the targets fixed under the State Plans are consistent with the Plans at the District-level, it has been stated that the watershed development programmes are implemented on project basis and are demand driven. Each watershed project is implemented over a period of five years and funds in suitable instalments are released on the basis of proposals received from DRDAs/ZPs. Since the annual allocations made under these programmes at the Central level have a major component of committed liabilities towards completion of on-going watershed projects, new projects are generally sanctioned keeping in view the extent of committed liabilities, performance of on-going projects, extent of problem area in the District/Block, etc. As such, it is not possible to fix State-wise targets under these programmes.

2.82 The Committee find that different watershed programmes of the Department are being implemented on project basis and are demand driven. They also note that the Department has an ‘Atlas’ giving the overall position with regard to the wastelands areas in the whole country State-wise as well as category-wise. Besides, they also note that efforts are being made to update the said ‘Atlas’, as mentioned in the preceding paras of the Report. Further, they also note that certain plan-wise targets are being fixed under each of the Five Year Plan as stated earlier. They fail to understand how the targets in a Five Year Plan can be achieved without having action plan at the National level, which should be in consistence with State plan and district Plans. From the data made available to the Committee, they also note that Planning Commission is giving more than the proposed allocation under

each programme based on watershed development. In this scenario, the Committee feel that this is the high time that a perspective plan at the National level in consultation with State Governments should be made.

2.83 The Committee further note that district plans in various States are not being properly implemented. The Committee would like to be apprised about the corrective steps taken by the Government in this regard.

Implementation of programme by States

Better performing vis-à-vis poor performing States

2.84 As per replies, the annual releases to different States do reflect the performance of the projects and a comparison of better performing and poorly performing States can be assessed on the basis of these figures.

2.85 When asked about the States which are under the category of better performing and poorly performing States and what steps are being initiated to motivate the poorly performing States by giving the examples of better performing States, the Department has furnished the State-wise and Programme-wise Statements showing funds which should have been claimed as per schedule of the projects and actually claimed. The Statements are given at *Appendices V, VI & VII*. It has further been stated by the Department that the States which have claimed more than 80% of funds could be considered as better performing States and less than 60% may fall in the category of poorly performing States. Success stories of projects are highlighted in various meetings held by the Ministry which includes the Annual Conference of Project Directors.

2.86 The Department makes all efforts to facilitate the completion of old projects and taking up of new projects. In order to improve the performance of watershed projects, watershed functionaries and officers concerned at District and State levels are encouraged to visit successful projects in other States. States are also encouraged to interact with each other through short workshops and other such fora for the purpose of experience sharing. The Supplementary Observation Mechanism at State and District level has been introduced to provide timely help and guidance to the implementing agencies of watershed projects. The better performing States are able to complete the projects in the stipulated time frame and

hence are likely to be allotted more number of new projects. It is an incentive for their good performance.

2.87 The Committee appreciate the mechanism to motivate the poor performing States, as given in the preceding para of the Report. While State-wise detailed analysis of the physical and financial achievements under different Schemes has been made in the succeeding paras of the Report, the Committee would like to highlight here that further thrust should be given to motivate the poorly performing States so as to have overall progress with regard to development of wastelands in the whole country.

Sustainable land development under Watershed Projects of the Department

2.88 As per the Economic Survey, the current strategy of various ongoing National, Bilateral and Internationally aided Projects for development of rainfed areas is based on the concept of conservation of rainwater for integrated development of wastelands, promotion of diversified and integrated farming systems, management of common property resources; and augmentation of family income and nutritional levels of participating watershed communities through alternate household production system.

2.89 When asked about the meaning of alternate household production system as mentioned in the Economic Survey, it has been stated that the concept of alternate household production system has already been incorporated in the Guidelines for Watershed Development. Formation of Self Help Groups and Users Groups for alternate household production system in watershed project areas has been envisaged in these Guidelines. The Watershed Development Programmes are expected to aim at increasing production and enhancing productivity in cultivated areas and development of wastelands/degraded lands in the watershed areas through in-situ soil and moisture conservation measures, afforestation, horticulture plantations etc. In order to generate additional income to watershed communities, other activities such as, sericulture, piggery, poultry, fishery or other off-farm activities are also promoted as alternate household production systems.

2.90 Further when enquired about the planning of the Department to ensure that watershed projects are based on the different concepts as mentioned in the Economic Survey, it has been stated that the common theme of the Watershed Development Programmes of

Department of Land Resources is to address areas characterised by a relatively difficult terrain and preponderance of community resources. Generally activities taken up under these programmes include land development in-situ soil and moisture conservation measures, afforestation, drainage line treatment, development of small water harvesting structures, renovation and augmentation of water resources, pasture development, repair, restoration and upgradation of existing common property assets, crop demonstration, promotion and propagation of non-conventional energy saving devices, etc.

2.91 Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is the pre-requisite for formulation of Watershed Action Plan. Training and community organization are also important components of the project. Self Help Groups (SHGs) are constituted consisting of homogenous groups who are dependent on the watershed areas such as agricultural labourers, landless persons, women, shepherds, scheduled castes/scheduled tribes.

2.92 Similarly, User Groups (UGs) are also constituted consisting of homogenous groups, who may be most affected by each work/activity of the watershed and they should actually take over the operation and maintenance of the completed community works or activities on common property resources.

2.93 Thus, the programme is based on the concept of sustainable land development with an enlarged participation of the community at the grass-root level on care and share basis.

2.94 The Committee note that various programmes of wastelands development are based on the concept of sustainable land development with an enlarged participation of the community at the grass root level. They further note, as given in the preceding para of the Report, no instances have been noticed, where the land, once developed under a programme, again reconverts into barren land. They also note from the Report of the recent survey made in some of the States that different schemes have a positive effect on the development of land in terms of increased water availability, land productivity, etc. While appreciating the overall performance of the different projects in the field of sustainability, the Committee would like that the post project maintenance should be in such a way that community at

the grass root level is totally involved so that there is no chance of a developed land again reconvertng into barren land.

CHAPTER – III

SCHEME-WISE ANALYSIS/EVALUATION

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

3.1 This programme has been under implementation since 1989-90, and was transferred to DoLR (erstwhile DoWD) along with the NWDB in July 1992. From 1 April 1995, the scheme is being implemented on a watershed basis in accordance with the Guidelines for Watershed Development. It is expected to promote the generation of employment in the rural areas besides enhancing the participation of people at all stages – leading to sustainable development of land and equitable sharing of the benefits. The guidelines for watershed development have been revised in September, 2001.

Funding Pattern

3.2 IWDP is a Centrally Sponsored Scheme and the cost norm of Rs.4,000 per hectare has been revised to Rs.6,000 per hectares w.e.f. 1st April, 2000. The increase of Rs.2000 is to be shared between the Central and State Governments in the ratio of 75:25. Thus the funding pattern of the scheme has been revised from 100% Central grant to sharing in the ratio of 11:1 between the Central Government and the State Governments:-

3.3 As per the data furnished by the Department, the physical and financial targets and achievement during the 9th Plan is as below:-

Physical

	(in ha.)
Target	1180750
Achievement	1065950
Shortfall	114800

Financial

	(Rs. in crore)
Allocation	576.60
Expenditure	496.32
Shortfall	80.28

3.4 The proposed allocation and the allocation finally agreed to by the Planning Commission for the 10th Plan under IWDP are given as under:

(Rs. in Crore)

10 th Plan (2002-2007)	
Proposed	Agreed by Planning Commission
1900.00	1800.00

Financial allocation and achievement during the two years of 10th Plan

(Rs. in crore)

Outlay 2002-2003	450 (including Rs.150 crore for EAS and Rs.63 crore for ongoing DFID Projects)
Expenditure 2002-2003	280.83 (As on 31.1.2003)
Outlay 2003-2004	401 (including Rs.66 crore for ongoing DFID Projects).

3.5 When asked for the reasons for shortfall in physical and financial assistance under IWDP during 9th Plan, it was explained that the development of community organizations, institutional mechanisms like watershed association, watershed committee, watershed development team, self help groups, etc. was a time consuming process causing delays in the implementation of the project. Besides, cuts are imposed by Ministry of Finance.

3.6 When asked whether the shortfall in physical achievement is the main reason for cuts imposed by the Ministry of Finance, it has been stated that apart from the cut imposed by Ministry of Finance, the shortfall is due to the requirement of spending 10% of the total plan in North Eastern States. Since two major programmes namely DPAP and DDP are not being implemented in these States, there is bound to be some saving in the allocation for NE States.

3.7 When asked whether no allocation for ongoing watershed projects under EAS has been made during the year 2003-2004, it has been stated that to complete projects taken up under EAS prior to 1st April, 1999, the requirement of funds for such projects during 2003-04 has been assessed at about Rs. 60 Crore, which may be met out of the allocation for IWDP as in the past.

3.8 The details of outlay, funds released (expenditure) and the physical achievements under the IWDP Scheme since the inception of the Scheme, year-wise and plan-wise are given as under :-

(Rs. in Crore)

Plan/ year	Budget outlay(RE)	Release/Ex- penditure	Physical Achievement (in ha.)
8th Plan			
1992-93	16.83	16.83	27,000
1993-94	40.72	44.49	50,000
1994-1995	49.20	53.04	65,000
1995-96	49.50	51.00	58,000
1996-97	50.50	50.80	84,000
9th Plan			
1997-98	53.95	53.95	90,000
1998-99	62.00	62.00	1,03,000
1999-2000	82.00	83.07	1,38,500
2000-2001	130.00	127.78	3,24,450
2001-2002	210.00	169.61	4,10,000
10th Plan			
2002-2003	232.00	164.87 (as on 17.3.03)	3,64,000 (as on 17.3.03)

3.9 Physical target and allocation during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 are as under -

(Area in lakh hectares)

Physical Target during 2002-2003 10 lakh

Physical Target during 2003-2007 58 lakh (14.50 lakh per year)

(tentative)

Allocation during 2002-2003 Rs.440 crore (as per revised estimates)

Allocation during 2003-2004 Rs.401 crore (BE)

3.10 When asked as to how the Department would achieve the enhanced targets with the reduced allocation it has been stated that the achievement will depend upon the allocation of funds for IWDP in the remaining years of the Tenth Plan. When enquired about the reasons for reduced allocation during 2003-2004 as compared to revised estimates of the previous year, the Department has stated that the allocation for 2002-03 contained an earmarked amount of Rs.150.00 crore. The requirement for 2003-04 for EAS, (Watershed Component) will be very marginal. Consequently the allocation for IWDP has substantially gone up. As per data furnished by the Department, out of Rs. 440 crore provided at the revised estimates stage the expenditure was Rs.315.35 crore. When asked whether the Department would be able to utilize around one-fourth of the total allocation during one month of the financial year, it has been stated that entire allocated funds for other than N.E. States have been released. When further enquired whether utilization of the substantial allocation during the last month of the year is a recurring problem under respective schemes and what steps have been initiated by the Department to overcome this problem, it has been stated by the Department that they will take steps to correct the situation.

IWDP Projects under EAS

3.11 The details of the allocation made and the expenditure met under EAS component of IWDP are as below:

Year	Allocation (Rs. in Crore)	Expenditure (Rs. in Crore)
1999-2000	-	301.55*
2000-2001	350.00	257.12
2001-2002	200.00	190.15
2002-2003	150.00	145.52

*This amount was released to the States out of the allocation for the Employment Assurance Scheme for 1999-2000.

3.12 Out of 19 States/Union Territories in which committed liabilities were assessed, balance central share remains to be released in respect of Orissa, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and for a few districts only in the States of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh and Karnataka. Therefore, watershed projects taken up under EAS prior to 1st April, 1999 in other States/Union Territories have either been completed or are nearing completion. Completion reports have been sought in respect of these.

3.13 When asked about the committed liabilities under the IWDP Component of EAS and how far the same have been fulfilled, it has been stated by the Department that the total committed liability (including State share) for the completion of the Watershed Development projects taken up under EAS prior to 1st April, 1999 worked out to about Rs.1500 crore as per the assessments during 1999-2000. It was decided that the Central share of the aforesaid amount may be released to the States in three years. As against the latest figure of Central share of Rs.1119.20 crore an amount of Rs.894.34 crore has till date been released (*Appendix VIII*).

3.14 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that under Employment Assurance Scheme, 90% work has been completed and the current financial year may be the last year of the scheme.

3.15 In the Performance Budget (2003-2004), number of projects sanctioned under IWDP during the period 1995-96 to 2002-2003 has been given. In some of the States the number has increased manifold in the seven years as in the case of Uttaranchal and Mizoram whereas the progress has increased 15 and 13 time respectively. In the case of Assam the increase is 30 times. In Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh the increase is two times and five times respectively.

3.16 When asked about criterion for sanctioning the number of projects in a particular State and whether the number of projects and the area covered commensurate to the percentage of geographical wasteland area in a particular State to total wastelands in the country and further asked how the Department would explain the very good and good progress in terms of increase in IWDP projects in respective States/UTs, it has been stated by the Department that IWDP is a demand driven programme. The projects under this programme are sanctioned to the districts keeping in view the extent of wastelands in the district, issue of poverty, backwardness, effect of drought, progress in ongoing projects. The Department has been ensuring that the IWDP project area taken up in a State is generally in

proportion to the percentage of geographical wasteland area of that State to total wastelands. However, the progress of ongoing projects and timely submission of complete project proposal by the States are also important factors for sanctioning new projects. With the proactive approach of the Department, IWDP projects are now under implementation in all the States of the country except Goa. The progress of projects which avail of funds as per the prescribed schedule are considered as 'very good' and those of the projects which claim at least one instalment each year can be formed as 'good'.

3.17 When asked whether any long term planning with regard to development of wastelands in the country has been made (IWDP being the biggest scheme of the Department of Wastelands), it has been stated that a new initiative namely Haryali has been proposed for implementation of the three Watershed Development Programmes of the Department of Land Resources viz. the Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), the Desert Development Programme (DDP) and the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) through the Panchayati Raj Institutions. Tentative targets for the Tenth Plan have also been indicated.

3.18 The Committee find that from the year 1992-93 to 2000-01, the utilization position was very encouraging whereby near about cent percent utilization could be achieved under one of the biggest programme of wastelands development, i.e. IWDP. However, they are perturbed to notice underspending during the year 2001-02 and 2002-03. During the year 2001-02, Rs.40.39 crore remained unutilized. Further, during the year 2002-03, there is an underspending of Rs.67.13 crore, although they also note that expenditure data has been given upto 17 March 2003. Further, with regard to the reasons for underspending, they are not satisfied with the routine reply furnished by the Department stating that the development of community organization watershed association, watershed community, watershed development team, etc. was a time consuming process causing delay in the implementation of the project. The Committee would like that besides stressing for higher allocation, thrust of the Department should be on proper utilization of scarce resources.

As regards the reason for underspending as being cuts imposed by Ministry of Finance, the Committee would like to say that the Department itself is responsible for the cut, as could be seen that the underspending during the year 2001-02 may be one of the reasons for cut imposed at RE stage during the following year, i.e. 2002-03. Further, the Committee would also like the Department to evaluate the reasons for underspending from each of the project for which money has been sanctioned and furnish a detailed reply in this regard.

3.19 With regard to North-Eastern States, the Committee find that the Department has furnished one of the reasons for underspending, as the shortfall due to the requirement of spending 10 per cent of the total outlay in North-Eastern States. The Committee understand that 10 per cent of the total allocation, as per the formula evolved by Government of India, is allocated to North-Eastern States and the unspent amount is deposited in the non-lapsable pool of resources. The Committee would like to be clarified whether while calculating total underspending of the Department, the unspent amount in case of the North-Eastern States as deposited in non-lapsable pool, is also included. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the criteria for spending money deposited in non-lapsable pool for infrastructure purposes.

3.20 While the issue regarding North-East allocation has been addressed separately in the preceding chapter, the Committee would like to say here that different States in the North-Eastern region should be persuaded to chalk out a detailed action plan with regard to implementation of IWDP so that the scarce resources earmarked for the development of the region could be meaningfully utilised.

3.21 As regards watershed component of EAS, the Committee find that the committed liability under watershed component of

EAS which was transferred to IWDP from 1999-2000 onwards was for Rs.1,500 crore as stated by the Department. They also note that since 1999-2000 onwards, Rs.894.34 crore have been released under EAS component of IWDP. They further note that around Rs.600 crore is the remaining committed liability in this regard. They also further find that Rs.60 crore have been earmarked for this component during the year 2003-04 and the Secretary has assured the Committee that this financial year will be the last year for the completion of the said projects. The Committee feel that the trends of allocation indicate another scenario. Almost one-third of the committed liability is yet to be fulfilled and yet the Secretary has stated that 90 per cent of the work has been completed.

3.22 The Committee understand that projects related to watershed component of EAS were transferred to Department of Land Resources w.e.f. 1999 and as informed by the Department, these projects were to be completed within three years. They find that three years have already been completed and there is huge committed liability as stated above. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the reasons for slippage of targets in this regard.

3.23 The Committee further note that the cost norms of development of wastelands per hectare have been revised from Rs.4,000 to Rs.6,000 per hectare w.e.f. 1 April 2000. They also note that before this revision, the programme was 100 per cent Centrally sponsored. But after the revision, State Governments have to contribute in the ratio of 75:25 with regard to the increase to Rs.2,000 per hectare cost. Thus, the funding pattern of the scheme has been changed from 100 per cent Central grant to sharing in the ratio of 11:1. The Committee would like to be apprised of the data with regard to the allocation made by the States since the year 2000. They would also like that the State-

wise position should be indicated in the Performance Budget. The Committee would further like to be apprised whether the States are facing any difficulty in providing the matching share. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the details in this regard.

3.24 The Committee further note that IWDP is a demand driven scheme. They also note that the number of projects sanctioned under IWDP, as given in the Performance Budget, indicate lopsided development of wastelands in the country, whereby in some of the States, the number of projects has increased manifold but in the bigger States like Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, which may be having more areas of wastelands, the increase is two times and five times respectively. As already recommended in the preceding para of the Report, the Committee would like that the Department has now to think over some mechanism, whereby the criteria for sanctioning a number of projects in a particular State, should commensurate the percentage of geographical wastelands area in that State to total wastelands in the country to achieve the targets of developing the wastelands in a country within a stipulated time frame.

Drought Prone Areas Programme

3.25 Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) is the earliest area development programme launched by the Central Government in 1973-1974 to tackle the special problems faced by those fragile areas which are constantly affected by severe drought conditions. At present, there are 972 block in the country and the scheme is in operation in all the blocks in 182 districts of 16 States.

3.26 The Year wise allocation during 9th Plan:

(Rs. in Crore)

Year	B.E	R.E	Actual Expenditure
1997-1998	115.00	110.75	90.75
1998-1999	95.00	73.00	73.00

1999-2000	95.00	95.00	94.99
2000-2001	190.00	190.00	189.58
2001-2002	210.00	210.00	208.99

(Rs. in Crore)

BE during 9 th Plan	705.00
RE during 9 th Plan	678.75
Expenditure	657.31

Outlay during 10th Plan 1500

(Rs. in Crore)

Year	B.E	R.E	Amount
2002-2003	250.00	250.00	206.60*
2003-2004	295.00	-	-

* (31.01.2003)

3.27 It has been stated in the written note that during 10th Plan it is proposed to sanction 13600 new watershed projects covering an area of 68 lakh hectare.

Number of projects sanctioned during 9th Plan

Year	Projects sanctioned
1997-1998	406
1998-1999	880
1999-2000	2278
2000-2001	3371
2001-2002	2052
Total	8987

3.28 When asked for the reasons for decline in the number of sanctioned projects during 2001-2002 as compared to previous year under DPAP, the Department has explained that these projects had huge outstanding liabilities due to increase in the cost norm for new

projects. Further when enquired whether the Department has tried to pursue Planning Commission to enhance the allocation, keeping in view the enhanced cost norms, it has been stated that the Department constantly pursues with the Planning Commission at various fora for enhancing budget allocation. In the year 1999-2000, the allocation for DPAP was Rs. 95.00 crore and it doubled to Rs. 190.00 crore in 2000-2001. This went up to Rs. 250 crore in 2002-03.

3.29 When asked as to how far the overall targets would be affected by reduction in watershed projects being sanctioned as compared to previous years, it has been stated by the Department that for the 9th Five Year Plan as a whole, overall targets had not been laid down for DPAP. The targets were being fixed annually on the basis of availability of funds after meeting the committed liabilities in respect of ongoing projects.

3.30 When asked about the proposed strategy of the Department to ensure 100% utilization of outlay earmarked for DPAP during 10th Plan specifically during the year 2003-2004, it has been stated that a watershed project sanctioned under DPAP takes 5 years to complete and the amount is released in 7 instalments. As such every year, there is an outstanding liability of the projects sanctioned during last five years. Besides, new projects are sanctioned every year and the first instalment (15% of Central share) is released along with the sanction. The releases for ongoing projects and first instalment of the new projects would ensure 100% utilization of outlay earmarked for DPAP during 10th Plan.

3.31 The Department has further stated that for 2003-2004 target for sanctioning new projects is 2400. This will involve release of Rs.81.00 crore. Besides there are more than 10000 ongoing projects. The release of instalments for these ongoing projects would ensure 100% utilization during 2003-2004.

3.32 When asked about the implementing agencies under DPAP and whether the funds are allocated timely to implementing agencies, it has been stated by the Department that the project implementing agencies may be either a Non Government Organisation (NGO) or a Government Department. In the revised Guidelines, it has been provided that the project implementing agencies should preferably be selected from amongst the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). The Agencies from other categories will be selected as PIA in case PRIs are not in a position to function as such. The funds are released to ZPs/DRDAs, which in turn release the funds to Implementing Agencies. At the time of release of subsequent instalments

to ZPs/DRDAs, it is ensured that DRDA has released the funds to PIAs, and Watershed Committees.

3.33 When asked what steps are being undertaken to ensure that the area treated under DPAP does not convert into the earlier position it has been stated that under the Guidelines, there is a provision of Watershed Development Fund to ensure proper maintenance of the watershed area after completion of the projects. In the revised Guidelines an exit protocol provision exists which provides that the Exit Protocol should explicitly form part of the watershed development plan. The watershed projects should generally be managed by the respective Watershed Associations/Watershed Committees under the overall supervision of the Gram Panchayat after the project period is over and after the external supporting agencies have withdrawn. The revised Guidelines also envisage that equity and sustainability of the benefits of the assets created under the watershed development plan should be clearly spelt out by the PIA before it exits from the area. The Guidelines also stipulate selection of new watersheds for treatment in contiguity with watersheds that have already received treatment. This will ensure a multiplier effect in sustaining overall area development. These measures will ensure that the area treated under DPAP does not convert into the earlier position.

3.34 Further it has been stated that the exercise of mid-term evaluation has been entrusted to the State Governments to be carried out through independent evaluators. However, the Monitoring Division of this Ministry has sponsored impact assessment studies in various watershed programme States.

3.35 When asked whether the Department has ever thought of having some permanent solution by taking various steps like bringing up the ground water table, conservation of water and by taking various steps of water harvesting etc. to make the DPAP blocks permanently greener, it has been stated that the Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) is a long term plan for drought proofing the identified areas by creation of a natural resource base. Activities to boost ground water, water conservation and water harvesting figure prominently in the programme.

3.36 When further asked whether any additional assistance has been provided to DPAP blocks during the year 2002-2003 keeping in view the severe drought situation in the country, it has been stated that the Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) is a long term plan for drought proofing the identified areas by creation of a natural resource base. The

programme does not envisage of providing contingency relief measures in the event of a drought situation.

3.37 As regards the statement of projects sanctioned under DPAP, it is stated by the Department that the funds for projects are released in seven instalments. The number of instalments released is , therefore, a parameter to determine the status of a project. With reference to instalments released, the status of the projects sanctioned during the 9th five year plan is as under: -

No. of Instalments released	No. of Projects
7	477
6	118
5	871
4	799
3	1870
2	1557
1	3295
Total projects sanctioned during 9 th Plan	8987

3.38 When asked for the corrective steps taken / proposed to be taken for better performance of DPAP during 2003-2004, the Department has stated that the following steps are being undertaken:

- (i) System of mid-term evaluation has been introduced for watershed projects under DPAP.
- (ii) The evaluation has been entrusted to the State Governments.
- (iii) Closure of non-performing projects.
- (iv) Establishment of State Level and District Level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to monitor and critically assess the performance of the projects.

- (v) Criteria for allocation of new projects to have weighted proportion for performance of ongoing projects.
- (vi) Supplementary Observation Mechanism through State and District Level Institutions for tracking the pace and quality of the implementation of the watershed projects taken up under DPAP has been introduced. The mechanism will serve the purpose of adding value to the monitoring system in force.

3.39 The Committee find that the data with regard to outlay earmarked under DPAP indicates around cent per cent utilisation of resources. Further, they note that DPAP is in operation in all the blocks in the country. As regards allocation made under DPAP by Government funding, the Committee find that year after year the allocation is increasing and allocation and expenditure position is quite satisfactory. With regard to the overall impact of DPAP on the areas covered, the Committee note that the exercise of mid-term evaluation has been entrusted to the State Governments to be carried out by the independent evaluators. Besides, Monitoring Division of the Ministry has also sponsored the impact assessment studies in various Watershed Programmes in various States. The Committee would like to be apprised about the mid-term evaluation started in various States. Besides, they would also like to be apprised about the results of the impact assessment studies. They would also like that it should be ensured that mid-term evaluation is made expeditiously by all the States Governments to have an overall view of the impact of DPAP in the areas being developed.

3.40 The Committee understand from the information provided to them as given in the preceding para that Drought Prone Areas Programme is a long-term plan for drought proofing of identified areas by creation of a natural resource base. The Committee

would like the Department to ensure that the money earmarked under DPAP is strictly utilised in line with the said objectives of the programme, so that a permanent solution by bringing the water table above can be found. To ensure this, the Committee would like the Department to monitor the progress of DPAP to achieve the desired objectives.

3.41 The Committee further note that as per the data furnished with regard to the status of projects being implemented under DPAP, it is noticed that most of the projects are new and as stated by the Department, the funds for projects are released in seven instalments, which means that huge allocation would be required under each of the financial year to complete the committed liability for the ongoing projects. The Committee would like to be apprised whether with the allocation earmarked during the 10th Plan, the committed liability would be fulfilled for the ongoing projects, besides ensuring achievement of the set targets for setting up new projects.

3.42 The Committee further note that one of the corrective steps mentioned for better performance of DPAP is closure of non-performing projects. The Committee would like to be apprised whether any data in this regard has been maintained by the Department and, if so, the State-wise figures may be provided. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the time and cost run involved in the various projects being implemented under DPAP.

Desert Development Programme (DDP)

3.43 The Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started both in hot desert areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Haryana and the cold deserts of Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh in 1977-78. From 1995-96, the coverage has been extended to a few more districts in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Under DDP, 235 blocks of 40 districts having an area of 4.58 lakh sq. km. in 7 States are covered.

Outlay and releases during 9th Plan

Year	BE	RE	Annual Release
1997-98	70.00	70.00	70.01
1998-99	90.00	80.00	79.80
1999-2000	85.00	85.00	84.99
2000-2001	135.00	135.00	134.99
2001-2002	160.00	150.00	149.88
Total 9 th Plan	540.00	520.00	519.67

10th Plan Allocation

Rs.1100 crore

	BE	RE	Release
2002-2003	185	185	134.33*
			*(as on 31.1.2003)
2003-2004	215	-	

3.44 When asked to furnish the details of the action plan made for proper utilization of allocation i.e. almost double of what was allocated during 9th Plan, the Department has stated that a watershed project sanctioned under DDP takes five years to complete and the amount is released in seven instalments.

3.45 With regard to committed liabilities, the Department has stated that from the year 1995-96 till 2002-03, 8314 projects have been sanctioned. This includes 1602 new projects sanctioned during 2002-03, which is the first year of the Tenth Five Year Plan. Out of these 8314 projects, the entire Central share has been released in respect of 1674 projects. The committed liability for the balance 6640 ongoing projects is approximately Rs. 958.16 crore. In addition, new projects are sanctioned every year. The target for the Tenth Plan is to sanction 8800 projects. The release of instalments for ongoing projects plus the liability for new projects would ensure 100% utilization of outlay earmarked for DDP during 10th Plan.

3.46 The Department has further stated that the impact assessment studies sponsored by the monitoring division of the Ministry, entrusted to independent agencies of repute with adequate expertise and experience in the field, have revealed a positive impact of DDP projects in terms of checking soil erosion, increase in water table, crop area and overall greenery.

3.47 As stated by the Department, the total desert area identified for coverage under DDP is 458 lakh hectare. Further, it has been submitted that the Department could cover less than 10% of the identified area under DDP and as such the impact is not visible. At the same time, it has been stated that the impact assessment studies have revealed positive impact.

3.48 When asked as to how the Department would explain contradictory statements as indicated in the aforesaid paras, it has been stated that since the area so far covered for treatment is less than 10% of the total identified DDP area, the impact of this programme, in its entirety, is not conspicuous at this stage of programme implementation. Yet, the Impact Assessment Studies so far completed in some States are sample studies conducted in representative project areas and the positive outcome there is indicative of the general performance of DDP in these areas and as such these facts are not in contradiction with each other.

3.49 When further asked about are the plans to cover the remaining 90% of DDP areas in the country, it has been stated that Desert Development Programme is a long term area development programme. During the Tenth Five Year Plan, the target is to sanction 8800 new projects to treat about 44 lakh hectares of land. The Department will pursue for higher allocations with the Planning Commission in the remaining years.

Physical and Financial Performance

3.50 From 1995-96 till 2001-2002, the year-wise details of sanction of projects is as under:-

Year	No. of projects	Areas (in lakh hectares)	Total cost (Rs. in crore)
1995-96 to 1998-99	2194	10.98	438.80
1999-2000	1500	7.50	325.00
2000-2001	1659	8.30	497.70
2001-2002	1359	6.79	407.70
Total	6712	33.57	1669.20

3.51 When asked as to how many watershed projects have been completed so far and what is their impact in providing permanent solution for the treatment of land where these projects are being implemented, it has been stated that 1674 watershed projects are deemed to have been completed as the entire funds have been released for these projects. The watershed projects created positive impact in checking soil erosion, increasing water table, crop area and overall productivity as revealed in some of the studies.

3.52 The Committee note that as per the information furnished by the Department, the area covered for treatment under DDP programme is less than 10 per cent of the total identified DDP area. As regards the trends of allocation during the 9th and 10th Plan, the Committee note that during the 10th Plan, Rs.1,100 crore have been earmarked against total releases amounting to Rs.519.67 crore during the 9th Plan, which means the increase is more than 50 per cent. However, keeping in view the fact that 90 per cent of the identified areas under DDP is still to be covered, they feel that even the enhanced allocation during the 10th Plan is not sufficient. Besides, the committed liability for the ongoing projects is another area, where huge investments would be required in the coming years. In view of the said position, there is less scope for additional areas to be covered under DDP. In view of this, they would like that the Department should chalk out an action plan and indicate the resources required for covering the total DDP blocks in the country, so that an estimate of outlay required could be made and the future planning can be made in this regard.

Modernisation of Revenue and Land Administration Scheme

3.53 Modernization of Revenue and Land Administration Scheme has two components, namely, (a) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Upgrading of Land records; and (b) Computerisation of Land records. Assistance is given to the States on a 50:50 sharing

basis and to the UTs on 100% basis under the component of strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records. Financial assistance under computerisation of Land Records is on 100% grant-in-aid basis. So far, 582 districts have been brought under the Computerisation programme in the country and the scheme has been operationalised in 2970 Tehsils/Taluka/Mandals in the Country.

(a) Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

3.54 As per the data furnished by the Department, the Financial Achievement during the 9th Plan is as below:

(Rs. in crore)

Total B.E. during 9 th Plan	178.00
RE	171.00
Expenditure	169.14

During the 10th Plan Period, the outlay under the Scheme is Rs. 400 crore against the proposed allocation of Rs. 500 crore.

Funds provided under the Scheme of CLR

3.55

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Proposed by the Department	Plan Allocation
2000-2001	110.00	50.00
2001-2002	75.00	45.00
2002-2003	100.00	55.00
2003-2004	55.00	35.00

3.56 The details regarding BE, RE and Expenditure incurred are as under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	EXPENDITURE
2001-2002	45.00	45.00	44.36
2002-2003	55.00	35.00	29.94 (UPTO 17.3.03)
2003-2004	40.00		

3.57 When asked about the reasons for getting lesser allocation at R.E. stage during the year 2002-2003, it has been stated that the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records is a demand driven Scheme. As and when proposals are received from the States, these are examined as per the Guidelines of the Scheme and funds are released to the States. The process of computerisation involves setting up computer centre at district and tehsil/taluk level, preparation of schedule and mechanism for data entry work, data verification and validation which is a time consuming process. Therefore, States are taking time in utilisation of funds released earlier and not requesting for additional funds under the Scheme. In view of this the allocation at the RE stage during 2002-2003 has been reduced.

3.58 Further, when enquired about the reasons for shortfall in expenditure during the year 2002-2003, the Department has stated that the Budget Allocation under the Scheme at the RE stage during the year 2002-2003 is Rs. 35.00 crore, out of which Rs. 30.00 crore has been released to States. The balance of Rs. 5.00 crore has been earmarked for the NE States and the same will be released after getting proposals from NE States during the remaining period of the current financial year.

3.59 It is further stated that the Department is in the process of revising the guidelines for the scheme of computerization of land records and it is expected that the same will be approved during the next financial year. When asked about the details of the proposals regarding restructuring the programme, it has been stated that under the existing guidelines of the Scheme of CLR, funds are provided for setting up of computer centers at District/Tehsil level and for actual amounts spent on data entry work. There is no provision in the existing guidelines for providing funds for setting up of computer centre at sub-division level. The sub-division being the intermediate unit of Revenue Administration between District and Tehsil level needs to be covered under the Scheme. The sub-division level could work as data storage centre for all the tehsils under its jurisdiction. This system could also be used for proper supervision and redressal of grievances of the public at the sub-division level.

3.60 At present, most of the States are entering only ownership detail. To make the Land Record Management system comprehensive, it is being proposed in the revised guidelines to incorporate other components like details of crop and cultivation, tenancy, irrigation, type of soil etc.

3.61 The Committee note that under the existing guidelines for the scheme of computerization of land records, the intermediate unit of sub-division between District and Tehsil has not been covered. At present, funds are provided for setting up computer centers and data entry work at the District and Tehsil levels, while allocation of funds for computer centers at the sub-division level is conspicuously missing. The Committee feel that by computerizing the sub-division level, it could work as a data storage centre for all tehsils under its jurisdiction. Moreover, this system could be used for proper supervision and redressal of grievances of the public at this level. Therefore, the Committee feel that necessary changes should be made in the Guidelines of the scheme of CLR to include the provision of allocation and disbursement of funds to the sub-division level for setting up computer centres and other related activities.

3.62 Moreover, to make the Land Record Management System Comprehensive, the Committee desire that while reviewing the Guidelines, along with ownership details, it should be made mandatory to include factual details about crop and cultivation, tenancy, irrigation, soil type, etc. in the database.

Physical achievement

3.63 During the 9th Plan, Rs. 169.13 crore was released to various States under the Scheme by covering 259 more districts. At present the Scheme is being implemented in 582 districts of the country leaving only those districts where there are no land records. Also 2970 tehsils/talukas were covered under operationalisation programme till 30th December, 2002. Since inception of the scheme, the Ministry has released Rs. 254.14 crore as on 31st January, 2003. The utilisation of funds reported by the States/UTs is Rs.152.97 crore which is approximately 60% of the total funds released.

3.64 When enquired about the number of districts where there are no land records and whether the Department has thought of giving flexibility to the State Governments for using the earmarked money for Computerisation of Land Records and maintaining the land records because both the scheme are co-related, the Department has responded that seven districts of

Meghalaya State have no proper land records, therefore, the State Government has been requested to initiate the process of preparing land records by using modern technology.

3.65 When asked about the steps being initiated to have the land records in the said districts of Meghalaya it has been stated by the Department that the land management system of Meghalaya is different from the systems in the rest of the country. In Meghalaya, land belongs to the tribes and its distribution, ownership and use are governed by unwritten tribal customs, rights over forests and minerals are also exercised by the Tribes. Therefore, there are no proper land records which can be computerized. During various conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries, State Government of Meghalaya has been requested to carry out cadastral survey work so that computerization may be initiated.

3.66 As stated by the Department, the utilization of funds under the scheme is 60% of the total funds utilized and the main reason for huge under-spending as indicated is delay in development of necessary software, delay in transfer of funds from State to implementing authority, non-availability of data entry agencies, delay in porting of data from UNIX-FOX base to window base, lack of trained staff to handle computers and delay in procurement of hardware by the State Governments.

3.67 When asked, about the steps being initiated to overcome each of the above problems it has been submitted in a written reply that to overcome the problem of porting of data, the State Unit of NIC has been requested to develop suitable software for conversion of existing data from UNIX-FOX base to Window base. Sufficient funds have been provided to the States to impart training to revenue officials involved in computerization work. States have also been requested to release funds to the implementing authority immediately.

3.68 When asked what specific steps have so far been initiated by the Department to gear up monitoring mechanism, it has been stated that under the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records the Department has requested the State Governments to constitute Committees at district and State level to gear up the monitoring mechanism. In pursuance of this, the States have formed these committees which review the progress of the scheme regularly. At the National level it is being reviewed from time to time by organising National level conferences of State Revenue Ministers/Secretaries. The progress of the Scheme is also being monitored through video conferencing interaction with States/UTs and through Quarterly Progress Report in the prescribed proforma, visit of Area Officers to respective States to review the rural development programme.

3.69 As per the written replies, land records have been computerised in the States of Karnataka, Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. The States of Goa and Karnataka have completed computerisation work and the land owners are getting computerised copies of ownership details of their record of rights on demand by paying a nominal fee. The Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that the work in these two States will be completed during the two years.

3.70 The Department has further submitted that the States viz. Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Manipur and Uttaranchal are lagging behind in the implementation of the Scheme. The main reason is delay in transfer of funds to implementing authority, delay in development of suitable software, non-availability of data entry agencies, lack of trained staff to handle computers and delay in finalisation of tenders for purchase of computers for installation at tehsil/taluk level.

3.71 When asked about the steps being initiated to improve implementation of the programme in the aforesaid States, it has been stated by the Department that the State Units of NIC have already developed suitable software in consultation with these States. They have also been requested to engage private vendors for undertaking data entry work and also to chalk out an Action Plan for completion of the Scheme of CLR in a time bound manner.

3.72 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary apprised the Committee that the Government of Karnataka has made a legal provision, whereby only computerised copy of the land records have been legalised. Similarly, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have also done something in this regard. When asked for the reasons for not getting success in the programme, the Secretary, further apprised that the agencies which are used to manual land records want that computer system should fail.

3.73 The Committee during their Study Visit to Goa during 2003 had observed that 100% records of rights of land have been computerised with the help of private sector participation.

3.74 When asked whether private sector has been involved in these projects in other States also, the Department has stated that the private sector has not been involved in the implementation of the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records, but States have been requested to undertake data entry work through private vendors so that work could be completed in a time bound manner.

3.75 The Department has stated that during the year 2002-2003, a decision was taken that the Schemes of Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records

(SRA&ULR) and Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) may be brought under one Major Head “Modernisation of Revenue & Land Administration” but with separate Sub-Head and allocation. When asked, whether the proposed initiative of the Department to bring two schemes i.e. SRA & ULR and CLR under one major head would result in better accounting and coordination under the programme the Department has stated that both these Schemes are co-related. If revenue records are properly updated and maintained then it would be easy to computerise updated records which would result in better accounting and coordination of the Scheme.

3.76 The Committee find from the information made available to them that in seven districts of Meghalaya, there are no proper land records. Further, they also note that due to the unwritten tribal customs in Meghalaya, proper land records cannot be maintained. Further, they note that the State Government of Meghalaya has been requested to carry out cadastral survey work. The Committee feel that much has to be done in this regard to enlighten the tribals about the usefulness of having land records. The Committee would like that the Government should initiate some action in this regard, so that Meghalaya has proper land records.

3.77 The Committee are unhappy to note the position of utilisation of funds, i.e. around 60 per cent. They would like that the proper utilisation of scarce resources should be ensured, so that the set targets under the programme are fully achieved.

3.78 The Committee further note that in some of the States, *viz.* Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Manipur and Uttranchal, the progress of the programme is poor. One of the reasons cited for poor performance is delay in transfer of funds to implementing authority. The Committee find that this is a recurrent problem with regard to implementation of different programmes of the Department. They would like that funds should be released to the implementing authorities timely, so as to ensure proper and effective implementation of the programme.

3.79 The Committee have been apprised by the Secretary that in some of the States, only computerized copy of land records are the legal documents which can be produced for various purposes. They feel that by making similar provisions by the remaining State Governments, the programme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) can further be successfully implemented. Not only that, by having the land records computerized, there will be much transparency and it will also reduce corruption and malpractices to a great extent. The Committee would like that some guidelines from the Union Government should be issued to the State Governments in this regard.

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

3.80 As per the data furnished by the Department in Preliminary Material, the Financial Achievement during the 9th Plan is as below:-

Total BE during 9 th Plan	92.60
RE	87.60
Expenditure	86.18

3.81 During the 10th Plan Period, the outlay under the Scheme is Rs. 200 crore against the proposed Rs. 350 crore.

The details regarding funds provided under the Scheme of SRA & ULR since 2000-2001 are as given under:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Proposed by the Department	Plan Allocation
2000-2001	30.00	25.00
2001-2002	50.00	30.00
2002-2003	70.00	35.00
2003-2004	35.00	25.00

3.82 The details regarding BE, RE and Expenditure incurred are as under:

Year	BE	RE	EXPENDITURE
2001-2002	30.00	25.00	24.50
2002-2003	35.00	20.00	15.12 (upto 31.1.03)
2003-2004	25.00	-	-

3.83 The Department has stated that during the next financial year, the guidelines would be revised and the allocation for 10th Plan is likely to be utilized in the remaining three years of the 10th Plan. When asked how the Department would ensure utilization of allocation made during 10th Plan i.e Rs.200 crore during two years available for implementation of the programme under the revised guidelines it is stated by the Department that States/UTs have been requested to complete survey/re-survey work by using modern survey equipment like GPS and Total Stations etc. They have also been requested to prepare an action plan for taking up digitization of cadastral survey maps in a phased manner where computerization of land record work is fully completed. These activities would require more funds. Hence, the funds of Rs.200 crore earmarked for the 10th Plan will be utilized fully.

3.84 As per the Performance Budget all the States/UTs have been covered under the Scheme and since inception funds to the tune of Rs. 236.16 crore were provided to the States/UTs as Central Share upto 31st January, 2003. The utilisation of funds reported by the States/UTs is Rs. 156.72 crore, which is approximately 68% of the total funds released.

3.85 When asked about the reasons for underspending during the year 2002-2003 it has been stated that the Budget Provision under the Scheme during the year 2002-03 is Rs. 35.00 crore. Under this Scheme, funds are released on 50:50 sharing basis between the Centre and the States. Some of the States find it difficult to match their share due to financial constraints which results in unspent balance under the Scheme. Subsequently, the Department did not get adequate proposals for seeking further assistance under the Scheme leading to under spending during the current financial year. However, at the RE stage the allocation has been reduced to Rs. 20.00 crore, out of which Rs. 18.88 crore has already been released to the States. The balance amount will be utilised during the remaining time of the current financial year.

3.86 The Department has stated that since inception of the Scheme, the Government of India has released Rs. 239.92 crore to States/UTs and utilisation reported is Rs. 161.04 crore (67%). The State-wise detail is given at *Appendix– IX*.

3.87 The Department has stated that Area Officers are deputed by the Ministry to review all programmes of the Ministry. They emphasise concerned Department of the State Government to implement the Scheme sincerely and efficiently so that the funds released under the Scheme could be utilised properly.

3.88 When asked as to how many Conferences of the State Revenue Ministers/Secretaries have so far been held during the last three years and what are the details of the findings of the said Conferences, it has been stated by the Department that during the last three years, two conferences of Revenue Ministers/Secretaries have been organised by this Department. The conference of Revenue Secretaries was held on 14th October, 2000 and the conference of Revenue Ministers of States on 19th and 20th August, 2002. A copy of the resolutions passed in the conference of Revenue Ministers is given at *Appendix– X*.

3.89 The Department has further stated that during the Conference of State Revenue Ministers/Secretaries, it was emphasized that funds released under the Scheme may be utilised expeditiously for the items it was sanctioned. They have been requested to adopt modern technologies in the field of Survey and Settlement, training manpower for adoption of the new technology, strengthening of the training infrastructure and facilities for maintenance of land records which will enable them to effectively implement the programme.

3.90 The Department has also stated that one of the objectives of the programme is setting up of Survey and Settlement Organization, especially in the North-Eastern Region, where no land records exist.

3.91 The Department has further stated that seven districts of Meghalaya have got no land records. Besides at some other place in the written note it is stated that several North-Eastern States do not, as yet, have proper land records and legislation in respect of land matters.

3.92 When asked as to how the Department would explain two different statements as given in the preceding para and further when asked about the names of North-Eastern States which do not have proper land records and about the steps being initiated to have the land records in such States it has been stated by the Department that Meghalaya is a State where land has not been Cadastrally Surveyed. The Land Tenure system prevailing in the State is

totally different from the system existing in other parts of the country. At present the Cadastral Survey Operation is being implemented to some extent in the western part of the State, where the local people and traditional institutions have come forward to cooperate and join hands with Government to make the operation successful. The system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal tracts of the North-Eastern States. In some of these areas, there is no legislation regarding land and land related matters. Cadastral survey has not been done and no land records exist. Though individual ownership of land has been developed in some areas, a good deal of land is still owned by different communities. The system operates fairly smoothly without any records being maintained by the Government or the community. However, in the plains districts of Assam and Manipur and the entire State of Tripura, cadastral survey has been done and land records exist. The situation in these areas is not very different from that in the rest of the country in the matter of land records and land administration.

3.93 The Department has further stated that the special problems are confined to two hill districts of Assam, five hill districts of Manipur and the States of Meghalaya, Nagaland, Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh. North-Eastern States have been requested to carry out survey and settlement, where it has not been done.

3.94 When asked how far the programme has really resulted in transparency in one of the important area i.e. Revenue Administration it has been stated by the Department that the following could be achieved with regard to transparency:

- (i) Easy access of the land owner to get a computerized copy of his record of rights on demand at reasonable charges results in empowering the land owner at grass root level.
- (ii) The land owner may use computerised copies of the record of rights for borrowing money from financial institutions.
- (iii) Wherever computer centres have been set up, it will bring transparency in revenue administration.

3.95 The Committee are constrained to note huge underspending under the programme SRA & ULR meant for maintenance and updating of land records. They note that not only the allocation made under the programme is inadequate, but

whatever funds are allocated, are not being meaningfully utilised. They also note that the main reason for underspending is difficulty faced by various State Governments in providing the matching share, which is 50:50 under the Scheme. The Committee further note that whereas Computerisation of Land Records is a 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Programme, the allocation under SRA & ULR is 50:50 between the Centre and the States. They find that having proper land records is a pre-requisite for success of computerization of land records. They also find that both the programmes are inter-related programmes and as such, they would like that the Department should merge the two programmes and the State Government should be provided flexibility in using the outlay for the two programmes. As regards the Centre-State ratio for allocation, the Committee would like to recommend to analyze the position State-wise and apprise the Committee accordingly.

Miscellaneous activities not having financial implication

(i) Allocation of Land to landless rural poor

3.96 One of the miscellaneous activities under the jurisdiction of the Department is to play an advisory and coordinating role in distribution of ceiling surplus land, Bhoodan land and Government wastelands etc. to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes etc. When asked for the purpose for which such land is being used by the beneficiaries, the Department has stated that they have no information in this regard.

3.97 When asked whether the Department monitor the position to ensure that the land allocated to landless rural poor is used for agricultural purposes as per the said objectives, it has been stated by the Department that land and its management falls within the administrative and legislative jurisdiction of the respective State Governments. The Central Government only plays an advisory and coordinating role in this regard. Therefore, the entire responsibility to ensure that the land allotted to the landless rural poor is used for agricultural purposes rests with the State Governments. However, while reviewing the various Land Reform Programmes at various fora, including Revenue

Secretaries'/Ministers'/Chief Ministers' Conferences, it has been emphasized that the land allotted to the landless rural poor for agricultural purposes should not be used for any other purpose and that the developmental schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development may be dovetailed to assist such beneficiaries.

(ii) Settlement of litigation cases.

3.98 As per Performance Budget, an area of 9.03 lakh acres is involved in litigation. When asked whether any steps are being undertaken for expeditious settlement of court cases, it has been stated by the Department that the issue relating to disposal of litigation cases was discussed at various fora including Conferences of Revenue Secretaries/Ministers. The Central Government have emphasized that the States having higher pendency of litigation cases, may constitute Land Tribunals under Article 323-B of the Constitution or set up Special Benches for expeditious disposal of such cases.

3.99 The Ministry has further stated that they have also requested State Governments at Chief Minister's level to dispose of litigation cases pending in various Revenue Courts expeditiously.

3.100 The Committee find that one of the objectives of distributing ceiling surplus land, Bhoodan land, Government wastelands etc., to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is to ensure that land is used for agricultural purposes. They also find that the position in this regard is never being monitored by the Union Government, although they have an advisory role of a coordinator in this regard. They, further find that although the Department has stated that in the various fora, including Revenue Secretaries', Ministers' and Chief Ministers' conferences, it is emphasised time and again that land allotted to landless rural poor should be used for agricultural purposes and the developmental schemes of Ministry of Rural Development should be dovetailed to assist such beneficiaries, no monitoring in this regard is being done. The Committee would like that some sort of data in this regard should be maintained, so that the objectives of the programme are really achieved. While considering the fact that Central Government have an advisory role in this regard,

they feel that some sort of instructions from the Union Government should be issued to the State Governments and further, they should be asked to furnish related data in this regard.

3.101 The Committee note that an area of 9.03 lakh acres is involved in litigation process in various States. They also find from the information provided by the Department that States having higher pendency of litigation cases may constitute land tribunals under article 323 (b) of the Constitution or set up special branches for expeditious disposal of such cases. They would like that specific instructions from the Union Government to all the State Governments should be issued in this regard.

Technology Development, Extension and Training(TDET) Scheme

3.102 Development of wastelands / degraded lands requires up-to-date information on their geographical location and extent, besides technological support. Proper area specific strategy has to be developed keeping in view the agro-climatic conditions and capability of the land. Consequently, a Central Sector Scheme of Technology Development Extension and Training (TDET) was launched during 1993-94 to develop data base on wastelands and to demonstrate cost effective and proven technologies for the development of various categories of wastelands for sustained production of food, fuel wood, fodder etc. on pilot basis.

3.103 Under this Scheme, 100% Central grant is admissible to implement the projects on wastelands owned by Government, Public Sector Undertaking including Universities, Panchayats etc. In case of projects on wastelands of Private Farmers/Corporate Bodies, the cost of the project requires to be shared in the ratio of 60:40 between the Department of Land Resources (DoLR) and the beneficiaries.

3.104 The projects sanctioned under the Scheme are monitored regularly on a half-yearly basis through progress reports received from project implementing agencies. Monitoring is also done through periodical review of the projects and field-visits.

3.105 The details of the year-wise outlay for 9th and 10th Five Year Plan are as under:

Year	Outlay	R.E.	(Rs. in crore) Expenditure
-------------	---------------	-------------	---------------------------------------

1997-1998	8.00	-	5.60
1998-1999	8.00	-	8.05
1999-2000	8.00	-	8.69
2000-2001	12.00	-	10.98
2001-2002	15.00	12.00	9.93
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	51.0		43.25
	<hr/>		<hr/>
2002-2003	17.00	16.00	8.30*
			*(as on 31.01.2003)
2003-2004	17.00		

3.106 The Department has stated that underspending during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 was because projects for which budget provision was made could not be sanctioned due to non submission of clarifications/additional information in time. An expenditure of Rs. 10.27 crore has been incurred upto 17th March, 2003. It is expected that the provision made in the RE for the Scheme would be fully utilized by releasing funds for on-going & new projects.

Physical Achievement during 9th Plan

Year	Area (ha.)
1997-98	3000
1998-99	3000
1999-2000	9661
2000-2001	7733
2001-2002	10500
	<hr/>
	33,894
	<hr/>

3.107 As indicated by the Department an area of 35,000 hectares under different categories of wastelands is proposed to be covered during the 10th Plan:

Year	Physical Targets	Physical Achievements
2002-2003	7000	2174 (31 st Jan.2003)
2003-2004	7000	

3.108 Total outlay during the 10th Plan under the Scheme is Rs.90.00 crore against the proposed allocation for Rs.100.00 crore.

3.109 When asked as to how the Department would justify double allocation during 10th Plan, while physical targets remain the same, it has been stated that under TDET Scheme, besides extension activities, projects on development of data base using remote sensing and GIS are also sanctioned, for which physical targets are not fixed. Hence, physical targets are not always commensurate with the financial outlay in the Scheme. In fact, during 9th Plan period the physical targets were fixed for 18,000 hectares whereas the achievement was 33,894 hectares. This was due to coverage of more area for reclamation of water logged and saline lands and watershed projects. Keeping this achievement in mind, the 10th Plan physical targets have been fixed at 35,000 hectares.

3.110 When asked as to how much area of wastelands is under the category of special problem lands for which said scheme is proposed to be implemented during the 10th Plan, it has been stated that as per the 'Wastelands Atlas of India 2000,' there is about 14.401 million hectares. area under special problem lands which include salt affected coastal saline areas (2.040 m.ha.), water logged & marshy land (1.657 m.ha.), gullied & ravinous land (2.055 m.ha.), shifting cultivation areas (3.514 m.ha.), mining/industrial wastelands (0.125 m.ha.) and sands including coastal sandy areas (5.002 m.ha.). Under the Scheme, pilot projects are to be taken up for development of these categories of special problem lands.

3.111 When asked about the steps being undertaken to use the latest technology in the task of development of wastelands in the country it has been stated that development of wastelands / degraded lands requires up-to- date information on their geographical location and extent besides technological support. Proper area specific strategy has to be developed, keeping in view the agro-climatic conditions and capability of the land. Various research organizations of the Central and State Governments have developed suitable technologies to improve the soil health and land productivity of various types of degraded land/wastelands. Under the on-going Central Sector Scheme of Technology Development Extension &

Training (TDET), pilot projects are sanctioned to develop data base on wastelands and extension of technology in private, community and institutional wastelands. These projects are also used as demonstration models for the farmers.

3.112 When asked about the achievement in respect of technology development in the field of wastelands as the nomenclature of the scheme indicates, the Department has stated that provision for development of technology is one of the objectives of the TDET Scheme. There are various research organizations of Central and State Governments viz. Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), State Agricultural Universities (SAUs) etc. engaged in the research and development of new and innovative technologies in the field of land development. Pilot projects relating to technology extension were considered under this scheme, to operationalise appropriate cost effective and proven technologies for development of various categories of wastelands. A few projects on development of data base on wastelands and natural resources themes/maps for watershed development using remote sensing and Geographic Information System (GIS) technology have also been sanctioned under the Scheme. 'Wastelands Atlas of India' covering the entire country on 1:50,000 scale using Remote Sensing imagery has been brought out in collaboration with NRSA, Hyderabad.

3.113 As the Atlas was prepared in five phases during 1985-86, another project has been entrusted to NRSA, Hyderabad to update the Atlas using latest satellite data of January, 2003 for the whole country at one time. The revised Atlas will also contain information about the sub-categories of wastelands and thus a total of 27 categories of wastelands will be covered under the revised Atlas.

3.114 When further asked whether any study has ever been made to analyse the latest scientific methods and technology used by other countries in the task of development of wastelands, it has been stated by the Department that the analysis of the latest scientific methods and technology used by other countries comes under the purview of the research organizations in the country. The Department of Land Resources replicates proven technologies developed by research organizations for the development of wastelands.

3.115 As per the written note Training and awareness raising are integral part of the TDET Scheme. Farmers and extension officials of the State Departments are trained on the improved methods of land use to enable them to adopt the methods /means in similar projects in other areas. Extension material/brochures are also prepared by the Project Implementation

Agencies (PIAs) and distributed to the extension workers and farmers in the training programmes and awareness camps.

3.116 The Department has further stated that review of TDET Scheme was done along with other Scheme of the Department by the Planning Commission during the zero based budget exercise. After the review of performance of the Scheme, it was found satisfactory and Planning Commission recommended for the continuation of the Scheme during the 10th Plan period.

3.117 Departmental Officers during their field visits to the project areas, inspect and review the implementation of the project. They also emphasize on the timely submission of Utilization Certificate (UC) and Audited Statement of Accounts (ASA), so that further funds are released and project is completed within the stipulated time frame.

3.118 When enquired in how many States/Uts the evaluation by the independent evaluators has been made, it has been stated by the Department that the evaluation of each project is done by the independent evaluator before releasing third installment. Hence, all the projects are invariably evaluated. The evaluator assesses whether the Guidelines have been followed. The evaluation report contains information about the implementation of the project with respect to the objectives, methodologies, physical targets and financial outlays set for the project vis-à-vis achievements, people's participation, projected benefits, usufruct sharing, maintenance of records, cash book etc. They also point out short comings, if any, in the implementation of the project and suggest necessary mid-term corrections.

3.119 The Committee find that the allocation made under Technology Development Extension Training (TDET) Scheme meant to administer cost effective and modern technologies for the development of various categories of wastelands is very meagre. Besides, they also note that even the meagre allocation made under the Scheme is not utilised fully. They would like that the scope of the Scheme should further be widened.

Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS)

3.120 A Central Sector Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS) was launched in 1994-95 in order to stimulate involvement of the Corporate Sector/ Financial Institution etc. to pool in resources for development of non-forest wastelands. It was later restructured to make it more popular and broad based. The Guidelines of the revised scheme were circulated to all the

States and other concerned during August, 1998. Under this Scheme, Central Promotional Grant/subsidy is limited to Rs.25 lakh. This Scheme has an in-built provision of attracting/channelling/mobilising funds in the form of promoter's contribution for certain categories of beneficiaries and 50% of the project cost from the financial institutions / banks as loan.

3.121 The physical/financial target / outlay and achievements are given below:-

Year	Physical (ha.)		Financial (Rs. Lakhs)	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
2000-2001	Not fixed	122.34	50.00	9.73
2001-2002	Not fixed	62.40	50.00	11.54
2002-2003	-	-	100.00	2.25*
2003-2004	-	-	10.00	-

*upto 31.1.2003

3.122 When asked about the reasons for non-utilisation of even the meagre amount under the scheme, it has been stated by the Department that sufficient project proposals have not been received under the Scheme. Funds could not be released under on-going projects for want of progress report and utilization of funds.

3.123 As per the written replies, the Planning Commission, based on the zero base exercise, has conveyed the decision that the IPS may be merged with the TDET Scheme. As the objectives and the funding pattern of both the Schemes are different, these Schemes cannot be merged. In view of the fact that various agencies are involved in the project viz. promoter, bank, revenue authorities, Central Government and State Governments, sufficient projects are not being submitted under the Scheme. In fact after restructuring the Scheme in 1998, only 24 projects could be sanctioned. On an average, an expenditure of Rs.10.00 lakh has been incurred under the Scheme against the financial outlay of Rs.200.00 lakh each in the first two years and Rs.50.00 lakh each in last two years. In view of the non-receipt of the sufficient proposals under the Scheme, the Ministry is examining discontinuance of this Scheme in the 10th Plan (from 2003-2004).

3.124 When enquired about the action being taken to attract private sector in pursuance of the Committee's earlier recommendations (refer 12th Report, 19th Report and 22nd Report of 13th Lok Sabha), the Department responded that continuous efforts were made by the Department to get proposals from the private sector. A letter was written from the level of

Additional Secretary in the Department of Land Resources to the Chairman/Chief Executive of the user industries/major corporate houses in the country, inviting them to develop the non-forest wastelands in the country and avail the subsidy under IPS. However, no response was received. Secretary (RD) has also interacted with the members of CII and ASSOCHAM during the last year about the involvement of the private sector in various rural development programmes, including the development of wastelands and watershed development. The Guidelines of the Scheme were distributed among all the stake holders.

3.125 For the meetings, workshop/seminars organized by the Department to popularize the Scheme from time to time, representatives of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Commerce & Industry, NABARD, private sector/corporate sector, CII, ASSOCHAM, banks and financial institutions are invariably invited. In some cases their representatives assured that they would submit proposals within a short time, but ultimately nothing came of it.

3.126 The reasons for the non-participation of the private sector in wastelands development programme as indicated by the Department are :-

- (i) Industry/Corporate sector do not own wastelands and demand allotment of large and contiguous patches of wastelands on long-term lease basis, removal/relaxation of land ceiling laws for plantation, simplification of the transit and felling rules for plantation etc.
- (ii) Land being a State subject, matters related to allotment of land on lease basis, land ceiling laws etc. are dealt by the States. Therefore, the role of the State Government is paramount in this regard. In fact, some of the State Governments viz. Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan have already taken initiatives and issued notification for allotment of Government wastelands on long term lease basis to the private sector for afforestation, horticulture and agro-based export oriented produce.
- (iii) The Private sector prefers activities which bring in profit without much risk; however, investments in wasteland involves a lot of uncertainties.
- (iv) Under the Investment Promotional Scheme, the amount of subsidy is very low (Rs.5000 per hectare) whereas the cost of development wastelands is invariably more than Rs.60,000 per hectare with drip irrigation facility.

Therefore, private sector participation in wastelands development specifically in the Investment Promotional Scheme has not been encouraging.

3.127 The Department has further stated that in view of the foregoing reasons, this scheme has not picked up and therefore, it was decided to discontinue it from the next financial year i.e. 1st April, 2003.

3.128 The Committee have, for the last two or three years, been drawing the attention of the Department to the need for extending the scope of implementation of IPS Scheme. Keeping in view the resource constraints of the Government, there is an urgent need to involve the private sector to achieve the set targets. The Committee had earlier recommended (refer 12th Report, 13th Lok Sabha – para 3.24) 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, which 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.

However, the Committee find that in spite of pursuing the matter further in their subsequent Reports, the Department has failed to give any satisfactory reply indicating the specific steps taken by them with regard to their recommendation. The Committee, further note that when asked about the action taken by the Department on their recommendation while examining the Demands for Grants of the current year, the Department has not given a satisfactory reply. The Committee take this issue very seriously and would like that the Department should categorically furnish reply to each of the items addressed in their earlier recommendations on this issue.

NEW DELHI;

21 April, 2003

1 Vaisakha, 1925(Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE

Chairman,

Standing Committee on

Urban and Rural Development

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
6. UNDP:	910.00	763.25	1900.00	1800.00	332.04	270.58	480.00	387.00	366.90	630.00	405.00	376.35	450.00	315.35	416.00	401.00			
7. Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme	27.00	20.91	100.00	90.00	10.14	8.80	12.00	10.87	10.98	15.00	12.00	9.93	17.00	16.00	9.68	20.00	17.00		
8. Investment Promotional Scheme	1.00	0.22	0.00	-	2.25	2.25	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.20	0.12	1.00	0.10	2.25	1.00	0.10		
9. Support to NCDs/Vis Scheme	1.00	0.40	0.00	-	-	-	1.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10. Applicant, Monitoring and Evaluation	6.00	0.25	100.00	71.00	1.40	1.40	1.00	0.26	0.20	5.00	0.20	0.05	5.95	2.95	1.40	7.00	4.85		
11. Communication	2.50	1.12	0.00	-	0.45	0.45	2.00	0.92	0.86	0.50	0.50	0.26	1.05	0.95	0.45	2.00	1.05		
12. Board Secretariat	5.50	4.05	0.00	-	-	-	2.50	2.45	2.38	3.00	2.10	1.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. New Initiatives	-	-	-	-	1000.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Plan	1800.00	1615.89	5600.00	6161.00	802.61	615.16	900.00	800.00	799.66	900.00	850.00	816.23	1000.00	950.00	753.05	1186.00	1050.00		
I. Non Plan																			
Secretariat Economic Services	1.89	1.67	-	-	2.67	2.19	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.83	3.81	3.62	2.65	3.66	3.66		
Total Plan & Non Plan	1801.89	1617.56	5600.00	6526.00	805.28	617.35	900.90	800.89	800.50	900.99	850.97	817.06	1003.81	953.62	755.70	1189.66	1053.66		

*Includes Externally Added Projects

APPENDIX II
DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES
STATEMENT SHOWING 9TH PLAN OUTLAY, CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE YEAR-WISE AND 10TH
PLAN OUTLAY & OUTLAY FOR 2002-2003
(Rupees in Crores)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	9th Plan Outlay and Expenditure										10th Plan Outlay							
		1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003		As Proposed	As Agreed by Planning Commission	As Outlay/Budget			
		BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.	BE	Actual Exp.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Plan																		
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	115.00	100.75	100.75	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.99	190.00	190.00	190.00	210.00	210.00	209.42	1600.00	**	250.00
2.	Desert Development Programme	70.00	70.00	70.00	90.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	85.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	160.00	150.00	150.00	1200.00	**	185.00
3.	Computerisation of Land Records	20.00	20.00	20.19	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	32.69	50.00	48.00	47.85	45.00	45.00	44.36	500.00	**	55.00
4.	SRAMULR	18.80	18.80	18.97	8.80	8.80	9.05	10.80	10.80	10.25	25.00	25.00	24.99	30.00	26.00	23.11	200.00	**	35.00
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	-	**	-

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
6. LWDP		74.50	50.00	53.95	82.10	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	83.07	490.00	367.00	386.90	430.00	405.00	364.90	1900.00	**	450.00
7. Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Scheme		8.00	7.50	5.60	8.00	8.00	8.05	8.00	8.00	8.20	12.00	10.87	10.98	15.00	32.00	11.63	100.00	**	17.00
8. Support to NGOs/Voc Scheme		4.00	4.00	2.60	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	**	-
9. Watersheds Development Tech Force		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**	-
10. Investment Promotional Scheme		1.00	0.20	0.00	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.23	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.50	0.20	0.10		**	-
11. Appraisal Monitoring and Evaluation		1.00	0.30	0.04	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.26	0.20	5.00	0.20	0.05	100.00	**	48.00
12. Communication		4.00	1.50	1.42	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.00	0.92	0.86	0.50	0.50	0.23		**	-
13. Board Secretariat		1.50	1.50	1.27	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.71	2.50	2.45	2.38	3.00	2.10	1.62		**	-
Total Plan		318.80	275.55	275.29	334.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	323.60	900.00	800.00	799.66	900.00	850.00	805.42	5600.00	**	1000.00
1. Non-Plan																			
Secretariat Economic Services		0.20	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.83	-	**	3.81
Total Plan & Non Plan		319.00	275.74	275.93	334.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	323.77	900.90	800.89	800.50	900.99	850.97	806.25	5600.00	**	1003.81

*The information is still to be received from Planning Commission
 **Combined entry for St. Nos. 10 to 13

APPENDIX III

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: 1:50,00 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 IV

FINDINGS OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES IN VARIOUS STATES REGARDING WATERSHED PROGRAMMES

Orissa

No. of Projects Surveyed

488 under DPAP

188 under IWDP (excluding micro watershed)

Total amount received

(from 1993-94 to 2000-01) Rs. 1393.91 lakh IWDP

Rs. 2941.80 lakh DPAP

Total corresponding expenditure Rs. 1210.93 lakh IWDP

Rs. 2176.30 lakh DPAP

The utilisation of funds 86.9% in case IWDP

74.0% in case DPAP

Impact

- (i) The areas where the DPAP projects were implemented, there was an increase in net sown area and gross cropped areas by 7.62% and 6.25% respectively.
- (ii) A total number of 148 projects under IWDP and DPAP were surveyed out of that IWDP project about 40% in progress, while about 32% were completed, 5% projects were incomplete due to financial and other difficulties and 14% of the projects were not started.
- (iii) 50% projects were selected on the basis of criteria developed by local Administration and 32% on the choice of DRDP/ ZP.
- (iv) 68% of the Projects were implemented by the Department and 19% were implemented by District Rural Development Agency.

- (v) Irrigation increased by 16.7% for DPAP and 32% for IWDP project. The water table of wells increased by 5% in DPAP Project areas.
- (vi) The increase in area under various crops ranged from about 10% to as high as 84%. The beneficiaries have shifted towards perennial crop.
- (vii) The average yield observed to have improved from 1380 kg/ha to 1833 kg/ha for Khariff in DPAP and from 758 kg/ha to 977 kg/ha for IWDP. Similar increase was observed for Rabi which increase from 1235 to 1824 kg/ha for DPAP and from 738 to 774 kg/ha for IWDP projects.
- (viii) The availability of fodder and fuel was observed to have improved as a result of implementation of the projects.
- (ix) The area under irrigation has increased about 242% in areas under DPAP and above 181% in area under IWDP.
- (x) There has been a overall increase of about 2% in the number of mandays created, the annual income increased of 38% per beneficiary, indicating the positive impact even after adjusting for inflation.
- (xi) The overall increase for all the crops for completed projects under DPAP was 70% and 66% for IWDP. A total of 32.97 lakh mandays employment (61.5% to Male and 38.5% to Female) was generated of which 12.90 lakh mandays generated through IWDP and 20.06 lakh mandays through DPAP.
- (xii) The utilisation of amount received was higher for IWDP projects at 95% and relatively lower for DPAP project at 77%.

State : Karnataka

Total Release	—	Rs. 3.28 Crore
Total Expenditure	—	Rs. 3.61 Crore
Targetted Area to be covered	—	Rs. 7945 Hectare

Impact

1. Out of the 276 watersheds implemented under different programmes, 250 (91 percent) had opened watershed and they could fully utilise the amounts of Rs. 32.81 crores

sanctioned to them. A total of 200 projects (72 percent) had also established separate watershed development funds to be utilised for repair, maintenance etc.

2. 276 Watershed programmes have generated 589 different kinds of assets.
3. In the 276 watershed covered by the study the watershed committees in 146 watersheds (53%) had Chairpersons chosen from the user groups, beneficiary representatives or from local farmers. About 40 watersheds (14%) chose the head of the grama panchayat as Chairperson. Representatives of the NGOs and Block officials were only very few.
4. Out of 16 districts, 5 districts namely, Belgaum, Hassan, Mandya, Mysore and Bangalore reported full positive effect in regard to all these 8 parameters *i.e.* improvement of moisture conservation, control of soil erosion, arrest of run off water, increased productivity, increased of employment opportunities and drought proofing.
5. In about 7 districts namely, Bagalkot, Bangalore, Belgaum, Bijapur, Hassan, Mandya and Mysor all the watershed projects had a beneficial impact, in the remaining districts the impact has been partial ranging from 45 percent in the case of Bidar to 94 percent in Raichur.
6. Total 34.23 lakh Mandays generated from the three different programme, 63 percent was contributed by the DPAP and 30 percent came from the DDP while the remaining employment generation was from IWDP.
7. Net area sown in 10 districts and gross cropped area in 13 districts showed increase ranging between 1 percent and 41 percent. Area irrigated in the post project period in almost all districts have gone up appreciably (63%) indicating the beneficial effect of the programme. In the project areas in all the selected district, average level of water table has increased by 12 percent indicating increased recharge of ground water.
8. Livestock applied under the projects included more than 12000 cows, nearly 9000 buffaloes, 8000 bullocks, 240000 goats and 6900 sheep.

9. Many of the important programme implemented under the different watershed projects could over fulfill the targets. Land development (106 percent), Drainage line treatment (193 percent), Water resources development (107 percent) Biological measures (123 percent), afforestation (141 percent) and Pasture development (241 percent).
10. The Scheduled Castes and Schedules Tribes constituted 13 percent and 11 percent respectively of the beneficiary and the share of households below the property line has been 22 percent. There has been appreciable increase (40 percent) in the arable land areas owned by the beneficiaries. The share of irrigated land in the total operational holdings of beneficiaries increased from 44 percent to 49 percent. The availability of drinking water also increased due to increase in number of wells and reduction in the depth of water table.
11. 69 percent of the beneficiaries and 39 percent of non-beneficiaries have reported increased availability of fodder.
12. 64 percent of the beneficiaries and 38 percent of the non-beneficiaries have reported increased availability.
13. The average expenditure of IWDP, DPAP beneficiaries were higher by 55 percent and 74 percent respectively, as compared with that of the non-beneficiaries.
14. 39 percent of the beneficiaries and 6 percent of the non-beneficiaries adopted one of the different soil conservation methods and the area covered was 53 percent and 26 percent respectively. Afforestation and Horticulture are the other conservation measures widely accepted by the beneficiaries.
15. As a result of improvement of crop yield, household income of beneficiaries also increased. The estimated increase was 58 percent in the case of DDP beneficiaries followed by 48 percent in the DPAP areas and 33 percent in the IWDP areas. Corresponding increase in respect of non-beneficiaries has been 48 percent, 38 percent and 31 percent respectively for DDP, DPAP and IWDP areas.
16. The income per hectare has registered 35 percent increase (from an estimated Rs. 5711 to Rs. 7686). The per hectare increase has been maximum (Rs. 9426) in the DPAP areas.

Among the DDP beneficiaries 66 percent expressed satisfaction with the benefits flowing from the project while the corresponding percentage for DPAP and IWDP were 56 percent and 58 percent respectively.

State : Haryana

DDP

433 Projects sanctioned:

Total Project cost	—	Rs. 10545.00 lakh
Total Expenditure	—	Rs. 4375.87 lakh
Targetted Area to be covered	—	2,16,500 hectare

IWDP Projects

Total Area to be treated	—	49406 hectare
Total Project cost	—	Rs. 2751.29 lakh
Total Release	—	Rs. 1538.25 lakh
Total Expenditure	—	Rs. 1494.94 lakh

Impact:

1. Containment of the further advance of desert areas.
2. Increasing moisture content in the soil and vegetative cover.
3. Positive Impact on control of soil erosion, treatment of alkaline and saline areas.
4. Increase in net sown area, area sown more than once, grass cropped area and net irrigated areas.
5. Increase in forest area.
6. Better availability of fodder and Fuel Wood.
7. Increase in yield of paddy and wheat.
8. Increase of 54.67% in the annual income of the beneficiaries from agricultural productions alone.
9. Increase of 25.83% in the average annual income (compared to only 7.23% increase in the case of non-beneficiaries)

Tamil Nadu**DPAP**

Total area covered	89636.18 hectare
Average utilisation of funds	90%
Average Area	549.92 hectare
Amount Received	Rs. 1907.14
Amount Spent	Rs. 1847.34

IWDP

Total Area Covered	18903 hectare
Average Utilisation of Funds	89.42%
Amount Received	Rs. 70.85 lakh
Amount Spent	Rs. 58.41 lakh

Impact

- (i) Increase in the average operational, available and irrigated holding of the beneficiary farmers.
- (ii) An average increase of 17.74% in the net sown area and 20.76% in gross cropped area in DPAP watershed districts.
- (iii) Positive impact in terms of recharge of ground water and increase in availability of water for irrigation.
- (iv) Productivity has generally increased for almost all crops, in both the seasons.
- (v) Increase in availability of fuel and fodder.
- (vi) Significant impact on livestock activities in the watershed areas.
- (vii) Watershed projects contributed significantly to the earning capability of rural farmers.

Himachal Pradesh**DPAP Projects in Himachal Pradesh:**

Total number of Projects	148
Total Project cost	Rs. 2960.00 lakh
Total Released	Rs. 1293.00 lakh
Total Expenditure	Rs. 1016.35 lakh
Target area to be covered	67866 hectare
The total area treated	23248.77 hectare

IWDP Projects

Total number of Projects	21
Total Project cost	Rs. 9143.67 lakh
Total Released	Rs. 2935.31 lakh
Total Expenditure	Rs. 2029.46 lakh
Target area to be covered	213401 hectare
Area treated	28169.55 hectare

Impact:

- (i) Drought proofing measures have contributed to better availability of irrigation facilities.
- (ii) Increase in net sown area, area sown more than once, gross cropped area, land under miscellaneous, the crops and desert area in the forest area and availability of fodder and fuel wood.
- (iii) Plantations in good conditions and efforts for maintenance taken.
- (iv) Positive impact on control of soil erosion, assets of run-off water and improvement in *in-situ* soil and moisture conservation.
- (v) Contributed to improving cropping pattern and increasing vegetable cultivation. Increase in yields of tomato, ginger, onion and potato.

- (vi) Community mobilisation activities were visible.
- (vii) 65.83% increase in annual income of the beneficiary from agricultural production and 23.23% increase in average annual income.
- (viii) Out migration of non-agricultural labour have reduced.

Maharashtra

Total Project cost	Rs. 159.45 Crores (from 1995-96 to 2000-01)
Funds available	Rs. 119.87 Crores
Expenditure incurred	Rs. 102.46 Crores
No. of watersheds covered under study	408
No. of beneficiaries covered	3975
Average population covered per watershed	1484

Impact of the Programme

- (i) 155 lakh mandays were created under DPAP watershed during the last 6 years.
- (ii) Average monthly expenditure of watershed beneficiary, household (H.H.) was Rs. 1880/- per month whereas in case of non-beneficiary, household it was Rs. 1699/-. There was overall 27% increase in income of all sample beneficiaries.
- (iii) In 40% watershed areas, the water level has increased more than 7 feet.
- (iv) About 2.5% of additional irrigation potential as created during the post period over that of pre project year.
- (v) Kharif crops have been shifted to Rabi due to better soil moisture, the production level and yield per hectare has also shown positive-impact.
- (vi) The availability of fodder and fuel has become more in the project areas.

- (vii) Average expenditure of Rs. 12.25 lakh per watershed was incurred upto March 2001, as against the normal budget of Rs. 20 lakh provided per watershed under the Programme.
- (viii) Implementation of the Projects was delayed to their time schedule in 42% cases.
- (ix) There was overall increase of 20% of man days of employment under different class of occupational beneficiaries.

Bihar

Impact :

1. In case of IWDPs, there is significant performance of projects intervention in controlling soil erosion.
2. In areas where the projects have been completed, the DPAPs have higher positive impact on paddy yield followed by wheat and other crops.
3. The implementation of IWDPs, resulted in increased availability of fodder, agriculture waste, grazing area, etc. which encouraged the beneficiaries to increase livestock resources.
4. The Programme has contributed a lot in increasing the production and income level of the community as a whole.
5. The positive impact of soil and water conservation measures are in improvement in productivity and consequently increased farm income.

Madhya Pradesh

Total amount released for DPAP and IWDP = Rs. 1866.69 crore

Total Expenditure for DPAP and IWDP = Rs. 1716.21 crore

DPAP

Total release = Rs. 199.01 crore

Total Expenditure = Rs. 114.58 crore

Projects covered = 612

IWDP

Total release = Rs. 1667.68 crore

Total Expenditure = Rs. 1601.63 crore

Impact

1. The Watershed Projects have improved the water table in dug wells by an average of 4.5 feet for DPAP and 2 ft. for IWDP Project villages.
2. The impact of watershed programme on an average generation under DPAP was 47% in agriculture production, 49% in agriculture labour and 40% in non-agriculture labour. The overall increase in labour (employment) was 39% for IWDP beneficiaries.
3. The average household income increased by 43% under agriculture production, 70% under agriculture labour, 60% under non-agriculture labour and 20% under the category for the beneficiary respondents. The corresponding figures for the IWDP beneficiaries were 100%, 88%, 46% and 34% in the respective order.
4. 63% of the beneficiaries reported in the increase in the availability of fodder due to DPAP programme. The percentage of beneficiaries for IWDP programme was around 50.
5. 52% under DPAP and 45% under IWDP of the respondents expressed satisfaction with the availability of fuel wood.

Uttar Pradesh

Total amount released for DPAP and IWDP = Rs. 14518.30 lakhs

Total Expenditure for DPAP and IWDP = Rs. 11652.93 lakhs

DPAP

Total release = Rs. 9616.39 lakh

Total Expenditure = Rs. 7579.90 lakh

Projects covered = 199

IWDP

Total release = Rs. 4901.91 lakh

Total Expenditure = Rs. 4073.03 lakh

Projects covered = 22

Impact

1. The Watershed Programmes have led to an increase in gross cropped area by 20.20%
2. The net irrigated area has grown up by 14.8%
3. The Watershed Projects have brought up the Water Table by about 17%.
4. After the implementation of Watershed Projects, the number of all type of animals and the quantum of related activities have gone up. An improvement of 24.67% is shown in livestock population.
5. Estimates show that the area under all crops has increased considerably after implementation of Watershed projects. The percentage of irrigated area under all the major crops has also shown an improvement after the implementation of the watershed Projects.
6. The Watershed projects have led to an overall improvement in the employment situation in the rural areas. The number of man-days per household has increased from 392.46 to 463.16, showing a percentage change of nearly 18%.
7. After implementation of Watershed Projects the average household income (annual) has gone up by 72%.

West Bengal**DPAP**

Projects covered = 161

Impact :**Impact of IWDP**

1. There was an increase in irrigated area due to the IWDP projects. The increase was largest in Purulia (2300%), followed by Darjelling (517%) and by Bankura (266%).
2. The Watershed Projects have brought up the Water Table 12.5% of the beneficiaries in Bankura and 80% in Purulia reported increase in the water table height.

3. 61.25% of the beneficiaries in Bankura, 80% in Darjeeling and 35% in Purulia reported that there were increases in both production and yield of Horticulture/Sericulture and fruit trees.
4. 65% of the beneficiaries in Bankura, 77.5% in Darjeeling and 82.5% in Purulia reported that they experienced a positive increase in fodder for animals. 91.25% of the beneficiaries in Bankura, 80.0% in Darjeeling and 97.5% in Purulia reported that there were positive increase in livestock production.
5. 52.5% of the beneficiaries surveyed in Bankura, 80% in Darjeeling and 37.5% in Purulia reported the availability of fuel by 60%.
6. The largest increase in both mandays and annual income in all the four districts was understandably in agriculture.

Impact under DPAP

1. There was an increase in irrigated area due to the DPAP. The increase was largest in Purulia (1200%), followed by Midnapur (491.7%) followed by Birbhum (279%) and by Bankura (51.1%).
2. The DPAP have brought up the Water Table. 78.4% of the beneficiaries in Bankura, 92% in Birbhum, 80% in Midnapur and 79.2% in Purulia reported increase in the water table height.
3. 60% of the beneficiaries surveyed in Birbhum, 46% in Midnapur and 60.2% in Purulia reported that drinking water supply has increased during the project.
4. There were increases in both production and yield of Horticulture/Sericulture and fruit trees.
5. 71.6% of the beneficiaries surveyed in Bankura, 56% in Birbhum, 38% in Midnapur and 66.2% in Purulia reported that they experienced a positive increase in fodder for animals. 80.7% of the beneficiaries surveyed in Bankura, 82% in Birbhum, 80% in Midnapur and 91.2% in Purulia reported that there were positive increase in livestock production.

6. 63.6% of the beneficiaries surveyed in Bankura, 40% in Birbhum, 34% in Midnapur and 57.4% in Purulia reported the increase in availability of fuel.
7. The largest increase in both mandays and annual income in the four districts was understandably in agriculture.

APPENDIX V

INTEGRATED WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

State-wise progress in implementation of IWDP Projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed (as on 24.3.2003)

(Rupees in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of State	Total No. of Projects	Amount that should have been claimed	Amount actually claimed	Claim in terms of percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	38	93.90	66.76	71
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	2	1.22	1.06	87
3.	Assam	30	35.50	32.09	90
4.	Bihar	2	0.72	1.38	192
5.	Chhattisgarh	11	15.46	12.17	79
6.	Gujarat	26	61.34	42.82	70
7.	Haryana	6	10.18	6.63	65
8.	Himachal Pradesh	24	51.55	41.31	80
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	7	12.59	11.25	89
10.	Jharkhand	4	4.16	2.31	56
11.	Karnataka	23	62.82	41.89	67
12.	Kerala	3	7.24	5.17	71
13.	Madhya Pradesh	39	68.36	73.24	107
14.	Maharashtra	20	47.33	24.45	52

1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	Manipur	8	24.04	12.83	53
16.	Meghalaya	7	6.78	2.84	42
17.	Mizoram	12	15.54	13.10	84
18.	Nagaland	17	42.50	38.89	92
19.	Orissa	30	53.29	33.33	63
20.	Punjab	4	1.39	1.39	100
21.	Rajasthan	29	46.71	32.52	70
22.	Sikkim	9	21.52	11.95	56
23.	Tamil Nadu	24	34.11	27.18	80
24.	Tripura	4	1.60	1.60	100
25.	Uttar Pradesh	41	109.81	83.27	76
26.	Uttaranchal	15	16.54	10.41	63
27.	West Bengal	1	0.45	0.45	100
Total		436	846.65	632.30	75

APPENDIX VI
DROUGHT PRONE AREAS PROGRAMME

State-wise progress in implementation of DPAP Projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed (as on 24.3.2003)

State	No. of Projects	Amount that should have been claimed (Rs. in Crore)	Amount actually claimed (Rs. in Crore)	Claim in terms of percentage
Andhra Pradesh	2966	277.06	253.58	91.53
Bihar/Jharkhand	1054	84.11	40.57	48.23
Gujarat	1359	120.82	97.94	81.06
Himachal Pradesh	238	19.62	14.08	71.76
Jammu & Kashmir	274	21.54	17.19	79.81
Karnataka	1386	121.29	99.33	81.89
Madhya Pradesh/Chhattisgarh	2739	243.85	217.93	89.37
Maharashtra	2211	196.71	113.67	57.79
Orissa	684	50.76	36.37	71.65
Rajasthan	680	58.09	53.81	92.63
Tamil Nadu	904	83.83	59.92	70.29
Uttar Pradesh/Uttaranchal	1518	136.70	111.55	81.60
West Bengal	255	22.55	12.88	57.12
Total	16268	1436.93	1132.83	78.84

APPENDIX VII

DESERT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

State-wise progress in implementation of DDP projects in terms of amount that should have been claimed and the amount actually claimed (as on 24.3.2003)

Name of the State	Total Number of Projects	Amount that should have been claimed (Rs. in crores)	Amount actually claimed (Rs. in crores)	Claim in terms of percentage
Andhra Pradesh	552	61.25	52.83	86.25
Gujarat	1676	197.21	155.10	78.65
Haryana	654	82.86	69.53	83.91
Himachal Pradesh	371	43.70	35.51	81.26
Jammu & Kashmir	536	76.67	52.97	69.09
Karnataka	832	83.31	54.27	65.14
Rajasthan	3693	472.45	415.59	87.96
Total	8314	1017.44	835.80	82.15

APPENDIX VIII
EAS WATERSHED RELEASES (STATE-WISE)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Area (in ha.)	Funds required for Completion	Central Share	(Rs. in Lakhs)						Total funds Released
					Funds Released 1999-2000	Funds Released 2000-2001	Funds Released 2001-2002	Funds Released 2002-2003 upto 14.3.2003	8	9	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1035601	21917.40	16438.05	5236.79	5686.94	2744.28	2753.65	16421.66		
2.	Andaman & Nicobar	6321.31	322.17	241.50	40.50	-	-	-	40.50		
3.	Chhattisgarh	-	17606.88	13205.16	3279.38	792.83	3101.22	4290.36	11463.79		
4.	Gujarat	247881	5640.04	4230.03	1267.06	2962.97	-	-	4230.03		
5.	Haryana	64595	2413.88	1810.41	338.00	448.72	363.155	372.49	1522.37		
6.	Himachal Pradesh	52334	1139.98	854.98	290.70	181.62	109.08	169.91	751.306		
7.	Karnataka	433597	6149.79	4612.52	768.91	1778.96	816.16	824.57	4188.60		
8.	Kerala	63618	1418.18	1063.65	103.01	354.56	148.72	74.36	680.65		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9.	Maharashtra	910292	15505.61	11627.59	1938.00	1958.35	1320.79	201.18	5418.32
10.	Madhya Pradesh	2662587	33027.71	24770.78	8827.50	5006.70	6818.05	4118.53	24770.78
11.	Meghalaya	515	77.35	58.01	950	-	-	-	9.50
12.	Manipur	13897	534.09	400.56	83.50	39.35	-	-	122.85
13.	Mizoram	2000	5.40	4.05	0.50	-	-	-	0.50
14.	Orissa	22918	11798.09	9379.10	1474.50	1375.87	911.73	1747.23	5509.33
15.	Rajasthan	655771	9737.73	7303.30	3148.43	2385.54	1769.33	-	7303.30
16.	Tamil Nadu	-	1200.59	900.44	632.37	268.07	-	-	900.44
17.	Uttar Pradesh	-	14267.24	10701.39	2095.30	2242.60	440.5	-	4778.40
18.	Uttaranchal	-	1833.79	1370.84	127.30	228.47	-	-	355.77
19.	West Bengal	184542	3930.62	2947.97	493.50	-	472.38	-	965.38
Total		6356468.29	148526.53	11192033	30154.75	25711.546	19015.395	14552.280	89433.97

APPENDIX IX
RELEASE AND UTILISATION OF FUNDS TOWARDS CENTRAL SHARE UNDER THE CENTRALLY
SPONSORED SCHEME OF SRA & ULR AS ON 17.3.2003

States/UTs	Upto 8th Plan	During 9th Plan							Total releases	Total Utilisation	% age Utilisation
		Funds released									
		1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-2001	2001-02	2002-03	2002-03			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Andhra Pradesh	172.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	172.80	107.51	62.22	
Arunachal Pradesh	151.00	0.00	0.00	22.75	0.00	0.00	-	173.75	150.97	86.89	
Assam	382.13	15.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	397.20	202.00	50.86	
Bihar including Jharkhand	1077.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	1077.85	815.63	75.67	
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62.10	-	-	
Gujarat	348.70	0.00	0.00	73.50	158.50	60.00	-	640.70	504.32	78.71	
Goa	75.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.15	136.09	83.36	61.25	
Haryana	253.00	0.00	0.00	19.29	29.25	0.00	40.19	341.73	255.45	74.75	
Himachal Pradesh	344.93	100.10	99.85	150.00	0.00	44.00	6.00	744.88	544.87	73.15	

(Rs. in Lakhs)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
J & K	776.50	294.50	90.00	35.00	0.00	133.00	115.00	1444.00	1152.91	79.84
Karnataka	404.37	344.60	0.00	0.00	77.50	0.00	15.00	841.47	478.66	56.88
Kerala	754.92	25.00	127.75	83.50	281.13	8.54	-	1280.84	850.00	66.36
M.P.	1720.71	97.75	70.65	119.45	355.36	521.83	248.03	3133.78	2535.21	80.90
Maharashtra	807.25	202.50	0.00	60.00	275.85	612.50	437.26	2395.36	1072.88	44.79
Manipur	60.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	60.18	0.15	0.25
Meghalaya	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	50.00	0.00	0.00
Mizoram	342.75	0.00	48.30	165.74	220.00	200.00	150.00	1126.79	795.27	70.58
Nagaland	69.65	0.00	0.00	68.55	0.00	82.37	106.47	327.04	94.55	28.91
Orissa	355.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	355.62	251.59	70.75
Punjab	1168.98	0.00	96.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	1315.35	1098.25	83.49
Rajasthan	897.57	74.64	150.55	49.73	0.00	25.00	-	1197.49	983.33	82.12
Sikkim	49.60	21.70	75.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	146.46	41.75	28.51

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Tamil Nadu	361.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	125.00	20.00	566.03	383.46	67.75
Tripura	69.58	40.00	0.00	0.00	90.00	147.00	185.50	532.08	197.80	37.17
U.P. including Uttaranchal	1382.21	372.43	146.38	57.50	406.06	35.10	-	2399.68	1628.01	67.84
West Bengal	1116.96	275.25	0.00	120.00	471.35	309.93	392.00	2685.49	1615.49	60.16
A & N Islands	43.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	43.03	28.18	65.49
Chandigarh	32.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	32.00	37.55	117.34
D & N Haveli	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	-	50.00	25.00	50.00
Delhi	62.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	62.00	44.26	71.39
Daman & Diu	6.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	6.50	6.50	100.00
Lakshadweep	25.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	-	50.71	25.71	50.70
Pondicherry	97.07	19.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.17	-	142.79	93.21	65.28
Total	13485.54	1883.08	905.01	1025.00	2450.00	2355.44	1887.70	23991.77	16103.83	67.12

APPENDIX X

RESOLUTION PASSED IN THE CONFERENCE OF REVENUE MINISTERS OF THE STATES HELD ON 19TH AND 20TH AUGUST, 2002 AT VIGYAN BHAVAN, NEW DELHI

1. DISTRIBUTION OF CEILING SURPLUS LANDS, GOVERNMENT WASTELANDS AND BHOODAN LANDS
 - (i) States/UTs may quickly finalise Action Plans for expeditious distribution of the remaining Ceiling Surplus Lands, Government Wastelands and Bhoodan Land and launch a special drive in this regard during the current financial year.
 - (ii) The recommendation of the Committee of Governors regarding distribution of Ceiling Surplus Lands and Government treatable Wastelands (estimated by the Committee as 37.50 million hectares) and of Bhoodan Lands be accepted and necessary steps initiated for its distribution amongst the landless rural poor, especially those belonging to SCs/STs categories.
 - (iii) In order to ensure that the lands allotted by the States/UTs to the rural poor are not allowed to be sold at any point of time without the approval of Competent Authority the States/UTs may consider appropriate amendments of the relevant Land Laws.
 - (iv) States/UTs may ensure allotment of at least 40% of the allotable Ceiling Surplus Land, Government Wastelands and Bhoodan Lands to the woman beneficiaries; in other cases also, such land should be allotted in the joint names of wife and husband.
 - (v) Requisite steps may be taken to develop the lands allotted under these programmes, by dovetailing various Schemes of the Central Government and the State Governments/UT Administrations.
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF VARIOUS LAND REFORMS LAWS
 - (i) The States/UTs need to ensure better implementation of ceiling and tenancy laws and of laws relating to consolidation and prevention of fragmentation of land holdings and prevention of alienation/restoration of alienated tribal lands.

- (ii) Concerted steps should be taken to detect insecure/informal tenants so as to bring them on record and ensure protection of their rights.
- (iii) States/UTs are advised to initiate action to remove existing inequalities in the inheritance laws, ceiling laws and other land reforms laws.
- (iv) The Draft Model Pattadar Pass Book and Model Pattadar Pass Book Bill, as circulated to the States/UTs should be urgently considered for adoption by the States/UTs and Action Plans prepared for distribution of the Passbooks to all the farmers by March, 2004.
- (v) States/UTs may review the issue of Consolidation of Land Holdings in totality, with a view to ensuring certain minimum size of land holding in the interest of higher agriculture production. Appropriate strategies have to be evolved for preventing the fragmentation of land holdings to ensure that the benefits of consolidation of holdings are not wasted.

States/UTs should take effective steps for eviction of unauthorized persons/encroachers of Government lands, in a time bound manner, and for prevention of further encroachments on such lands by vested interests.

The Conference strongly recommends that the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF), Government of India may be approached to simplify the procedure for utilisation of such Government/Community lands as are categorised as forest lands but do not have tree growth for development activities. The MOEF may, accordingly, consider delegating the powers to the State Governments/UT Administrations in this regard.

3. DISPOSAL OF COURT CASES

- (i) Action Plans may be finalised and implemented for disposal of ceiling surplus cases, tenancy cases (and related cases) pending in various Courts by March, 2004.
- (ii) Some 10 lakh acres of ceiling surplus land is involved in litigation, such cases need to be disposed off quickly and the land released from litigation distributed to the landless rural poor on priority basis.

- (iii) A large number of alienation of tribal land cases are also pending in various Courts; efforts have to be made on a time-bound basis, towards restoring the lands to the entitled tribals.
- (iv) For expeditious disposal of pending cases, the States may consider setting up of Tribunals under Article 323-B of the Constitution or constitution of Special Benches in the respective High Courts.

4. LAND RECORDS IN THE NORTH-EASTERN STATES

Several North-Eastern States do not, as yet, have proper land records and legislation in respect of land matters. Such States are, accordingly, requested to legislate relevant laws and carry out survey by adopting modern survey technology/equipments like total stations, theodolites and work stations and strengthening the survey, training institutions to improve work efficiency at various levels of the Revenue Administration.

5. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTS

Since Progress Reports in respect of the land reforms programmes are not being received regularly (and have, in some cases, not been received since long), the States/UTs are urged to furnish such reports, duly updated, till 31st March, 2002, by the end of 30th September, 2002 positively. Thereafter, such reports should be submitted every quarter, without interruption.

6. IMPLEMENTATION OF CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEMES

A. Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

- (i) While the Government of India have released Rs. 233.56 crores (upto 31.3.2000), only about Rs. 148.42 crores have been utilised. The States/UTs have to take steps to expedite the implementation of the Scheme.
- (ii) The Pilot Projects cleared by the Ministry of Rural Development should be completed at the earliest and completion report (along with the observations) forwarded to the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) by March, 2003.

B. Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

About Rs. 212.04 crores have been released, as Central share, by the Government of India (upto 31.3.2002) but the States/UTs have utilised only Rs. 156.38 crores so far and are urged to accelerate the implementation of the Scheme.

APPENDIX XI

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2003)

**MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON
TUESDAY, THE 25th MARCH, 2003.**

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Ranen Barman
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Shriram Chauhan
6. Shri Hassan Khan
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
11. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
12. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
13. Shri Maheshwar Singh
14. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
15. Shri Chinmayanand Swami

16. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

RAJYA SABHA

17. Shrimati Prema Cariappa

18. Shri N.R. Dasari

19. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap

20. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur

21. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah

22. Shri Harish Rawat

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. | Shri K. Chakraborty | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 2. | Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | - | Under Secretary |
| 3. | Shri N.S. Hooda | - | Under Secretary |

Representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development

(Department of Land Resources)

1. Shri M. Shankar, Secretary
2. Shri Lalit Mathur, Additional Secretary & Financial Advisor
3. Shri P.S. Rana, Additional Secretary
4. Smt. Lalitha Kumar, Joint Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004).

[The representatives of the Department of Land Resources were then called in]

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) to the sitting. He then drew their attention to the provisions of direction 55 (1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee thereafter took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004). The members raised various clarificatory queries and made their observations. The representatives of the Department were asked to send written replies to the queries, which could not be answered during the sitting.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.
The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)

MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 4TH APRIL, 2003

The Committee sat from 1230 hrs. to 1400 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Ranen Barman
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Shriram Chauhan
6. Shrimati Hema Gamang

7. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
8. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
9. Shri Maheshwar Singh
10. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

RAJYA SABHA

11. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
12. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
13. Shri N.R. Dasari
14. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
15. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
16. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
17. Shri Harish Rawat

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. | Shri K. Chakraborty | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 2. | Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | - | Under Secretary |
| 3. | Shri N.S. Hooda | - | Under Secretary |

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. The Committee adopted the said draft Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) with certain modifications as indicated in the *Annexure*.

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

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of Minutes dated 04.04.2003)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1.	9	2.14	10 & 11	<u>For</u> <i>from bottom</i> 'given priority, as could be seen from the trends of allocation of the Department during 10 th Plan'
				<u>Substitute</u> 'the Budget estimates are sanctioned and outlay earmarked'
2.	10	2.15	-	<u>Add at the end:</u>

‘Besides, the Committee would like that before making allocation, the Department should have the proper strategy to ensure that the money earmarked is meaningfully utilised during a financial year. The Committee would like that while furnishing the information before them with regard to new schemes to be launched by the Department, the Committee should be apprised about the details well in advance so as to enable them to analyse and suggest changes, if required, to ensure proper implementation of the scheme.’

3. 12 2.18 -

For the existing para, read the following:

‘The Committee find that with regard to the issue of conversion of wastelands into agricultural lands, they have been apprised by the Department that agricultural production is generally not feasible on developed land under different schemes in the first stage of development and as such, no data in this regard is being maintained. While appreciating that agricultural production is not possible at the first stage of development, the Committee feel that once the project is completed, it should result in increase in net sown area. Further, they also find that one of the components of impact studies made by the Department is increase in net sown area as could be seen from Appendix-IV. While analysing the impact studies, the Committee find that net sown area has increased in almost all the States. The Committee would like that in view of the position as given above, the Department should maintain data with regard to the impact of different schemes on net sown area by covering wastelands into agricultural land.’

4. 21 - -

Add the following new para 2.38 after para no. 2.37:

‘The Committee would like that before taking a project for the wasteland development under the respective schemes of the Department, i.e. IWDP, DDP and DPAP, sufficient attention should be given towards publicity, so that the people at the grassroot level are made aware of the details of the projects and their involvement, which is a pre-requisite for the success of a project, is ensured. Besides, they also feel that training is the basic input for the success of a scheme or programme. The Committee would like that the officials involved in implementation of the project, PRIs and NGOs, who are responsible for implementation of the project, should be imparted proper training to ensure the success of the projects.’

5. 23 2.42 10

For :

‘The Committee are confused about the two different information provided to them. They would like to be apprised about the role of DRDAs viz-a-viz MPs/MLAs/MLCs in the new initiative Haryali.’

Substitute :

‘The Committee find that they are not able to understand the role of DRDAs vis-a-vis MPs/MLAs/MLCs in the new initiative Haryali and would like the Department to clarify the position in this regard.’

6. 23 - -

Add the following new para 2.43 after para no. 2.42:

‘The Committee note that the meetings of DRDAs of which MPs are members, are usually convened when the Parliament is in Session, and as such, MPs are unable to

attend the meetings of DRDAs. The Committee would like the Department to give instructions to various State Governments that the meetings of DRDAs should be fixed after getting the convenience of MPs.’

7. 27 2.48 4

Add after various stages of finalisation:

1 2 3 4

5

‘They are distressed that there has been such an inordinate delay in finalizing an issue of vital importance that has impact on the lives of people whose land is acquired in the name of ‘the greater common good’ or who are displaced due to ‘development projects’.’

8. 27 - -

Add the following new para 2.50 after para no. 2.49:

‘The Committee reiterate that the most important component of their recommendation is that in the amendment to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 – rehabilitation and resettlement must become part of the Act itself because this is the only way to ensure that justice is done to those from whom the land is acquired. The Committee also recommend that, to the extent possible, compensation for land must be in the form of land of the same quality rather than cash in compensation for land. The Committee also desire that a copy of the rehabilitation and resettlement policy is made available to them so that they may make recommendations before it is finalized.’

9. 40 - -

Add the following new para 2.83 after para no. 2.82:

‘The Committee further note that district plans in various States are not being properly implemented. The Committee would like to be apprised about the corrective steps taken by the Government in this regard.’

10. 54 3.19 13

Add at the end:

‘The Committee would also like to be apprised about the criteria for spending money deposited in non-lapsable pool for infrastructure purposes.’

11. 63 - -

Add the following new para 3.40 after para no. 3.39:

‘The Committee understand from the information provided to them as given in the preceding para that Drought Prone Areas Programme is a long-term plan for drought proofing of identified areas by creation of a natural resource base. The Committee would like the Department to ensure that the money earmarked under DPAP is strictly utilised in line with the said objectives of the programme, so that a permanent solution by bringing the water table above can be found. To ensure this, the Committee would like the Department to monitor the progress of DPAP to achieve the desired objectives.’