

FIFTY-THIRD REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2003-2004)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in
the Forty-seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and
Rural Development (Thirteenth Lok Sabha)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on

Laid in Rajya Sabha on



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

January, 2004/Pausa, 1925 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2004)	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2003)	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
CHAPTER I. Report	1
CHAPTER II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	29
CHAPTER III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.	53
CHAPTER IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee.	54
CHAPTER V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited.	69

APPENDICES

I. Name of the Institutes to whom Impact Assessment Studies assigned	71
II. A copy of draft policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families 2003	73
III. Impact Assessment Studies of Watershed Programmes....	100
IV. Status of Implementation of DPAP Projects sanctioned during 1995-96	110
V. Extract of the minutes of the Thirty-first sitting of the Committee held on 30.12.2003.	111
VI. Extract of the minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 13.01.2004	114
VII. Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-seventh Report of the Committee (13th Lok Sabha)	116

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

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

- *2. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
3. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
4. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
5. Shri Ranen Barman
6. Shri Padmanava Behera
7. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
8. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
9. Shri Shriram Chauhan
10. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullu
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
13. Shri Jaiprakash
14. Shri Hassan Khan
15. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
16. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
17. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
18. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
19. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
20. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
23. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
24. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
25. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
28. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
- **30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

* Nominated *w.e.f.* 17.7.2003 *vice* the vacancy caused in the place of Shri Chinmayanand Swami, ceased to be a member of the Committee consequent upon his retirement as Minister in the Council of Ministers *w.e.f.* 24 May 2003.

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agniraj
- **32. Vacant
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
- ***34. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
35. Shri N.R. Dasari
36. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
37. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
38. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
39. Shri Rumandla Raamachandrayya
40. Shri Harish Rawat
41. Shri Man Mohan Samal
42. Shri G.K. Vasani
- ****43. Vacant
44. Vacant
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Assistant Director*

** Vacancy caused consequent upon retirement of Shrimati Shabana Azmi, M.P. (R.S.) from the membership of Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 26.8.2003.

*** Nominated vice Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan ceased to be a member w.e.f. 4.5.2003.

**** Vacancy caused consequent upon appointment of Shri Rajnath Singh M.P. (R.S.) as Minister w.e.f. 24.5.2003.

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004)

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
3. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
4. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
5. Shri Ranen Barman
6. Shri Padmanava Behera
7. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
8. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
9. Shri Shriram Chauhan
10. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullu
11. Shrimati Hema Gamang
12. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
13. Shri Jaiprakash
14. Shri Hassan Khan
15. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
16. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
17. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
18. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
19. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
20. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
23. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
24. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
25. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
28. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

(iv)

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shri Urkhao Gwra Brahma
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
34. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
35. Shri N.R. Dasari
36. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
37. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
38. Shri Vidya Nivas Misra
39. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
40. Shri Rumandla Raamachandrayya
41. Shri Harish Rawat
42. Shri Man Mohan Samal
43. Shri G.K. Vasani
44. Vacant
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Assistant Director*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2004), having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fifty-third Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-seventh Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2003) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources).

2. The Forty-seventh Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 22 April 2003. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 26 August 2003.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee (2003) at their sitting held on 30 December 2003. However, the term of the Committee expired on 31 December 2003 before the Report could be presented to the Parliament. The Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development were reconstituted on 1 January 2004, which again considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 13 January 2004.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Forty-seventh Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee (2003) is given in Appendix-VII.

NEW DELHI;
20 *January*, 2004

30 *Pausa*, 1925 (*Saka*)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2004) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Forty-seventh Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Land Resources which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22 April 2003.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 48 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

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

Para Nos.: 2.13, 2.18, 2.36, 2.37, 2.38, 2.43, 2.44, 2.45, 2.48, 2.49, 2.50, 2.57, 2.58, 2.66, 2.83, 2.87, 2.94, 3.20, 3.39, 3.40, 3.41, 3.42, 3.52, 3.61, 3.62, 3.76, 3.77, 3.78, 3.79, 3.100, 3.101 and 3.119.

- (ii) Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:

Para No.: 3.19

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

Para Nos.: 2.14, 2.15, 2.21, 2.28, 2.42, 2.82, 3.18, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.95 and 3.128

- (iv) Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government is still awaited:

Para Nos.: 2.22 and 2.80

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

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

A. Detailed Action Plan for proper utilisation of allocation earmarked for North-Eastern States

Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)

5. The Committee had noted as below:—

“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.”

6. The Government have replied as below:

“The cut in Budget estimate is generally imposed by the Ministry of Finance after taking into account the resources available with the Central Government. DOLR will be communicating the views of the Committee to the Planning Commission against imposing any cut in the allocation for the Department at the RE stage. During the year 2002-03, the expenditure position as compared to Revised Estimates was 96.60 per cent. The reduction was mainly on account of less utilisation for States in NE Region. The expenditure under

IWDP in this Region has been increasing continuously year after year as can be seen from the figures below:

2000-01	—	Rs. 26.78 crore
2001-02	—	Rs. 42.64 crore
2002-03	—	Rs. 56.45 crore

The Department has been sanctioning a large number of projects every year in these States as can be seen from the table below:

Period	Projects sanctioned	Area in lakh. ha.
1995-96 to 1998-99	17	1.48
1999-2000	10	0.96
2000-2001	29	2.78
2001-2002	28	1.85
2002-2003	41	2.87

However, the shortfalls in expenditure in North-Eastern States is mainly due to the fact that the two major watershed programmes, *i.e.* DPAP and DDP are not being implemented in this Region. Efforts are being made for further increasing the coverage of IWDP in the NE region. The progress of on-going projects is also being followed up pro-actively with the State Governments and DRDAs.”

7. The Committee have been persistently stressing to chalk out a detailed action plan for the proper utilization of resources earmarked exclusively for the North-Eastern Region in their 33rd and 42nd Reports (13th Lok Sabha) [Refer para nos. 2.54 and 28 respectively]. Instead of addressing to such a serious issue, the Department has tried to justify the position by indicating the trend of increasing expenditure position under IWDP. While admitting that there is an increase in expenditure position during the last three years, the overall expenditure position as compared to the allocation is not yet satisfactory. During 2002-2003, the utilization was only Rs. 56.45 crore as against an allocation for Rs. 100 crore. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Department and would like that they should chalk out detailed action plan for the effective utilization of scarce resources earmarked exclusively for the development of North-Eastern region.

The Committee note that DPAP and DDP schemes are not being implemented in the North-Eastern States which account for shortfall in expenditure. The Committee have also not been informed as to why these schemes are not in operation there. If these schemes are either not necessary or feasible in the North-Eastern States then a realistic allocation strategy should be worked out so that the funds earmarked are fully utilised. The Committee would like to hear more in this regard from the Ministry.

B. Strategy for meaningful utilisation of funds 'New Initiatives' for drinking water supply in critically drought affected areas

Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)

8. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

9. The Government have replied as below:

“The Department of Land Resources has formulated a draft Scheme titled, 'Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana' (PMGJSY) for the critically drought-affected areas in the country, specially where drinking water is a major problem. During the Tenth Plan the Scheme is proposed to be implemented in all the 235 Blocks covered under the Desert Development Programme (DDP) and 325 Blocks covered under Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) in the first phase. Remaining 647 DPAP Blocks will be covered in

the 2nd phase. The funding pattern of the Scheme is being proposed as 75:25 between Centre and State Governments. Besides, the Gram Panchayat/Beneficiaries are required to contribute 10 per cent of the project cost for maintenance of assets created under the projects. The Scheme is proposed to be implemented through Gram Panchayats. The thrust of the Scheme will be on water conservation through water harvesting measures.

The EFC memo of the Scheme has already been circulated for comments of the PMO, Planning Commission and Ministries of Finance, Agriculture, Environment and Forests, and Water Resources. The matter is also being monitored by the PMO.”

10. The Committee find from the reply furnished by the Department that a new Scheme titled, ‘Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana’ (PMGJSY) for the critically drought affected areas in the country, especially where drinking water is a major problem, is under consideration of the Government. They had, in their earlier recommendation, noted that Rs. 1,000 crore for ‘New Initiatives’ were allocated during 10th Plan and as such, desired to know about the details of the new Schemes to be launched during 10th Plan. The Committee are concerned to note that even after lapse of more than one-and-a-half year of the 10th Plan, new schemes, for which substantial allocations were proposed, are yet to be launched. The Committee deplore the planning process of the Government. They would, therefore, urge the Government to ensure that the details of the new Schemes are finalised before allocating the required outlay. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee would like that the new Scheme, viz. ‘Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana’ (PMGJSY) meant for critically drought affected areas in the country should be finalised expeditiously and the Committee be intimated immediately.

The Committee in their earlier recommendation had also desired that the details of the new Schemes should be furnished to them well in advance so that the Committee could examine and suggest changes, if necessary to ensure proper implementation. The Committee find that the features of the Schemes furnished by the Department are not adequate to enable them to analyse and furnish their considered views. They would, therefore, like that detailed information covering various aspects of the Scheme should be furnished to them expeditiously.

C. Impact assessment studies for Watershed Projects

Recommendation (Para No. 2.21)

11. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

12. The Government have replied as below:

“The Department is constantly striving to improve the implementation of the schemes. The scope of each scheme has been consistently widened over the years as can be seen in the increased coverage of the three schemes over the last 3 years.

New Projects sanctioned in the last 3 years (Area in lakh ha.)

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
IWDP	11.12	7.97	3.35
DPAP	16.85	10.26	12.39
DDP	8.30	6.79	8.01

The shortfall in sanctioning new projects under IWDP during 2002-2003 was due to the utilisation of the budget allocation for the ongoing projects taken up before 31 March, 2002.”

13. The Committee had in their earlier recommendation urged for:

- (i) an overall analysis of the findings of the various impact studies, when the studies from the remaining States are also available should be made and the Committee be apprised accordingly;
- (ii) to further gear up the implementing mechanism of the various schemes to successfully implement different programmes;
- (iii) the positive trends by the impact studies should be brought before the Planning Commission to persuade them to increase the allocation under different Schemes; and
- (iv) the scope of each of the Schemes of wasteland development should be further widened.

The Committee find from the reply furnished by the Department that it has not addressed the issues raised at (i), (ii) and (iii) above. In view of this, they would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and expect *categorical* and *specific* replies from the Department in this regard. With regard to the part of the recommendation at (iv) above, the Committee find that the reply of the Department itself is contradictory. Whereas the Department has claimed that the scope of each of the Schemes, *i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP has consistently widened over the years, the data reflects otherwise. Under IWDP, the decline is more noticeable. During 2001-02, the area as compared to the previous year had declined from 11.12 lakh hectare to 7.97 lakh hectare. During 2002-03, the area covered was less than half of the achievement made during 2001-02. Although the Department has furnished the reason that the Budget allocation was used for on-going programmes, the Committee are not satisfied with the reply. Under DPAP, there was a reduction in the area covered in 2001-02, as compared to the previous years. During 2002-03, although there is an increase in the area covered as compared to the previous year, but it could not match the performance level achieved during 2000-01. Similar trends are being noticed in respect of DDP also. The Committee are not convinced by the reply of the Department and would urge them to justify their claim that the area of activity under different Schemes is increasing over the years.

D. Expeditious completion of impact studies**Recommendation (Para No. 2.22)**

14. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

15. The Government have replied as below:

“List of the Institutes to whom Impact studies have so far been assigned is given below:

NAME OF THE INSTITUTES TO WHOM IMPACT ASSESSMENT
STUDIES ASSIGNED BY THE MINISTRY

Sl. No.	Name of the Institute
1	2
i.	Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi
ii.	Institute of Rural Management, ANAND, Gujarat
iii.	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, DEONAR, Mumbai
iv.	Department of Social Work, (Delhi School of Social Work), University of Delhi, Delhi
v.	National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi
vi.	National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad
vii.	Centre for Management Development, Thiruvananthapuram
viii.	ORG, New Delhi
ix.	RITES Ltd., New Delhi
x.	Institute for Human Development, New Delhi
xi.	Institute of Applied Manpower Research, New Delhi

1	2
xii.	International Management Institute, New Delhi
xiii.	Pragana Research & Consultancy Services, Hyderabad
xiv.	Advantage India, New Delhi
xv.	International Institute of Sustainable Development & Management, Ahmedabad
xvi.	Organisation for Applied Socio-Economic System (OASES), New Delhi
xvii.	Technical Consultancy Services Organisation of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore
xviii.	Development and Research Services, New Delhi
xix.	Xavier Institute of Social Sciences, Ranchi
xx.	Marathwada Institute for Training Research & Development, Bhopal
xxi.	Taylor Nelson Sofres, Mode Private Ltd., (MODE), New Delhi
xxii.	Centre for Advanced Research & Development, Bhopal
xxiii.	CMI Social Research Centre, New Delhi
xxiv.	Bihar Institute of Economic Studies, Patna”

Studies in the remaining States are being assigned/completed in a phased manner.

16. The Committee with satisfaction that the Government have finally assigned twenty-four Institutes in the country for undertaking assessment studies of different Wasteland Development Programmes on employment generation. However, the reply of the Government is not comprehensive to indicate the Programme-wise and State-wise assessment, assigned to these Institutes. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to apprise the Committee of the position in this regard and would like that completion of these studies be expedited.

E. Convergence of all Wasteland Development Programmes under Department of Land Resources

Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.28 and 2.82)

17. The Committee have noted as below:

“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.”

(Para No. 2.28)

18. “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.”

(Para No. 2.82)

19. The Government have replied as below:

“A Cabinet Note on ‘Setting up of Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Narain Mission for Land and Watershed Development’ in the Department of Land Resources (DOLR), Ministry of Rural Development and transfer of watershed and soil conservation related schemes to DOLR was submitted to the Cabinet Secretariat for consideration of the Cabinet. The subject came for discussion in the Cabinet meeting held on 10 July 2003. However, the agenda item was postponed. Subsequently, Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Environment and Forests wrote to the Minister of Rural Development reiterating their strong reservations on the desirability and feasibility of setting up a Mission and transfer of all watershed and soil conservation related Schemes from their Ministries to the DOLR. Keeping in view the strong reservations from both the Ministers, the matter was reconsidered in the Ministry and the Cabinet note has since been withdrawn.”

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 2.28)

20 “Programmes for development of wastelands/degraded lands are being implemented by various Ministries/Departments, including DOLR. Therefore, a National Perspective Plan for wastelands development would be meaningful only when all these Programmes are taken into consideration and funds allocated by the Planning Commission accordingly. The Planning Commission have included a Perspective Plan for reclamation/development of degraded lands in the Tenth Plan document. This Department has also been advising the States to draw up a Perspective Plan for wastelands development.”

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 2.82)

21. The Committee have, for the last five years, been recommending strongly to the Department to bring the various Schemes meant for the development of wastelands, at present being handled by different Ministries of Government of India, under one umbrella. They find that whereas the matter regarding convergence

was at the stage of finalisation, certain strong reservations were expressed by the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment and Forests. The Committee while examining the Demands for Grants 2003-04 had been given the impression that the issue of convergence had, in principle, been agreed to by the concerned Ministries and also by the Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission and Prime Minister's Office. They further note that the Government has not been able to chalk out the National Perspective Plan for wastelands development pending the finalisation of convergence issue. The Committee are really unhappy on becoming aware of the manner in which the Government has dealt with such a serious issue. They would like to be apprised about the specific views expressed by Ministers of Agriculture and Environment and Forests in this regard. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised whether their concerns expressed in their earlier Reports were brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat as desired by them.

F. The role of MPs/MLAs/MLCs under the New Initiative, '*Haryali*'

Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.42)

22. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

23. The Government have replied as below:

“As per provisions of the Guidelines for *Haryali*, the ZP/DRDA shall, normally, be the authority competent to decide on selection of projects as also the selection of the Project Implementation

Agencies (PIAs) for taking up projects under the watershed development programmes. MPs/MLAs/MLCs are generally members of the ZPs and also the Governing Bodies of the DRDAs. Thus, their role is important in selection of watershed projects and PIAs. Once a watershed project is sanctioned, the role of Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat becomes important in implementation of the project. Their roles are, therefore, complementary in nature”.

24. The Committee find from the reply furnished by the Department that in the New Initiative, ‘Haryali’ specific role for MPs/MLAs/MLCs in implementation and monitoring of the programme has not been indicated. In the reply, it has been stated that MPs/MLAs/MLCs are generally members of the Zilla Parishad and also of the governing bodies of the DRDAs. The Committee are aware of the aforesaid position and they in their earlier recommendation made in 47th Report (13th Lok Sabha) [refer para no. 2.43] had observed that although MPs/MLAs/MLCs are members of DRDAs, no constitution with them is made for various programmes. Besides, the meetings of DRDAs are held when the House is in Session and as such, they are unable to attend the meetings. In view of this, the Committee would like that the consent of MPs/MLAs/MLCs should be sought beforehand so as to enable them to attend the sittings of DRDAs and Zilla Parishad. Besides, they would also like that the consent of MPs/MLAs/MLCs should be sought while selecting the various projects. In view of it, their role should be specifically indicated in the guidelines of ‘Haryali’.

G. Finalisation of Amendment of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Persons (PAPs)

Recommendation (Para No. 2.48)

25. The Committee had noted as below:

“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."

26. The Government have replied as under:

Amendment to Land Acquisition Act, 1984

"The Group of Ministers in its Meeting held on 22.11.2001 approved the amendments proposed by this Ministry. However, subsequently two new proposals, i.e. (i) relating to amendment of Section 6 (inserting new section 6A-suggested by the Law Commission of India), and (ii) direction of the Supreme Court relating to the acquisition of the property of Minority Educational Institutions were received in this Ministry. These were examined and draft proposals have been sent to the Ministry of Law for their concurrence/vetting. Thereafter, the proposal for amendment of the Act would be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration and approval.

National Policy on the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families (NPRR-2003):

This Department prepared a draft policy on R&R for the Project Affected Families, which was submitted before the GOM for its consideration. The GOM in its last Meeting held on 22.11.2001, directed the Department of Land Resources to prepare a draft Bill and circulate it to all concerned Ministries/Departments for their comments and bring up the proposal before the GOM thereafter.

In pursuance of the aforesaid directions of the GOM, this Ministry prepared a draft Bill based on the provisions contained in the Draft National Policy on R&R. The Draft Bill was concurred by the Ministry of Law. Subsequently, the Cabinet Secretariat desired that the draft Bill may be discussed first by the Standing Committee of Secretaries (SCOS) before it is considered by the GOM. Accordingly, this Ministry prepared a Note for consideration by the SCOS. The Note was considered on 27th May, 2003 and the SCOS desired that "it was preferable to have a Central Policy on PAF, rather than a Central Legislation". It was decided that since action for the proposed PAF (R&R) Bill was based on recommendations of the GOM, any deviation had to be placed before it for further directions.

In the light of the directions of the SCOS, this Department has prepared a Draft National Policy for Project Affected Families (Resettlement and Rehabilitation)—2003 (NPRR—2003) taking into account the suggestions of the SCOS. The draft has been approved by Minister (RD) and has been circulated to different Ministries/ Departments for their comments/suggestions, if any. After receipt of their comments/suggestions, a Note for the GOM along with the draft Policy will be prepared and submitted for its consideration.

Necessary steps are being taken to complete both the proposals, i.e. Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill and the National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families expeditiously.”

27. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had expressed concern over the delay in finalising the important issues viz. amendment of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families (NPRR-2003) and had, therefore, desired the finalisation of the same within a stipulated time period of six months. The Committee express their concern over the fact that even after lapse of eight months since they presented their Report, the issues of public importance do not appear to be near finalisation. They reiterate their finalisation without any further loss of time.

H. Externally Aided Projects for wastelands development

Recommendation (Para No. 2.80)

28. The Committee had noted as below:

“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 Resources 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.”

29. The Government have replied as below:

“Four proposals seeking foreign assistance received from the Government of Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh duly recommended by this Department have been forwarded by the Department of Economic Affairs to the donor agencies for consideration. A final decision on these proposals depends upon the response of the donor agencies. As regards further initiative to have external funding for different projects in the country, the project proposals are formulated by the State Governments and the same are processed by the Department of Land Resources. Finally, the proposals are forwarded to Department of Economic Affairs with the request that the proposals may be posed to donor agencies for their consideration.”

30. The Committee note that a final decision on four proposals (three from Government of Andhra Pradesh and one from Government of Madhya Pradesh) for external assistance forwarded by the Department of Land Resources to Department of Economic Affairs has been inordinately delayed which is depended on the response of the donor agencies. The Committee desire that Government should play a pro-active role in getting a positive response from donor agencies so that these projects are actually implemented in Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh.

I. Slow Performance of IWDP Programme during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

Recommendation (Para No. 3.18)

31. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee find that from the year 1992-93 to 2000-2001, the utilization position was very encouraging whereby near about cent per cent utilization could be achieved under one of the biggest programmes of wastelands development, i.e. IWDP. However, they are perturbed to notice the 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.”

32. The Government have replied as below:

“The details of BE, RE and Actual Expenditure under IWDP during the year 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 are given as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

	2001-02				2002-03			
	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exp.	Excess Exp./ Savings	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exp.	Savings
Non-N.E. States	351.00	331.00	333.71	+2.71	362.00	357.00	357.00	—
N.E. States	79.00	74.00	42.64	-31.36	88.00	83.00	56.45	-26.55
Total	430.00	405.00	376.35	-28.65	450.00	440.00	413.45	-26.55

The above table indicates that the entire allocated funds of R.E. amounting to Rs. 331.00 crore under Non-NE States were released fully under IWDP during the year 2001-02 and 2002-03. During 2001-02, an excess expenditure amounting to Rs. 2.71 crore under IWDP from the savings of other schemes was also made to Non-NE States. However, in case of NE States, Rs. 31.36 crore and Rs. 26.55 crore went to non-lapsable pool in the years 2001-02 & 2002-03 respectively owing to the fact that no DPAP/DDP areas have been identified in

NE-States and 10 per cent of entire grant for the three programmes (i.e. IWDP, DPAP and DDP) was released under IWDP. NE States were not able to raise demand for the release of funds under IWDP, which is a demand driven programme. Under IWDP, 1st instalment is released alongwith sanction of new project. Each subsequent instalment is released only after utilization of more than 50 per cent funds of the previous instalment.”

33. The Committee note that the underspending under IWDP is primarily in the North-Eastern States. They also find that in North-Eastern States 10 per cent of the entire grant for three programmes, viz. IWDP, DDP and DPAP which are based on watershed guidelines, is being released under IWDP whereas only one scheme, i.e. IWDP is being implemented in North-Eastern States. This fact has resulted in huge under spending in the outlay earmarked in North-Eastern States. The Committee find that since the concept of allocating one-tenth of the total outlay of the Department exclusively for North-Eastern States has been started, the same reply has been furnished by the Department. The Committee in their earlier Report [Refer para 2.66 of 47th Report (13th Lok Sabha)] had recommended that in North-Eastern Region, where most of the Schemes are not being implemented, 10 per cent of the outlay should be of the Schemes/ Programmes which are applicable in such region. While the Committee appreciate allocating 10 per cent of the outlay exclusively for North-Eastern States, they would like at the same time that the scarce resources earmarked for such States should be effectively utilized for overall development of these States. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee would again strongly recommend that either the base of IWDP in North-Eastern States should be enhanced so as to have 100 per cent spending of the scarce resources or ten per cent outlay of only IWDP, the scheme which is being implemented in North-Eastern States should be earmarked.

J. Re-examination of Watershed Component of Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) in view of its unaccomplished goals

Recommendation (Para Nos. 3.21 and 3.22)

34. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

(Para No. 3.21)

35. “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.”

(Para No. 3.22)

36. The Government have replied as below:—

“The total committed liability assessed during 1999-2000 for completion of EAS-watershed projects in various States was about Rs. 1,500 crores which includes State’s share also. Funds under the scheme are shared in the ratio of 75:25 between the Central and State Governments. Accordingly out of Rs. 1,500 crore, Rs. 1,125 crore is the assessed Central share and Rs. 475 crore, State share. However, subsequently it was observed that the requirement of funds would be much less than the initial assessment. The progress in some States was rather very slow and as such these programmes were foreclosed. Taking this into account, the net requirement during the current financial year has been assessed around Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 crore.”

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 3.21)

37. “Although it was initially assessed during 1999-2000 that the projects would be completed in three years, *i.e.* by 2001-2002, since the project period as per the common guidelines for watershed

development is five years, the projects started in 1997-98 and 1998-99 were allowed further time for completion. Some of the States had also indicated that the recurrence of droughts in the past few years had adversely affected the implementation of the EAS (watershed projects). Further, in programmes of such nature, slippage to some extent does take place.”

(Reply to Recommendation at Para No. 3.22)

38. The Committee find the reply of the Government as disappointing. They are alarmed to find that the level of assessed funds for completion of EAS-Watershed projects in different States during 2003-2004 has gone down to even Rs. 50 crore from Rs. 1,500 crore in 1999-2000. Since the implementation of programmes in some States was slow, as such these programmes were fore-closed. The Committee fail to understand the reasons behind such a foreclosure of programmes particularly when there was a huge demand of Rs. 1,500 crore only five years back and out of which Rs. 600 crore still remains to be utilised. The Committee also find that issue of re-examination of watershed component of the Employment Assurance has been repeatedly examined by them. However, Government’s reply thereto has been far from satisfactory. For instance, the Committee in their Thirty-third Report presented to the House on 24 April 2002 had recommended for prioritising the committed liabilities in respect of watershed projects for their completion within the target year. The Committee had in their Forty-second Report presented to the House on 26 February 2003 reiterated the same. The Committee thereafter in their Forty-seventh Report presented to the House on 22 April 2003 again highlighted the issue in view of one-third of the committed liability to the tune of Rs. 1,500 crore remaining to be fulfilled. The Committee feel that in view of unfinished committed liability of Rs. 600 crore, the earmarking of a meagre Rs. 60 crore, is hardly justified on the ground that projects for which original funds sought in some States were foreclosed due to their slow implementation. The Committee, therefore, reiterate that committed liability under Watershed Component of EAS of IWDP be re-examined. The Government have also attributed recurrence of drought in the past few years as a reason for slow implementation of the project. The Committee observe that citing the above factors as slippage in implementation is unsustainable and urge the Government to tighten their implementing mechanism in these States.

K. State's share in watershed programmes

Recommendation (Para No. 3.23)

39. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

40. The Government have replied as below:

“While issuing the sanction orders for new projects and release of funds for ongoing projects, the State Governments are requested to release their matching State share under intimation to the DOLR. At the time of release of next instalments, it is ensured that the State share has been released by the State concerned. Since almost all schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development have a funding pattern of 75:25, the revised funding pattern of IWDP is still beneficial to the States. There is only a marginal contribution of Rs. 500 per ha. over a period of 5 years. Except for the North-Eastern States, no instances have been brought to our notice regarding difficulties being faced by State Governments in providing the matching State share. However, the NE States including Assam have been releasing their shares in all the projects sanctioned after 1 April 2000.”

41. The Committee note that in the reply furnished by the Department they have not addressed to that part of the recommendation whereby the Committee had desired that the Department should furnish the data with regard to the allocation

made by the States since the year 2000 under IWDP. They had also desired that the State-wise position should be indicated in the Performance Budget. The Department has not addressed to the said part of the recommendation as well. The Committee would like the reaction of the Department in this regard. Further, the Committee note that North-Eastern States are facing problem with regard to providing matching share under IWDP. The Committee would like to be apprised about the specific response received from each of the States indicating their difficulties in providing matching share.

I. Criteria for sanction of watershed projects

Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)

42. The Committee had noted as below:

“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 with 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.”

43. The Government have replied as below:

“Under IWDP, Districts are prioritized in consultation with the concerned State Governments for sanction during the year taking into consideration preponderance of wastelands/community land in the district, the progress and utilization of funds in the on-going projects, incidence of poverty, backwardness and SC/ST population. While allocating tentative area for the States, the availability of wastelands is an important consideration.”

44. The Committee find that as per the existing criteria for allocating funds for wastelands development the availability of wastelands is an important consideration. However, the Committee while examining the overall development of wastelands in the country in their earlier recommendation had noted that there was lopsided development of wastelands in the country. They had observed that whereas in bigger States like Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh increase in the wastelands areas is two times and five times respectively, the number of projects has increased manifold in some of the States. The position as indicated by the Department while examining Demands for Grants indicate that there is a certain flaw in allocating outlay for different wastelands programmes. The Committee would like that the development of wastelands in the country should be examined critically and the criteria should be such, whereby sanctioning of projects in a particular State should commensurate with the percentage of geographical wastelands area in that State to total wastelands in the country to achieve the targets of developing the wastelands within a stipulated time frame as earlier recommended by them. In this context, the Committee would like that emphasis should be given on undertaking projects under IWDP for those ecologically fragile areas where preponderance of wastelands hinder developmental activities. The Committee further feel that apart from Government initiative, participation of the community should also be encouraged. They are of the view that involvement of community-based organisations in the planning and implementation of projects would go a long way in making them successful and sustainable.

M. Action Plan for covering the total DDP Blocks

Recommendation (Para No. 3.52)

45. The Committee had noted as below:

“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.”

46. The Government have replied as below:

“In order to treat the area under DDP, the number of projects required are 91,600 of 500 hectares each. However, since 1995-96 till 2002-2003, i.e. during 8 years’ time, only 8,314 projects have been sanctioned to cover 41.57 lakh hectares. The total amount committed for these 8,314 projects is Rs. 2,283.43 crore, the Central share being Rs. 1,805.49 crore. For the treatment of balance area 83,286 new projects will be required the cost of which will be Rs. 24,985.80 crore. Even if 2,000 new projects are sanctioned every year, it will take around 42 years to cover the entire area of this country for treatment. However, the process of area treatment under the programme may be hastened by increased allocation in successive Plans, future tie-ups with various financial institutions for additional funding, linkage with National Action Programme (NAP) under United Nations Convention for Combating Desertification (UNCCD), etc.”

47. The Committee observe that as per the Government’s estimates it will take around 42 years to cover the entire DDP blocks in the country for treatment keeping in view the pace of allocation under the programme. The country cannot wait for such a long period to see the DDP areas to grow as green areas and, therefore, would like that their concerns should be brought before the Planning Commission for enhancing the outlay for the purpose.

N. Merger of CLR and SRA & ULR Schemes

Recommendation (Para No. 3.95)

48. The Committee had noted as below:

“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 main reason for under spending 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.”

49. The Government have replied as below:

“It is true that the scheme of computerisation of land records and strengthening of revenue administration and updating of land records (SRA&ULR) are inter-related. Under the scheme for SRA&ULR, financial assistance is given on 50:50 sharing basis for purchase of modern survey equipment like Global Positioning System (GPS), EDM, total station, theodolites, taking of aerial survey, purchase of office equipment like photocopier, laminating machine, binding machines, construction of office-cum-residence of patwaris and construction of record room for proper storage of land records. The main aim of the CLR is to implement a comprehensive and transparent land information system, capturing the entire work of land record maintenance with the provision to store, retrieve and process land records data containing ownership, tenancy rights, crop details, land revenue, source of irrigation, mutation, updation and dispute resolution and also on demand distribution of computerized copies of ROR to the land owners at reasonable rate. Funds are also being released to States for procurement and installation of computers at Tehsil/taluk level.

The nature of these schemes are such that State-wise allocations are not being made. These are demand-driven schemes and proposals received from the States are examined and funds released

as per the guidelines. Most of the States are providing their matching share of 50% along with Central Government release under the scheme of SRA&ULR except in the North-Eastern States who are facing problems of matching share of 50 per cent because of financial constraints. Since inception of the scheme of SRA&ULR, Government of India have released Rs. 241.77 crore as the Central share and utilization reported by States/UTs is Rs. 170.31 crore which is approximately 71 per cent of the total releases. To make this scheme more successful, Government of India, is considering revising the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the State and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States.”

50. The Committee note that the issue addressed in their recommendation has not been properly dealt with. The Committee had, in their earlier recommendation, recommended merger of the two programmes, i.e. ‘Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records’ and ‘Computerization of Land Records’ since both are inter-related and hence desired that State Government should be provided flexibility in using the outlay for two programmes. While the Department has agreed that both the programmes are inter-related, their reply on the said recommendation is quite vague. The Committee would like them to respond to the said issue categorically. On the issue of Centre-State ratio for allocation under the SRA&ULR Scheme, the Committee note that Government is considering to revise the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and State and to 90:10 for the North-Eastern States. The Committee would like to be apprised of the final decision taken in this regard.

O. Development of wastelands through Private Sector

Recommendation (Para No. 3.128)

51. The Committee had noted as below:

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 Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS). 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 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.”

52. The Government have replied as below:

“As recommended by the Committee in its 12th Report (13th Lok Sabha), the Department made serious efforts to popularise the

scheme by organizing workshops/seminars at National, Regional and District levels wherein the representatives of CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, NABARD, Scheduled Commercial Banks, User Industries, Ministries of Finance, Commerce and Industry etc. were also invited.

The reasons for non-participation of the private sector in wastelands development has already been given in the earlier reply submitted to the Committee. The performance of the Scheme was reviewed by the Planning Commission during the Mid Term review and zero based budgeting exercise. Keeping in view the slow progress made under the scheme and minimal interest shown by the private sector in implementation of the scheme, the scheme has been discontinued from 2003-04 (1.4.2003).”

53. While considering the resource constraints with the Government and keeping in view the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country, the Committee feel that it is not justified to discontinue the Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS). They find that the Government’s funding in this regard would not be sufficient and there is an urgent need to involve private sector to achieve the set goals. They would like that the Government should reconsider the issue and take up the matter again with the Planning Commission. The Committee also stress that the Government should make all possible efforts to involve beneficiaries and persons from all walks of life in the development of wastelands in the country. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Government in this regard.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The Department will be communicating the views of the Standing Committee to the Planning Commission. The matter will also be taken up with the Planning Commission at the time of plan allocation for DoLR for the next financial year.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 analyzing 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.

Reply of the Government

The programmes of DoLR are being implemented on watershed basis since April 1995. It is envisaged that a watershed project would require about 5 years for its successful completion. The Ministry have already launched impact evaluation studies of the completed projects whose findings are encouraging. In almost all these studies, it has been observed that the net sown area has increased due to implementation of the watershed project. It is pertinent to add here that all watershed projects of DoLR are required to have a post-project evaluation study conducted after their completion in which one of the components of observation would be change in net sown area. As such, as advised by the Standing Committee, all efforts would be made to maintain basic data regarding the impact of various watershed projects of DoLR on net sown area.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The guidelines for 'Hariyali' have been finalized and made operational w.e.f. 1.4.2003. In the new arrangement, the Gram Panchayats in place of the Watershed Development Committee under the old Guidelines shall execute the works under the guidance and control of the Gram Sabha in place of Watershed Association. Technical guidance will be given by a technical team called the Watershed Development Team of the Project Implementation Agencies. The Gram Panchayat Secretary will be responsible for convening meetings of the Gram Panchayat and Gram Sabha and for carrying out their decisions. The Gram Sabha will meet, at least twice a year to approve/improve the watershed development plan, monitor and review its progress, approve the statement of accounts, from User Groups/Self Help Groups, resolve differences/disputes between different User Groups/Self Help Groups or amongst members of these groups, approve arrangements for the collection of public/voluntary donations and contributions from the community and individual members, lay down procedures for the operation and maintenance of assets, and approve the activities that can be taken up with the money available in the Watershed Development Fund.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Since all the watershed development programmes of the Department i.e. IWDP, DPAP and DDP are being implemented under the common Guidelines for Hariyali, the condition of 5% of the total project cost earmarked for training and capacity building is applicable to all the above programmes. The Guidelines for other Schemes like TDET also contain provision for training.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 grass-root 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.

Reply of the Government

The Guidelines for Hariyarli provide for publicity of the programmes through display boards at the project sites, posters, wall paintings etc. showing details of watershed programmes. The DRDAs/ZPs concerned implementing the above programmes have to ensure that the programme reaches the people. Community mobilization and training are pre-requisites before initiating developmental work in watershed projects. Prior sensitization and orientation training on watershed project management is imparted to all concerned functionaries and elected representatives at the District, Block and village level before they assume their responsibilities with the help of local training institutions.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The Department has taken note of the suggestion and would communicate to the State Governments the views of the Standing

Committee that meetings of DRDAs should be convened when Parliament is not in session.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

No action is required on this item.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 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.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry of Rural Development has circulated copies of the Guidelines for the Vigilance and Monitoring (V&M) Committees, both in Hindi and English to all the Members of Parliament. The Guidelines contain the rights of the Members of Parliament as Chairman/Vice-

Chairman of the V&M Committees. The Guidelines have also been communicated to all the States and District authorities for their information, record and necessary action.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 finalization of the same within a stipulated time period of six months.

Reply of the Government

Amendment to Land Acquisition Act, 1894

The Group of Ministers in its Meeting held on 22.11.2001 approved the amendments proposed by this Ministry. However, subsequently two new proposals, i.e. (i) relating to amendment of Section 6 (inserting new section 6A—suggested by the Law Commission of India), and (ii) direction of the Supreme Court relating to the acquisition of the property of Minority Educational Institutions were received in this Ministry. These were examined and draft proposals have been sent to the Ministry of Law for their concurrence/vetting. Thereafter, the proposal for amendment of the Act would be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration and approval.

National Policy on the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families (NPRR-2003):

This Department prepared a draft policy on R&R for the Project Affected Families, which was submitted before the GOM for its consideration. The GOM in its last Meeting held on 22.11.2001, directed "the Department of Land Resources to prepare a draft Bill and circulate it to all concerned Ministries/Departments for their comments and bring up the proposal before the GOM thereafter."

In pursuance of the aforesaid directions of the GOM, this Ministry prepared a draft Bill based on the provisions contained in the Draft National Policy on R&R. The Draft Bill was concurred by the M/o Law. Subsequently, the Cabinet Secretariat desired that the draft Bill may be discussed first by the Standing Committee of Secretaries (SCOS) before it is considered by the GOM. Accordingly, this Ministry prepared a Note for consideration by the SCOs. The Note was considered on 27th May, 2003 and the SCOS desired that "it was preferable to have a Central Policy on PAF, rather than a Central Legislation". It was decided that since action for the proposed PAF (R&R) Bill was based on recommendations of the GOM, any deviation had to be placed before it for further directions.

In the light of the directions of the SCOS, this Department has prepared a Draft National Policy for Project Affected Families (Resettlement and Rehabilitation)—2003 (NPRR—2003) taking into account the suggestions of the SCOS. The draft has been approved by Minister (RD) and has been circulated to different Ministries/ Departments for their comments/suggestions, if any. After receipt of their comments/suggestions, a Note for the GOM along with the draft Policy will be prepared and submitted for its consideration.

Necessary steps are being taken to complete both the proposals, i.e. Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill and the National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families expeditiously."

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 27 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations made in the 8th Report of the Standing Committee of the Parliament (1994-95, 10th Lok Sabha) and 24th Report (1995-96, 10th Lok Sabha) were taken into consideration while drafting proposals for amending the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.50)

The Committee reiterate that the most important component of their recommendations 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.

Reply of the Government

The issue relating to incorporating provisions of National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation for Project Affected Families with the Land Acquisition Act was examined in this Ministry and a conscious decision was taken that the proposals may not be merged and the R&R Policy may be issued in the form of executive instructions.

The compensation while acquiring the land is paid as per procedure laid down in the LA Act, 1894 (amended from time to time). Compensation in the form of land of the same quality may not be feasible. A copy of draft Policy on R&R is enclosed at Appendix-II

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 and 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.

Reply of the Government

Drought Prone Areas Programme is being implemented under Common Guidelines and with a uniform cost norm of Rs. 6000 per hectare having done away with the system of categories and corresponding cost norms. Accordingly, the total project cost of a watershed project of 500 hectares is Rs. 30 lakh. The flexibility of fixing cost estimates for various thematic activities/work items in the detailed work plan of the entire project of Rs. 30 lakh on account of the specific needs, treatment technologies, local materials, wages, etc. has been left to the concerned State Government to workout as per Standard Schedule of Rates (SSR) approved by it. Thus, there is inherent mechanism and scope to implement essential activities in difficult areas including KBK districts subject to the limit of Rs. 30 lakh, notwithstanding the norm of Rs. 6,000 per hectare.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Drought Prone Areas Programme is being implemented under Common Guidelines and with a uniform cost norm of Rs. 6000 per hectare having done away with the system of categories and corresponding cost norms. Accordingly, the total project cost of a watershed project of 500 hectares is Rs. 30 lakh. The flexibility of fixing cost estimates for various thematic activities/work items in the detailed work plan of the entire project of Rs. 30 lakh on account of the specific needs, treatment technologies, local materials, wages, etc. is left to the concerned State Government to workout as per Standard Schedule of Rates (SSR) approved by it. The Department has adopted a uniform cost norm irrespective of specific problem areas. There is an inherent mechanism for some flexibility in the cost norms. It will not be possible to have different cost norms for different areas.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 2002-03, 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.

Reply of the Government

The feelings of the Standing Committee regarding earmarking 10% outlay of only the schemes/programmes which are applicable in the

North-Eastern Region, are being communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

It may be submitted that areas for coverage under DPAP and DDP have been identified by taking Block as a unit. Consequently, 972 Blocks in 16 States and 235 Blocks in 7 States are covered under DPAP and DDP respectively. These Blocks are being sanctioned new projects as per established norms keeping in view the availability of funds. Similarly, the non-DPAP and non-DDP Blocks are being sanctioned projects under IWDP. Priority lists are finalised in consultation with each State Government for taking up projects in these Blocks. The total wastelands in the State is kept in view while drawing up the priority lists. Each project under the above programme draws up and finalises its own activity wise plan for the project period of five years which is monitored at the district, State and DoLR level.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 poor performing States so as to have overall progress with regard to development of wastelands in the whole country.

Reply of the Government

The Committee recommended that thrust be given to motivate poorly performing States. In this respect suitable measures like review

of the programmes with the State Secretaries concerned, visits to the project areas by the officers of the DoLR, tele-conferencing with the State Officials concerned, visits by the Area Officers etc. are being taken to appreciate the local problems and circumstances leading to poor performance and offer suitable advice for improvement. The States are also advised to conduct training programmes for the functionaries involved in implementation of watershed programmes and financial assistance is sanctioned for the purpose.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 total involved so that there is no chance of a developed land again reconverts into barren land.

Reply of the Government

Under the Guidelines for Watershed Development, several provisions have been in-built for post-project maintenance of assets created under the projects. To this end, at the planning stage, the Project Implementation Agency (PIA), in close consultation with the village community, is required to design a mechanism to ensure post-project maintenance by the watershed community. At the implementation stage, public contributions to the tune of a minimum 5-10% of cost of works are collected from the beneficiaries and maintained separately in a Watershed Development Fund, which can be used after the project period for maintenance purposes. Most importantly, under the new initiative Hariyali, the entire responsibility of planning and implementation of the watershed projects rests with

the concerned Gram Panchayats, which are being provided with the required financial, technical and administrative support. This initiative adequately ensures that the Gram Panchayat which plans for and implements the watershed projects on its own and as per its requirements would also be responsible for post-project maintenance of assets created under the project. It is envisaged that these provisions would ensure that there is no chance of developed land converting into barren land again.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Details of the wasteland development projects sanctioned under IWDP in different states of the North-Eastern Region and the release of funds are as below :—

Sl. No.	Year	No. of projects sanctioned	Area (ha.)	Funds released (Rs. in lakhs)
1.	1995-96	1	2500	673.46
2.	1996-97	2	17500	630.32
3.	1997-98	7	53867	556.20
4.	1998-99	7	74300	960.95
5.	1999-2000	10	96420	956.32
6.	2000-01	29	277828	2638.17
7.	2001-02	28	185061	4263.85
8.	2000-03	41	287038	5645.43

It is clear from the table above that the area coverage under IWDP in the N.E. States as also the release of funds has increased consistently over the last few years especially after the formation of the Department of Land Resources in April 1999. This has been made possible due to the pro-active approach of this Department. Whereas only 4 States were availing assistance under IWDP upto 31.3.1999, all the States of N.E. Region have now been covered. However, the Scheme is demand driven and therefore, there is a limitation on the release of instalments in ongoing projects in the Region. The absorption capacity of the NE States also limits the scope of taking up more projects under the Scheme.

The allocation for NE States during the last three years and corresponding releases made during these years are as below:

(Rs. in crores)

Year	Total allocation for NE States (Revised)	Total releases under all the schemes of DoLR	Releases under area development scheme (IWDP)
2000-01	27.45	32.45	26.38
2001-02	85.00	51.68	42.64
2002-03	95.00	62.16	56.45

The Department shall be writing to the States in the North-Eastern Region to chalk out detailed action plan with regard to implementation of IWDP so that the scarce resource earmarked for the development of the region can be meaningfully utilised.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 land 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 State Governments to have an overall view of the impact of DPAP in the areas being developed.

Reply of the Government

The mid-term evaluation report is one of the documents that has to be submitted by the DRDA before seeking release of 4th instalment of funds under the Drought Prone Areas Programme. The trend in most of these mid-term evaluation report indicates that the projects are being implemented satisfactorily and that there is improvement in programme areas.

In order to assess the impact of the DPAP projects, Impact Assessment studies have been carried out in some programme States. These studies reveal that due to implementation of these watershed projects, the overall productivity of land has increased, water table has gone up and there has been a significant positive impact on overall economic development of the inhabitants in the project areas. The studies also indicate that green vegetative cover, irrigation, crop yield etc. have also improved in these areas. A brief note on the findings of the impact assessment studies in respect of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh is at Appendix-III.

All the State Governments/concerned Zilla Parishads/DRDAs have already been advised to submit mid-term evaluation of projects. In fact, now the mid-term reports are being received along with the request for release of next instalment of funds.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) is implemented on watershed basis. The implementation of projects is constantly monitored through:

1. Periodical Reports and Returns—Information from the field is obtained through periodical reports which carry information on the financial as well as physical progress under the programme.
2. Review at different levels—At the Centre, the Programme is periodically reviewed at meetings of the concerned State Secretaries under the Chairmanship of Union Secretary (Rural Development) from time to time.
3. Field Inspection under the Area Officers Scheme of the Ministry—The Officers make field visits and inspect the works from time to time.
4. Recently, monitoring has been strengthened and made more effective by introducing supplementary monitoring and rapid intensive evaluation of selected watershed projects.
5. District Vigilance & Monitoring Committees under the chairmanship of local Member of Parliament have also been set up to constantly monitor the implementation of the projects in the districts and also at the State level.
6. Video conferences are also held with State Secretaries.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 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.

Reply of the Government

During the 10th Plan, the target is for sanctioning of 13,600 new projects. The Planning Commission has earmarked Rs. 1500 crores for this Programme during the 10th Plan period. During the year 2002-03 and 2003-04, 2478 and 2535 new projects respectively have been sanctioned under Drought Prone Areas Programme. The Budget Estimates for this programme for these two years are Rs. 250 crore and Rs. 295 crore respectively. Under DPAP first instalment is released along with the sanction of new projects. Subsequent instalments are released on the basis of specific requests received from the concerned Zilla Parishads/DRDAs. The trends, as per the demands raised by the State Government has shown that every year about 70-75% of the funds are released for on-going projects and the balance 25-30% funds are utilized towards sanctioning of new projects. In view of this, the proposed allocation for 10th Plan is expected to meet the requirements for new and on-going projects under the Programme.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

DPAP is a demand-driven scheme and funds are released in 7 instalments over a project periodic of 5 years. During the year 1995-96, 4523 watershed projects were sanctioned out of which all 7 instalments have been released in respect of 2979 projects. 672 projects have been released 80% of the total project cost and 649 projects have been released 65% of the project cost. Only 223 projects have claimed less than 50% funds. A statement indicating release of instalment of funds, State-wise, is at Appendix-IV.

Release of further instalments of funds in respect of remaining projects has been stopped.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

In order to treat the area under DDP, the number of projects required are 91,600 of 500 hectares each. However, since 1995-96 till 2002-2003 i.e. during 8th year's time, only 8314 projects have been sanctioned to cover 41.57 lakh hectares. The total amount committed for these 8314 projects is Rs. 2283.43 crores, the Central share being

Rs. 1805.49 lakhs. For the treatment of balance area, 83286 new projects will be required the cost of which will be Rs. 24985.80 crores. Even if 200 new projects are sanctioned every year, it will take around 42 years to cover the entire area of this country for treatment. However, the process of area treatment under the programme may be hastened by increased allocation in successive Plans, future tie-ups with various financial institutions for additional funding, linkage with National Action Programme (NAP) under United Nations Convention for Combating Desertification (UNCCD), etc.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 47 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 of computer centres and data entry work at the District and Tehsil level, while allocation of funds for computer centres at the sub-division level is conspicuously missing. The Committee feel that by computerizing the sub-division level, it could work as 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.

Reply of the Government

This Ministry is in the process of finalizing revised guidelines on the implementation of the Scheme of Computerization of Land Records (CLR). To improve the quality of supervision, it has been decided to provide sub-division level computer centres in the State as suggested by the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.62)

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

Reply of the Government

The Department have noted the above observations of the Committee and it is proposed to be emphasised in the revised guidelines that States must computerize land records pertaining to ownership, tenancy details, land holdings, crop details, classification of soil, sources of irrigation, land revenue etc.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The issue relating to updation of land records in the North-Eastern States including Meghalaya State has been reviewed from time to time including in the Conferences of Revenue Secretaries/Ministers organized by this Ministry. It has been impressed upon Meghalaya to complete their survey/re-survey so that they have proper land records for which this Ministry is providing funds on 50:50 sharing basis between Centre and States under the Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR). Once the land records are updated in the State of Meghalaya, the computerization of land records can be initiated.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.77)

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

Reply of the Government

At the time when the report was submitted the position of utilization of funds was 60%. Since then considerable improvement in fund utilization has been reported by the States. So far (till 31st July, 2003), the utilization of funds has increased from 60% to 71%.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

The funds under the Scheme of CLR are being released to the Revenue Department of the States/UTs and in turn these are transferred to implementing authorities in the districts. Wherever funds are not released to the implementing Authority by the State Governments in time, this Ministry takes up the matter with the State Government to release the funds at the earliest to the implementing authority.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

During the Conferences of Revenue Secretaries/Ministers organized by this Department from time to time, it has been emphasized that legal sanctity may be given to computerized copies of RoR by amending necessary rules/regulations. Karnataka, Goa and Tamil Nadu have already amended the rules/regulations to make only computerized copies accepted as the legal document for any type of land transactions etc. The Department is also of the view that the legal sanctity given to computerized copies of RoR will bring transparency in transactions and easy accessibility to land related information. The Department will, therefore, continue to impress upon the States/UTs to change the rules/regulations to make only computerised copies accepted as legal documents.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 emphasized 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 easily achieved. While considering the fact that the Central Government have 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 the regard.

Reply of the Government

States have been requested to send QPRs on distribution of ceiling surplus land to this Department regularly in the prescribed format. They have also been informed that the relevant information may also be fed in the website developed by the Department of Land Resources. This Ministry is fixing targets under the Twenty-Point Programme for distribution of ceiling surplus land on the basis of availability of land for distribution as on 1st April of preceding year. The States have also been instructed that available ceiling surplus land should be distributed to SC/ST beneficiaries and other rural landless people.

Efforts are also being made to review the progress of various programmes of Land Reforms through Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), organizing Conferences of Revenue Secretaries/Ministers of States/UTs from time to time, video conferencing with States and through field visits of Area Officers of this Ministry.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.101)

The Committee note that an area of 9.03 lakh acres is involved in litigation process in various States. The 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 States Governments should be issued in this regard.

Reply of the Government

During the Conference of Revenue Secretaries organized by this Department on 25.7.03, States have been urged to distribute remaining ceiling surplus land/bhoodan land/Govt. wasteland in a time-bound manner. States have been requested to expedite litigation cases involving 9.03 lakh acres of ceiling surplus land pending in various Courts. States have also been requested to constitute Land Tribunal/Special Benches in the respective High Courts where large number of cases are pending for expeditious disposal of such cases.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Recommendation (Para No. 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 utilized fully. They would like that the scope of the Scheme should further be widened.

Reply of the Government

When TDET Scheme was launched in 1993-94 the outlay of the Scheme was Rs. 1.5 crore only. Besides, widening the scope, the outlay of the Scheme has also been enhanced over the years. The outlay of the Scheme during 2003-04 is Rs. 17 crores. The scope of the Scheme is further being extended in the 10th plan by covering special problem areas like ravinous area, waterlogged and salt affected areas, sandy area including coastal sandy areas, shifting cultivation areas, mine spoiled areas, land slides in hilly areas etc.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No. 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 apprise about the criteria for spending money deposited in non-lapsable pool for infrastructure purposes.

Reply of the Government

(i) It may be clarified that while calculating total under-spending of the Department, the unspent amount in case of North-Eastern States as deposited in non-lapsable pool is also included.

(ii) The criteria for spending money deposited in non-lapsable pool for infrastructure purposes are decided by the Department of Development of North-Eastern Region (DONER).

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

CHAPTER IV
RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES
OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED
BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Para No. 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 under spending is basically in the outlay earmarked for North-East. While this issue has been dealt 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.

Reply of the Government

The cut in Budget estimate is generally imposed by the Ministry of Finance after taking into account the resources available with the Central Government. DOLR will be communicating the views of the Committee to the Planning Commission against imposing any cut in the allocation for the Department at the RE stage. During the year 2002-03, the expenditure position as compared to Revised Estimates was 96.6%. The reduction was mainly on account of less utilisation for States in NE Region. The expenditure under IWDP in this Region has been increasing continuously year after year as can be seen from the figures below:

2000-01	-	Rs. 26.78 crore
2001-02	-	Rs. 42.64 crore
2002-03	-	Rs. 56.45 crore

The Department has been sanctioning a large number of projects every year in these States as can be seen from the table below:

Period	Projects sanctioned	Area in lakh. ha.
1995-96 to 1998-99	17	1.48
1999-2000	10	0.96
2000-2001	29	2.78
2001-2002	28	1.85
2002-2003	41	2.87

However, the shortfalls in expenditure in North-Eastern States is mainly due to the fact that the two major watershed programmes, i.e. DPAP and DDP are not being implemented in this Region. Efforts are being made for further increasing the coverage of IWDP in the NE region. The progress of on-going projects is also being followed up pro-actively with the State Governments and DRDAs.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 7 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 meaningful 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.

Reply of the Government

The Department of Land Resources has formulated a draft Scheme titled, 'Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana' (PMGJSY) for the critically drought-affected areas in the country, specially where drinking water is a major problem. During the Tenth Plan the Scheme is proposed to be implemented in all the 235 Blocks covered under the Desert Development Programme (DDP) and 325 Blocks covered under Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) in the first phase. Remaining 647 DPAP Blocks will be covered in the 2nd phase. The funding pattern of the Scheme is being proposed as 75:25 between Center and State Governments. Besides, the Gram Panchayat/Beneficiaries are required to contribute 10% of the project cost for maintenance of assets created under the projects. The Scheme is proposed to be implemented through Gram Panchayats. The thrust of the Scheme will be on water conservation through water harvesting measures.

The EFC memo of the Scheme has already been circulated for comments of the PMO, Planning Commission and Ministries of Finance, Agriculture, Environment and Forests, and Water Resources. The matter is also being monitored by the PMO.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 10 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 analyses 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.

Reply of the Government

The Department is constantly striving to improve the implementation of the schemes. The scope of each scheme has been consistently widened over the years as can be seen in the increased coverage of the three schemes over the last 3 years.

New Projects sanctioned in the last 3 years (Area in lakh ha.)

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
IWDP	11.12	7.97	3.35
DPAP	16.85	10.26	12.39
DDP	8.30	6.79	8.01

The shortfall in sanctioning new projects under IWDP during 2002-2003 was due to the utilisation of the budget allocation for the ongoing projects taken up before 31 March 2002.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 13 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

A Cabinet Note on 'Setting up of Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Narain Mission for Land and Watershed Development' in the Department of Land Resources (DoLR), Ministry of Rural Development and transfer of watershed and soil conservation related schemes to DoLR was submitted to the Cabinet Secretariat for consideration of the Cabinet. The subject came for discussion in the Cabinet meeting held on 10 July 2003. However, the agenda item was postponed. Subsequently, Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Environment and Forests wrote to the Minister of Rural Development reiterating their strong reservations on the desirability and feasibility of setting up a Mission and transfer of all watershed and soil conservation related Schemes from their Ministries to the DoLR. Keeping in view the strong reservations from both the Ministers, the matter was reconsidered in the Ministry and the Cabinet note has since been withdrawn.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 21 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

As per provisions of the Guidelines for *Haryali*, the ZP/DRDA shall, normally, be the authority competent to decide on selection of projects as also the selection of the Project Implementation Agencies (PIAs) for taking up projects under the watershed development programmes. MPs/MLAs/MLCs are generally members of the ZPs as also the Governing Bodies of the DRDAs. Thus, their role is important in selection of watershed projects and PIAs. Once a watershed project is sanctioned, the role of Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat becomes important in implementation of the project. Their roles are, therefore, complementary in nature.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development
O.M. No.H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph No. 24 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Programmes for development of wastelands/degraded lands are being implemented by various Ministries/Departments, including DoLR. Therefore, a National Perspective Plan for wastelands development would be meaningful only when all these Programmes are taken into consideration and funds allocated by the Planning Commission accordingly. The Planning Commission have included a Perspective Plan for reclamation/development of degraded lands in the Tenth Plan document. This Department has also been advising the States to draw up a Perspective Plan for wastelands development.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 21 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.18)

The Committee find that from the year 1992-93 to 2000-2001, the utilization position was very encouraging whereby near about cent per cent utilization could be achieved under one of the biggest programme of wastelands development, i.e. IWDP. However, they are perturbed to notice under spending 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 under spending 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 under spending, 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 under spending 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 under spending 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 under spending from each of the project for which money has been sanctioned and furnish a detailed reply in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The details of BE, RE and Actual Expenditure under IWDP during the year 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 are given as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

	2001-02				2002-03			
	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exp.	Excess Exp./ Savings	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Exp.	Savings
Non-N.E. States	351.00	331.00	333.71	+2.71	362.00	357.00	357.00	—
N.E. States	79.00	74.00	42.64	-31.36	88.00	83.00	56.45	-26.55
Total	430.00	405.00	376.35	-28.65	450.00	440.00	413.45	-26.55

The above table indicates that the entire allocated funds of R.E. amounting to Rs. 331.00 crore under Non-NE States were released fully under IWDP during the years 2001-02 and 2002-03. During 2001-02, an excess expenditure amounting to Rs. 2.71 crore under IWDP from the savings of other schemes was also made to Non-NE States. However, in case of NE States, Rs. 31.36 crore and Rs. 26.55 crore went to non-lapsable pool in the years 2001-02 & 2002-03 respectively owing to the fact that no DPAP/DDP areas have been identified in NE-States and 10% of entire grant for the three programmes (*i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP) was released under IWDP. NE States were not able to raise demand for the release of funds under IWDP, which is a demand driven programme. Under IWDP, 1st instalment is released

alongwith sanction of new project. Each subsequent instalment is released only after utilization of more than 50 per cent funds of the previous instalment.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 33 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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. 1500 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.

Reply of the Government

The total committed liability assessed during 1999-2000 for completion of EAS-watershed projects in various States was about Rs. 1,500 crore which includes State share also. Funds under the scheme are shared in the ratio of 75:25 between the Central and State Governments. Accordingly out of Rs. 1,500 crore, Rs. 1,125 crore is the assessed Central share and Rs. 475 crore, State share. However, subsequently it was observed that the requirement of funds would be much less than the initial assessment. The progress in some States was rather very slow and would have to be foreclosed. Taking this into account, the net requirement during the current financial year has been assessed around Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 crore.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 38 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

Although it was initially assessed during 1999-2000 that the projects would be completed in three years, i.e. by 2001-2002, since the project period as per the common guidelines for watershed development is five years, the projects started in 1997-98 and 1998-99 were allowed further time for completion. Some of the States had also indicated that the recurrence of droughts in the past few years had adversely affected the implementation of the EAS (watershed projects). Further, in programmes of such nature, slippage to some extent does take place.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 38 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 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.

Reply of the Government

While issuing the sanction orders for new projects and release of funds for ongoing projects, the State Governments are requested to release their matching State share under intimation to the DoLR. At the time of release of next instalments, it is ensured that the State share has been released by the State concerned. Since almost all schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development have a funding pattern of 75:25, the revised funding pattern of IWDP is still beneficial to the States. There is only a marginal contribution of Rs. 500 per ha. over a period of 5 years. Except for the North-Eastern States, no instances have been brought to our notice regarding difficulties being faced by State Governments in providing the matching State share. However, the NE States including Assam have been releasing their shares in all the projects sanctioned after 1 April, 2000.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 41 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 the State to total wastelands in the country to achieve the targets of developing the wastelands in a country within a stipulated time frame.

Reply of the Government

Under IWDP, Districts are prioritized in consultation with the concerned State Governments for sanction during the year taking into consideration preponderance of wastelands/community land in the district, the progress and utilization of funds in the on-going projects, incidence of poverty, backwardness and SC/ST population. While allocating tentative area for the States, the availability of wastelands is an important consideration.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development)
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 44 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.95)

The Committee are constrained to note huge under spending 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 main reason for under spending 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 Computerization 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 and 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.

Reply of the Government

It is true that the scheme of computerisation of land records and strengthening of revenue administration and updating of land records (SRA&ULR) are inter-related. Under the scheme of SRA&ULR, financial assistance is given on 50:50 sharing basis for purchase of modern survey equipment like global positioning system (GPS), EDM, total station, theodolites, taking of aerial survey, purchase of office equipment like photocopier, laminating machine, binding machines, construction of office-cum-residence of patwaris and construction of record room for proper storage of land records. The main aim of the CLR is to implement a comprehensive and transparent land information system, capturing the entire work of land record maintenance with the provision to store, retrieve and process land records data containing ownership, tenancy rights, crop details, land revenue, source of irrigation, mutation, updation and dispute resolution and also on demand distribution of computerized copies of ROR to the land owners at a reasonable rate. Funds are also being released to States for procurement and installation of computers at Tehsil/taluk level.

The nature of these schemes are such that State-wise allocations are not being made. These are demand-driven schemes and proposals received from the States are examined and funds released as per the guidelines. Most of the States are providing their matching share of 50% along with Central Government release under the scheme of SRA&ULR except in the North-Eastern States who are facing problems of matching share of 50% because of financial constraints. Since inception of the scheme of SRA&ULR, Government of India have released Rs. 241.77 crore as the Central share and utilization reported by States/UTs is Rs. 170.31 crores which is approximately 71% of the total releases. To make this scheme more successful, Government of India, is considering revising the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the State and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 50 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 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 recommendations. 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.

Reply of the Government

As recommended by the Committee in its 12th Report (13th Lok Sabha), the Department made serious efforts to popularise the scheme by organizing workshops/seminars at National, Regional and District levels wherein the representatives of CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, NABARD, Scheduled Commercial Banks, User Industries, Ministries of Finance, Commerce and Industry etc. were also invited.

The reasons for non-participation of the private sector in wastelands development has already been given in the earlier reply submitted to the Committee. The performance of the Scheme was reviewed by the Planning Commission during the Mid Term review and zero based budgeting exercise. Keeping in view the slow progress made under the scheme and minimal interest shown by the private sector in implementation of the scheme, the scheme has been discontinued from 2003-04 (1.4.2003).

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 53 of Chapter I of the Report)

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Para No. 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.

Reply of the Government

List of the Institutes to whom Impact studies have so far been assigned is at Appendix-I. Studies in the remaining States are being assigned/completed in a phased manner.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 16 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 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 Resources 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.

Reply of the Government

Four proposals seeking foreign assistance received from the Government of Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh duly recommended by this Department have been forwarded by the Department of Economic Affairs to the donor agencies for consideration. A final decision on these proposals depends upon the response of the donor agencies. As regards further initiative to have external funding for different projects in the country, the project proposals are formulated by the State Governments and the same are processed by the Department of Land Resources. Finally, the proposals are forwarded to Department of Economic Affairs with the request that the proposals may be posed to donor agencies for their consideration.

[Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources),
O.M. No. H-11014/3/2003-M&C Dated 25.8.2003]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 30 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;
20 January, 2004
30 Pausa, 1925 (Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

NAME OF THE INSTITUTES TO WHOM IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES ASSIGNED BY THE MINISTRY

Sl. No.	Name of the Institute
1	2
1.	Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi
2.	Institute of Rural Management, ANAND, Gujarat
3.	Tata Institute of Social Sciences, DEONAR, Mumbai
4.	Department of Social Work, (Delhi School of Social Work), University of Delhi, Delhi
5.	National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi
6.	National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad
7.	Centre for Management Development, Thiruvananthapuram
8.	ORG, New Delhi
9.	RITES Ltd., New Delhi
10.	Institute for Human Development, New Delhi
11.	Institute of Applied Manpower Research, New Delhi
12.	International Management Institute, New Delhi
13.	Pragana Research & Consultancy Services, Hyderabad
14.	Advantage India, New Delhi
15.	International Institute of Sustainable Development & Management, Ahmedabad
16.	Organisation for Applied Socio-Economic System (OASES), New Delhi
17.	Technical Consultancy Services Organisation of Karnataka (TECSOK), Bangalore

1	2
18.	Development and Research Services, New Delhi
19.	Xavier Institute of Social Sciences, Ranchi
20.	Marathwada Institute for Training, Research & Development, Bhopal
21.	Taylor Nelson Sofres, Mode Private Ltd., (MODE), New Delhi
22.	Centre for Advanced Research & Development, Bhopal
23.	CMI Social Research Centre, New Delhi
24.	Bihar Institute of Economic Studies, Patna

APPENDIX II

SECRET

E.No. Acq. 13011/6/2002-LRD(Pt)
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Land Resources
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110 001

Table of Contents

NATIONAL POLICY ON THE RESETTLEMENT & REHABILITATION OF PROJECT AFFECTED FAMILIES-2003

(NPPR-2003)

1. Chapter I: Preamble
2. Chapter II: Objectives of the Policy
3. Chapter III: Definitions
4. Chapter IV: Appointment of Administration and Commissioner for Resettlement & Rehabilitation and their powers and functionaries
5. Chapter V: Schemes/Plans for Resettlement & Rehabilitation
 - 5.1 Declaration of Affected Zone
 - 5.2 Procedure to be followed for survey and census of PAFs
 - 5.10 Assessment of Land
 - 5.12 Declaration of Resettlement
 - 5.13 Power to Acquire Land
 - 5.14 Draft Scheme/Plan
 - 5.15 Management of Funds for R&R
 - 5.18 Contents of Draft Scheme/Plan
 - 5.19 Final Publication of the Scheme/Plan

6. Chapter VI: Benefits for R&R
7. Chapter VII: Dispute Redressal Mechanism
 - 7.1 R&R Committee at Project Level
 - 7.2 Grievance Redressal Cell
 - 7.3 Inter-State Projects
8. Chapter VIII: Monitoring Mechanism
 - 8.1 National Monitoring Committee
 - 8.3 National Monitoring Cell
 - 8.4 Applicability
9. Annexure I

SECRET

F.No. Acq. 13011/6/6/2002-LRD (Pt)
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Land Resources
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110 001

NATIONAL POLICY ON THE RESETTLEMENT AND
REHABILITATION OF PROJECT AFFECTED FAMILIES—2003
(NPRR-2003)

CHAPTER I: POLICY

Preamble:

1.1 Compulsory acquisition of land for public purpose including infrastructure projects displaces people, forcing them to give up their home, assets and means of livelihood. Apart from depriving them of their lands, livelihoods and resource-base, displacement has other traumatic psychological and socio-cultural consequences. The Government of India recognizes the need to minimize large scale displacement to the extent possible and, where displacement is inevitable, the need to handle with utmost care and forethought issues relating to Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families. Such an approach is especially necessary in respect of tribals, small & marginal farmers and women.

1.2 The system of extending cash compensation does not, by itself, in most cases, enable the affected families to obtain cultivable agricultural land, homestead and other resources which they have to surrender to the State. The difficulties are more acute for persons who are critically dependent on the acquired assets for their subsistence/ livelihoods, such as landless agricultural workers, forest dwellers, tenants and artisans, as their distress and destitution is more severe, and, yet they are not eligible for cash compensation.

1.3 Some States and Central Ministries/Departments have their own Policies and Guidelines for Resettlement and Rehabilitation. However, National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families (PAFs) has not so far been enunciated. This Document

aims at laying down basic norms and packages in the shape of a Policy which would, henceforth be referred to as the **National Policy on the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families-2003 (NPRR-2003)**.

1.4 The Policy essentially addresses the need to provide succour to the assetless rural poor, support the rehabilitation efforts of the resource poor sections, namely, small and marginal farmers, SCs/STs and women who have been displaced. Besides, it seeks to provide a broad canvas for an effective dialogue between the Project Affected Families and the Administration for Resettlement & Rehabilitation. Such a dialogue is expected to enable timely completion of projects with a sense of definiteness as regards costs and adequate attention being paid to the needs of the displaced persons especially the resource poor sections. The intention is to impart greater flexibility for interaction and negotiation so that the resultant Package gains all-round acceptability in the shape of a workable instrument providing satisfaction to all stakeholders/Requiring Bodies.

1.5 The National Policy on the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families will be in the form of broad guidelines and executive instructions for guidance of all concerned and will be applicable to **Projects displacing 500 families or more enmasse**. It is expected that appropriate Government and Administrator for R&R shall implement this Policy in letter and spirit in order to ensure that the benefits envisaged under the Policy reaches the Project Affected Families, especially resource poor sections including SCs/STs.

1.6 The rehabilitation grants and other monetary benefits proposed in the Policy would be minimum and applicable to all project affected families whether belonging to BPL or non-BPL families except in cases where an express provision has been made. States where R&R packages are higher than proposed in the Policy are free to adopt their own packages.

SECRET

F.No. Acq. 13011/6/2002-LRD (Pt)
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Land Resources
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110 001

CHAPTER II

2. Objectives of the Policy

2.1 The objectives of the Policy are as follows:—

- (a) To minimize displacement and to identify non-displacing or least-displacing alternatives;
- (b) To plan the resettlement and rehabilitation of Project Affected Families, (PAFs) including special needs of Tribals and vulnerable sections;
- (c) To provide better standard of living to PAFs; and
- (d) To facilitate harmonious relationship between the Requiring Body and PAFs through mutual cooperation.

SECRET

F.No. Acq. 13011/6/2002-LRD (Pt)
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Land Resources
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110 001

CHAPTER III

3. Definitions

3.1 The **Definition** of various terms used in this Policy Document are as follows:

- (a) “Administrator for Resettlement and Rehabilitation” means an officer not below the rank of District Collector of the State Government appointed by it for the purpose of resettlement and rehabilitation of the Project Affected Families of the Project concerned provided that if the appropriate Government in respect of the project is the Central Government, such appointment shall be made in consultation with the Central Govt.
- (b) “affected zone”, in relation to a project, means declaration under para 5.1 of this Policy by the appropriate Government area of villages or locality under a project for which the land is being acquired under Land Acquisition Act, 1894 or any other Act in force or an area that comes under submergence due to impounding of water in the reservoir of the project;
- (c) “agricultural family” means a family whose primary mode of livelihood is agriculture and includes family of owners as well as sub-tenants of agricultural land, agricultural labourers, occupiers of forest lands and of collectors of minor forest produce;
- (d) “agricultural labourer” means a person normally resident in the affected zone for a period of not less than three years immediately before the declaration of the affected zone who does not hold any land in the affected zone but who earns

his livelihood principally by manual labour on agricultural land therein immediately before such declaration and who has been deprived of his livelihood;

- (e) “agricultural land” includes lands used or capable of being used for the purpose of—
 - (i) agriculture or horticulture;
 - (ii) dairy farming, poultry farming, pisciculture, breeding or livestock and nursery growing medical herbs;
 - (iii) raising of crops, grass or garden produce; and
 - (iv) land used by an agriculturist for the grazing of cattle, but does not include land used for the cutting of wood only;
- (f) “Appropriate Government” means,—
 - (i) in relation to acquisition of land for the purposes of the Union, the Central Government;
 - (ii) in relation to a project is executed by Central Government agency/Central Government undertaking or by any other agency on the orders/directions of Central Government, the Central Government, otherwise the State Government; and
 - (iii) in relation to acquisition of land for other purposes, the State Government.
- (g) ‘BPL Family’: The Below Poverty Line Families shall be those as defined by the Planning Commission of India from time to time.
- (h) “Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation”, in relation to a project, means the Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation appointed by the State Government not below the rank of Commissioner/Secretary of that Government.
- (i) “Displaced family” means any tenure holder, tenant, Government lessee or owner of the other property, who on account of acquisition of his land including plot in the abadi or other property in the affected zone for the purpose of the project, has been displaced from such land or other property.

- (j) “family” means Project Affected Family consisting of such persons, his or her spouse, minor sons, unmarried daughters, minor brothers or unmarried sisters, father, mother and other members residing with him and dependent on him for their livelihood.
- (k) “holding” means the total land held by a person as an occupant or tenant or as both.
- (l) “marginal farmer” means a cultivator with an unirrigated land holding upto one hectare or irrigated land holding upto half hectare.
- (m) “non-agricultural labourer” means a person who is not an agricultural labourer but is normally residing in the affected zone for a period of not less than three years immediately before the declaration of the affected zone and who does not hold any land under the affected zone but who earns his livelihood principally by manual labour or as a rural artisan immediately before such declaration and who has been deprived of earnings his livelihood principally by manual labour or as such artisan in the affected zone.
- (n) “notification” means a notification published in the Official Gazette;
- (o) “occupiers” means members of Scheduled Tribe community in possession of forest land prior to 25th October, 1980;
- (p) “project” means a project displacing one thousand or more families enmasse as a result of acquisition of land for any project.
- (q) “project affected family” means a family/person whose place of residence or other properties or source of livelihood are sustainability affected by the process of acquisition of land for the project and who has been residing continuously for a period of not less then three years preceding the date of declaration of the affected zone or practicing any trade, occupation or vocation continuously for a period of not less than three years in the affected zone; preceding the date of declaration of the affected zone.
- (r) “Resettlement zone”, in relation to a project, means the declaration of any area by the appropriate Government

acquired or proposed to be acquired for resettlement and rehabilitation of Project Affected Families as a resettlement zone.

- (s) "Requiring Body" shall mean any company, a body corporate, an institution, or any other organization for whom land is to be acquired by the appropriate Government, and includes the appropriate Government if the acquisition of land is for such Government either for its own use or for subsequent allotment of such land in public interest to a body corporate, institution, or any other organization or to any company under lease, license or through any other system of transfer of land to such company, as the case may be.
- (t) "small farmer" means a cultivator with an unirrigated land holding up to two hectares or with an irrigated land holding up to one hectare.

CHAPTER IV

4. Appointment of Administrator and Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation and their Powers & Functions

Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation

4.1 Where the appropriate Government is satisfied that acquisition of land for any project involves displacement of one thousand or more families enmasse, it shall, by notification, appoint in respect of that project, an officer not below the rank of District Collector of the State Government to be the **Administrator** for R&R in respect of that project.

Provided that if the appropriate Government in respect of the project is the Central Government, such appointment shall be made in consultation with the Central Government.

4.2 The Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall be assisted by such officers and employees as the appropriate Government may provide.

Powers and Functions of Administrator

4.3 Subject to the superintendence, directions and control of the appropriate Government and Commissioner for R&R, the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall take all measures for the rehabilitation and resettlement of all project affected families (PAF) in respect of that project.

4.4 The overall control and superintendence of the formulation of resettlement and rehabilitation plan and execution of the same shall vest in the Administrator, Resettlement & Rehabilitation.

4.5 Subject to any general or special order of the appropriate Government, the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall perform the following functions/duties:—

- (i) minimize displacement of persons and to identify non-displacing or least displacing alternatives in consultation with the requiring body;

- (ii) hold consultation with the project affected families while preparing a resettlement and rehabilitation scheme/plan;
- (iii) ensure that interest of the adversely project affected families of Scheduled Tribes and weaker sections are protected.
- (iv) prepare a draft plan/scheme of resettlement and rehabilitation as required under Chapter V of this Policy;
- (v) prepare a budget including estimated expenditure of various components of acquisition of land, resettlement and rehabilitation activities of programmes in consultation with representatives of the project affected families and requiring body for whom the land is acquired;
- (vi) acquire adequate land for the project as also for setting the project affected families;
- (vii) allot land and sanction the benefit to project affected families; and
- (viii) perform such other functions as the appropriate Government may, from time to time, by order in writing, assign.

Delegation of powers of Administrator

4.6 Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation may, by order in writing, delegate such of the administrative powers conferred and duties imposed on him by or under this Policy to any officer not below the rank of Tehsildar or equivalent.

4.7 All officers and staff appointed by the appropriate Government under this Policy shall be subordinate to the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation.

Commissioner for R&R

4.8 The State Government shall appoint an officer of the rank of Commissioner/Secretary of that Government for resettlement and rehabilitation in respect of such projects to which this Policy applies to be called the Commissioner for Resettlement & Rehabilitation.

4.9 For the purposes of this Policy, the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation and other officers and employees appointed for the purposes of resettlement and rehabilitation of PAF

shall be subordinate to the Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation.

Functions of Commissioner for R&R

4.10 The Commissioner shall be responsible for supervising the formulation of resettlement and rehabilitation plans/schemes, proper implementation of such plans/schemes and redressal of grievances as mentioned in Chapter VII of this Policy.

CHAPTER V

5. Schemes/Plans for Resettlement and Rehabilitation

The procedure mentioned in this Chapter shall be followed for declaration of Affected Zone, carrying out survey & census of Project Affected Families, Assessment of Government land available and land to be acquired for the purpose of Resettlement and Rehabilitation, preparation of draft scheme/plan for R&R and its final publication.

Declaration of Affected Zone

5.1 The appropriate Government may, if it is of the opinion that acquisition of land for a project is likely to displace one thousand or more families enmasse declare, by notification in the Official Gazette, area of villages or localities as an **affected zone** of the project and thereupon the contents of this Policy shall apply to the project involved.

Procedure to be followed for survey and census of PAFs etc.

5.2 Every declaration made under Para 5.1 of the Policy shall be published in at least two daily newspapers one of them should be in the local vernacular having circulation in villages or areas which are likely to be affected and also be affixing a copy of the notification on the **Notice Board of the concerned Gram Panchayats and other prominent place or places in the affected zone.**

5.3 Once the declaration is made under para 5.1 of the Policy, the Administrator for Resettlement and Rehabilitation shall undertake a **survey for identification** of the persons and their families likely to be affected by the project.

5.4 Every survey shall contain the following village-wise information of the project affected families:—

- (i) Members of the family who are permanently residing, practicing any trade, occupation or vocation in the project affected area;
- (ii) Project Affected Families who are likely to lose their house, agricultural land, employment or are alienated wholly or substantially from the main source of their trade occupation or vocation.

- (iii) Agricultural labourers and non-agricultural labourers; and
- (iv) Project Affected Families who are having possession of forest lands prior to the 25th October, 1980, that is prior to the commencement of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

5.5 Every survey undertaken under para 5.4 shall be completed within a period of ninety days from the date of declaration made under para 5.1

5.6 On the expiry of the period of **ninety days** as aforesaid, the Administrator for Resettlement and Rehabilitation shall, by notification, and also in such other manner so as to reach all persons likely to be affected, publish a draft of the details of the findings of the survey conducted by him for inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby.

5.7 On the expiry of **thirty days** from the date of publication of the draft of the details of survey and after considering the objections and suggestions received by him in this behalf, the Administrator for Resettlement and Rehabilitation shall submit the final details of survey with his recommendations to the State Government.

5.8 Within **forty-five days** from the date of receipt of the recommendations of the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation, the State Government shall publish the final details of survey in the Official Gazette.

5.9 The Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall ensure that the Project Affected Families may be settled preferably in group or groups and such sites should form a part of existing Gram Panchayat as far as possible. However, it has to be ensured that the PAFs may be resettled with the host community on the basis of equality and mutual understanding, consistent with the desire of each group to preserve its own identity and culture.

Assessment of Land available for Resettlement and Rehabilitation

5.10 For the purposes of para 5.9 above, the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall draw up a list of lands which may be available in any existing Gram Panchayats for resettlement and rehabilitation of project affected families.

5.11 The lands drawn up under para 5.10 shall consist of:—

- (a) Government waste lands and any other land vesting in the Government available for allotment to project affected families.
- (b) If sufficient Government land is not available there, then land to be acquired for the purposes of resettlement and rehabilitation scheme/plan. However, the Administrator for R&R should ensure that such acquisition of land should not lead to another list of affected families.

Declaration of Resettlement Zone

5.12 The appropriate Government shall, by notification, declare any area acquired or proposed to be acquired for resettlement and rehabilitation of project affected families, as a resettlement zone.

Power to acquired land for Resettlement & Rehabilitation

5.13 The Administrator for R&R, on behalf of the appropriate government, may either compulsorily acquire keeping in view the contents of Para 5.11(b) above any land under the Land Acquisition Act 1894 or purchase land from any person through consent award and may enter into an agreement for this purpose.

Draft Scheme/Plan for Resettlement & Rehabilitation

5.14 After completion of base line survey and census of Project Affected Families and assessment of requirement of land for resettlement as mentioned in Paras 5.3 & 5.11, the Administrator for R&R shall prepare a draft scheme/plan for the Resettlement & Rehabilitation of the Project Affected Families in consultation with representatives of Project Affected Families including women, Chairpersons of elected Panchayati Raj Institutions within which the Project area is situated.

Management of Funds for R&R

5.15 While preparing a draft scheme/Plan, the Administrator for R&R shall ensure that the cost of R&R scheme/Plan should be an integral part of the cost of the Project for which the land is being acquired and the entire expenditure of R&R benefits and other expenditure for resettlement and rehabilitation of PAFs are to be borne by the requiring body for which the area is being acquired.

5.16 It shall be the responsibility of the requiring body to provide sufficient funds to the Administrator for R&R for proper implementation of resettlement & Rehabilitation scheme/plan of Project Affected Families.

5.17 The Administrator for R&R shall keep proper books of accounts and records of the funds placed at his disposal and submit periodical returns to the Appropriate Government in this behalf.

Contents of Draft Scheme/Plan of R&R

5.18 Every draft scheme/Plan of resettlement and rehabilitation prepared shall contain the following particulars, namely:—

- (a) the extent of area to be acquired for the project and the name(s) of the corresponding village(s).
- (b) a village-wise list of project affected families and likely number of displaced persons, family-wise and the extent and nature of land and immovable property in their possession indicating the survey numbers thereof held by such persons in the affected zone;
- (c) a list of agricultural labourers in such area and the names of such persons whose livelihood depend on agricultural activities;
- (d) a list of persons who have lost or are likely to lose their employment or livelihood or who have been alienated wholly and substantially from their main sources of occupation or vocation consequent to the acquisition of land for the project;
- (e) a list of occupiers, if any,
- (f) a list of public utilities and Government buildings which are likely to be affected;
- (g) a comprehensive list of benefits and packages which are to be provided to project affected families;
- (h) details of the extent of land available which may be acquired in settlement area for resettling and for allotment of land to the project affected families;

- (i) details of the basic amenities and infrastructure facilities which are to be provided for resettlement;
- (j) the time schedule for shifting and resettling the displaced families in resettlement zones;
- (k) such other particulars as the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation may think fit to include for the information of the displaced persons.

Final Publication of Scheme/Plan of R&R

5.19 The Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation shall, submit the draft scheme/plan for R&R to the State Government for its approval. It will be the responsibility of the State Government to obtain the consent of requiring body before approving the same. The draft scheme/plan may be published in the Official Gazette to give wide publicity to the same in the affected zone.

5.20 Upon notification of a scheme/plan, the same shall come into force.

CHAPTER VI

R&R Benefits for Project Affected Families

6.1 The Resettlement and Rehabilitation (R&R) benefits shall be extended to all the Project Affected Families (PAF).

6.2 A family comprising of single Individual without spouse or children shall get half monetary benefits under this Policy.

6.3 Any Project Affected Family (PAF) owning house and whose house has been acquired may be allotted free of cost house site to the extent of actual loss of area of the acquired house but not more than 150 sq.m. of land in rural areas and 75 sq.m. of land in urban areas.

6.4 Each PAF of BPL category shall get a one-time financial assistance of Rs. 25000 for house construction. Non-BPL families shall not be entitled to receive this assistance.

6.5 Each PAF owning agricultural land in the affected zone and whose entire land has been acquired may be allotted agricultural land or cultivable waste land to the extent of actual land loss subject to a maximum of one hectare of irrigated land or two hectares of un-irrigated land/cultivable waste land subject to availability.

6.6 Stamp duty and other fees payable for registration shall be borne by the requiring body.

6.7 The Land allotted under para 6.5 shall be free from all encumbrances. The Land allotted may be in the joint names of wife and husband of PAF.

6.8 In case of allotment of wasteland/degraded land in lieu of acquired land, each PAF shall get financial assistance of Rs. 10000 per hectare for land development. In case of allotment of agricultural land, a one-time financial assistance of Rs. 5000 per PAF for agricultural production shall be given.

6.9 Each PAF having cattle shall get financial assistance of Rs. 3000 for construction of cattle shed.

6.10 Each PAF shall get financial assistance of Rs. 5000 as transportation cost for shifting of building materials, belongings and cattle etc. from the affected zone to the resettlement zone.

6.11 Each PAF comprising of rural artisan/small trader and self employed person shall get one-time financial assistance of Rs. 10,000 for construction of working shed/shop.

6.12 Each PAF owning agricultural land in the affected zone and whose entire land has been acquired shall get one-time financial assistance equivalent to 750 days minimum agricultural wages for "loss of livelihood" where neither agricultural land nor regular employment to one member of the PAF has been provided.

6.13 Each PAF owning agricultural land in the affected zone and whose entire land has not been acquired and consequently he becomes a marginal farmer shall get one time financial assistance equivalent to 500 days minimum agricultural wages.

6.14 Each PAF owning agricultural land in the affected zone and consequently he becomes a small farmer shall get one time financial assistance equivalent to 375 days minimum agricultural wages.

6.15 Each PAF belonging to the category of 'agricultural labourer', or 'non-agricultural labourer' shall be provided a one time financial assistance equivalent to 625 days of the minimum agricultural wages.

6.16 Each displaced PAF shall get a monthly subsistence allowance equivalent to 20 days of minimum agricultural wages per month for a period of one year.

6.17 In the case of acquisition of land in emergent situation such as under Section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 or similar provision of other Act in force, each PAF shall be provided with transit accommodation, pending resettlement and rehabilitation scheme. Such families shall also get R&R benefits as mentioned in above paras under the Policy.

6.18 Acquisition of Long Stretches of Land: In case of projects relating to Railway Lines, Highways, Transmission Lines and laying pipelines wherein only a narrow stretch of land extending over several kilometers is being acquired, the Project Affected Families will be offered an ex-gratia amount of Rs. 10,000/- per family, no other Resettlement & Rehabilitation benefits shall be available to them.

6.19 The Project Affected families shall be provided necessary training facilities for development of entrepreneurship to take up self-employment projects at the resettlement zone as part of R&R benefits.

6.20 The Project Affected Families who were in possession of forest lands prior to 25th October, 1980 shall get all the benefits of R&R as given in above paras under the Policy.

6.21 The PAFs of Scheduled Caste category enjoying reservation benefits in the affected zone shall be entitled to get the reservation benefits at the resettlement zone.

6.22 R&R BENEFITS FOR PROJECT AFFECTED FAMILIES OF SCHEDULED TRIBES CATEGORY.

6.22.1 Each Project affected Family of ST category shall be given preference in allotment of land for land, if available.

6.22.2 Each tribal PAF shall be entitled to get R&R benefits mentioned in above Paras under the Policy.

6.22.3 Each Tribal PAF shall get additional financial assistance equivalent to 500 days minimum agriculture wages for loss of customary rights/usages of forest produce.

6.22.4 Tribal PAFs will be re-settled close to their natural habitat in a compact block so that they can retain their ethnic linguistic and cultural identity.

6.22.5 Tribal PAFs shall get land free of cost for community & religious gathering.

6.22.6 Tribal PAFs resettled out of the district/taluka will get 25% higher R&R benefits in monetary terms.

6.22.7 The Tribal Land Alienated in violation of the laws and regulations in force on the subject would be treated as null and void and the R&R benefits would be available only to the original tribal land owner.

6.22.8 The Tribal families residing in the Project Affected Areas having fishing rights in the river/pond/dam such tribals shall be given fishing rights in the reservoir area.

6.22.9 Tribal PAFs enjoying reservation benefits in the affected zone shall be entitled to get the reservation benefits at the resettlement zone.

6.23 INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES AND BASIC AMENITIES TO BE PROVIDED AT RESETTLEMENT ZONE:

6.23.1 While shifting the population of the Affected Zone to the Resettlement Zone, the Administrator for R&R may as far as possible, ensure that:

(a) In case the entire population of the village/area to be shifted belongs to a particular community, such population/families may be resettled enmasse in a compact area so that socio-cultural relations (social harmony) amongst shifted families are not disturbed.

(b) In case of resettlement of Scheduled Castes PAFs it may be ensured that they are resettled in sites close to the villages.

Infrastructure facilities

6.23.2 For enmasse resettlement of Project Affected Families, the following infrastructure facilities and basic minimum amenities shall be provided to enable the resettled population to enjoy a reasonable standard of community life:

- (a) The new resettlement site is reasonably habitable.
- (b) Roads, passages and easement rights for resettled families may be arranged and proper drainage as well as sanitation facilities provided at the resettlement sites;
- (c) One (or more) assured sources of safe drinking water for each 50 families settled in a pocket may be ensured, capable of yielding enough water to meet the demand @ at least sixty litre per capita per day.
- (d) Educational facilities for the children shall be arranged;
- (e) A reasonable number of Fair Price Shops shall be set up;
- (f) Panchayat Ghars and Community Halls shall be established (if permitted under the rules).
- (g) Village level Post Offices with facilities of opening Saving Accounts may be set up, (if permitted under the rules);
- (h) Health/medical care as appropriate, shall be provided, (if permitted under the rules);
- (i) Appropriate seed-cum-fertilizer stores shall be set up;

- (j) Efforts shall be made to provide irrigation facilities for the agricultural lands allotted to the resettled families;
- (k) Institutional arrangements for availing of financial assistance under the Central/State Government's schemes/Bankable schemes shall be made;
- (l) Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) shall be brought into operation at the earliest.
- (m) Anganwadi house may be constructed near each Primary School, (if permitted under the rules).
- (n) Electricity connections shall be provided, as far as possible;
- (o) Transport facility (which shall include all-weather road and public transport facilities) may be provided;
- (p) Public cremation ground/burial ground shall be provided for all communities;
- (q) Separate land shall be earmarked for traditional tribal institutions;
- (r) Tribal families shall be extended their traditional rights on minor forest produce and common property resources, as available in the vicinity of the new place of settlement;

CHAPTER VII

7. Dispute Redressal Mechanism

7.1 R&R Committee at Project Level

Dispute Redressal Mechanism

7.1.1 In respect of every project to which this Policy applies, the State Government shall constitute a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Administrator of that Project to be called the Resettlement and Rehabilitation Committee to monitor and review the progress of implementation of scheme/plan of resettlement and rehabilitation of the Project Affected Families.

7.1.2 The Resettlement & Rehabilitation Committee constituted as above shall *inter-alia* include as one of its members:—

- a representative of women residing in the affected zone;
- a representative each of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes residing in the affected zone;
- a representative of a voluntary organization;
- a representative of the lead bank;
- Chairman or his nominee of the PRIs located in the affected zone
- MPs/MLAs of the area included in the affected zone

Grievance Redressal cell

7.1.3 Procedure regulating the business of the Resettlement & Rehabilitation Committee, its meeting and other matters connected thereto shall be prescribed by the Appropriate Government.

7.2. Grievance Redressal Cell:

7.2.1 In respect of every project to which this Policy applies, the State Government shall constitute a Grievance Redressal Cell under the Chairmanship of the Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation for redressal of grievances of the PAFs.

7.2.2 The composition, powers, functions and other matters relating to the functioning of the Grievance Redressal Cell shall be such as may be prescribed by the Appropriate Government.

7.2.3 Any Project Affected Family, if aggrieved, for not being offered the admissible R&R benefits as provided under this Policy, may move an appropriate petition for redressal of his grievances to the Grievance Redressal Cell.

7.2.4 The form and manner in which and the time within which complaints may be made to the Grievance Redressal Cell and disposed of shall be such as may be prescribed by the appropriate Government.

7.2.5 The Grievance Redressal Cell shall have the power to consider and dispose of all complaints relating to resettlement and rehabilitation against the decision of the Administrator/R&R Committee at Project level for Resettlement & Rehabilitation and issue such directions to the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation as it may deem proper for the Redressal of such grievances.

7.3 Inter State Projects:—

Inter State Projects

7.3.1 In case a project covers an area in more than one State or States or a Union territory where the project affected families are or had been residing, or proposed to be resettled, the Central Government in the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) shall in consultation with concerned States or Union territory, as the case may be, appoint the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation and the Commissioner for Resettlement and Rehabilitation for the purposes of this Policy.

7.3.2 The method of implementation of plans/schemes for resettlement and rehabilitation shall be mutually discussed by the State Governments and the Union territory administration and the common plan/scheme shall be notified by the Administrator for Resettlement & Rehabilitation in the State or Union territory administration, as agreed to, in accordance with the procedure laid down in this Policy.

7.3.4 If any difficulty arises in the implementation of the schemes/plans, the matter shall be referred to the Central Government in the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) for its decision and the decision of the Central Government shall be binding on the concerned States and Union territory.

CHAPTER VIII

MONITORING MECHANISM

8. National Monitoring Committee

National Monitoring Committee

8.1 The Central Government, Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Land Resource shall constitute a National Monitoring Committee, to be chaired by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources for reviewing and monitoring the progress of implementation of resettlement and rehabilitation scheme/plan relating to all projects to which this Policy applies. The Committee will have the following or his nominee not below the rank of Joint Secretary as its members:—

Secretary, Planning Commission

Secretary, M/o Social Justice and Empowerment

Secretary, M/o Water Resources

Secretary, M/o Tribal Affairs

Secretary, M/o Railways

Secretary, M/o Power

Secretary, M/o Coal

Besides, the Secretary of the administrative Ministry/Department of the project for which the land is to be acquired shall be invited as one of the Members. The functions and duties of this Committee shall be prescribed by this Ministry.

8.2 The National Monitoring Committee shall be serviced by the National Monitoring Cell to be constituted by the Department of Land Resources for reviewing and monitoring the progress of implementation of Resettlement and Rehabilitation scheme/plan relating to all projects to which this Policy applies.

8.3 National Monitoring Cell constituted under this Policy shall be headed by an officer not below the rank of Joint Secretary to the Government of India. The National Monitoring Cell as referred to above shall be assisted by the officers and staff as referred to in Annexure I.

8.4 Applicability

Applicability

The National Policy on the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families (NPRR-2003) shall come into effect from the date of its publication in the Gazette of India (Extra-ordinary).

As on 29.7.03

(NB: The decisions of SCOS meeting dated 27.5.03 incorporated)

ANNEXURE I

The Composition of the National Monitoring Cell (See Para 8.3)

Sl. No.	Name of the Post	No. of Post
1.	Joint Secretary/Resettlement and Rehabilitation Commissioner	1
2.	Zonal Directors/Subject Matter Specialists Consultants	4
3.	Deputy Directors/Consultants	4
4.	Statistical Officer	1
5.	Section Officer/Desk Officer	1
6.	Assistants	2
7.	Statistical Assistants	2
8.	L.D.C-cum-Typists	4
9.	Stenographers	9
10.	Peons	4
11.	Sweepers	2
12.	Drivers	2

APPENDIX III

IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES OF WATERSHED PROGRAMMES

BIHAR

Conducted by:— International Institute of Sustainable Development and Management, Chandkheda, Ahmedabad.

District covered: 6 districts for DPAP and 2 districts under IWDP.

Project assessed: 78 projects under DPAP and 4 micro watershed projects under IWDP.

Soil Conservation:— In the case of DPAPs control of soil erosion has been successful for 45% of projects. However, in the case of projects during the post-guidelines period, positive impact has been very low because of non-completion of work in such projects. In the case of IWDPs, there is significant performance of project interventions in controlling soil erosion.

Land Holding Size of Farmers:— The average operational land holding size of the farmer indicates no improvement in the post-project period. However, there is improvement in arable land holding size due to projects. The average arable land holding size increased from 1.112 ha. in the pre guideline period to 1.116 in post-guideline period. There is significant improvement in irrigation facilities and increase in irrigated area; 42.16 per cent increase in the average irrigated area in the case of pre-guideline projects and 45.19 per cent in the case of post-guideline projects.

Changes in Water Table: Out of 78 project areas, ground water level has increased in 75 project areas. The extent of increase is not appreciable in the project areas due to poor maintenance of the assets created under the projects. The ground water level has increased in 54 project areas in the range of 0-25 per cent and in 21 project areas, the increase is in the range of 25-50 per cent. in IWDPs no such intervention was taken up.

Changes in Livestock & Allied Activities: In respect of completed projects, the percentage increase in livestock resources was 10.11 for

non-beneficiary households compared to 22.84 for beneficiaries and 25.89 for the project areas as a whole. In respect of projects in progress, the percentage increase in livestock resources was higher at 26.01 for the project areas and 21.20 for beneficiaries as against 10.11 for non-beneficiaries. Implementation of WDPs resulted in increased availability of fodder, agricultural waste, grazing area, etc.

Changes in Cropping Pattern and Yield: No positive effect of the programme has been observed in Bhabua district in terms of combined yields of all dominant crops while mixed results are observed in Nawada and Sitamarhi district. In the case of Jamui, Madhubani, and Rohtas districts, the indicators provide positive effect of the programme but in varying degrees.

Impact on Employment: The extent of employment created is not much compared to investments made in the projects. In 78 DPAPs, a total of 172,993 mandays of employment was generated. On an average a total 1,146 mandays of employment per project was generated covering less than 3 villages and 540 ha. of land. The situation is better in the case of IWDPs.

Impact on Income: The income of non-beneficiaries registered an increase of 36.27%. In the case of beneficiaries, the increase was to the extent of 56.28% where the project is completed and 44.71 per cent in the areas where the projects are in progress.

Overall Impact Qualitative assessment of the impact on various aspects of the programme indicates that as many as 62.07 per cent PIAs of completed projects reported positive impact on control of soil erosion. Further, 48.28 per cent reported increased availability of water, 44.38 per cent increased productivity and 31.03 per cent each arrest of run-off water and increased awareness.

Madhya Pradesh

Conducted by: Centre for Advanced Research and Development,
Bhopal

Sample size: 349 micro-watersheds in 105 blocks of 21 districts.

Project assessed: Sanctioned from 1991 to 1998 under DPAP.

The major ecological and livelihood impacts of the programmes are as under:—

1. The average arable and non-arable land increased by 0.26 hac. And 0.23 hec. per household respectively.
2. The water table in dug wells improved by an average of 4.5 ft. with an maximum increase of 8 ft.
3. The impact of DPAP on average employment generation has been 47% in agriculture production, 49% in agriculture labour and 40% in non-agriculture labour.
4. The average household income in the watershed villages increased by 43% under agriculture production, 71% under agriculture labour and 60% under non-agriculture labour in 10 DPAP Districts.
5. The DPAP watershed projects have definitely succeeded in reducing the droughts in 9 districts, i.e. East Nimar, Shajapur, Shivpuri, Guna, Damoh, Raisen, Jabalpur, Panna and Shahdol.
6. The DPAP Programme has helped in substantially reducing the seasonal out-migration in 16 districts out of the 21 districts studied.

Orissa

Conducted by: M/s. Rites Ltd. New Delhi.

District covered: 13, from across the entire State.

Project assessed: Sanctioned from 1992 to 1998, under DPAP & IWDP.

A total number of 148 projects under IWDP and DPAP were surveyed.

Land Use Pattern: It was noticed that generally the post-project *vis-a-vis* pre-project situation had resulted in decrease in fallow lands,

cultivable land not used, reduction in barren and uncultured land etc. The summary is given below:—

Classification	Percentage Increase/Decrease		
	DPAP	IWDP	MICRO
Net Area sown	7.0	8.1	6.8
Area sown more than once	6.7	13.0	4.1
Gross cropped	6.9	8.3	6.6
Land under misc.	10.9	7.1	0.2
Forest area	0.3	0	0
Area under nalas, streams	0	0	0

Nature of Vegetation: It was observed that uniformly there has been positive impact of the project represented by increase in area for vegetation cover. The significant improvement in vegetation cover in the areas covered under the Watershed programmes was in the areas under grass cover for DPAP, IWDP as well as for Micro IWDP projects. For areas under DPAP, the increase was 85% and for IWDP it was a phenomenal increase of 180% as the areas falling under this programme were larger than those falling under DPAP. Similar reason also appeared to hold good for an increase in tree plantation in the areas under IWDP (Micro).

Changes in Water Table: The overall area under irrigation increased by 16.71% for DPAP and by 32% for IWDP projects. The depth of water table of wells had shown decrease (which is an improvement) in case of areas under DPAP projects. There was change in depth of water table as given below:—

	Feet (%)	Area (%)
DPAP	-4.7%	3.0%
IWDP	0.0%	4.3%
MICRO	-11.1%	7.6%

Changes in Livestock & Allied Activities: There appeared to be significant increase in the population of cows, buffaloes, fish, goats

and pigs. the inter-district population of livestock by different categories varied but generally the livestock population had shown increase. But the bullock population had shown a decrease in the post project scenario. The increase was more marked in the case of DPAP project as compared to a mixed trend witnessed through IWDP and micro watershed projects.

Changes in Cropping Pattern and Yield: The areas where the DPAP projects were implemented reported an increase in net sown areas and gross cropped areas by 7.62% and 6.25% respectively. For IWDP, these were observed to be 8.1% and 8.3% and for Micro watershed projects, these were 6.8% and 6.6% respectively. The impact of DPAP towards increasing the forest area was marginal (0.3%). The area sown more than once had been noted to have increased by 6.7% under DPAP, 13% in the case of IWDP and by 4.1% under Micro Watersheds. There has been a qualitative change in the cropping pattern in favour of high valued crops. The increase in area under various crops ranged from about 10% to 84%. A pronounced shift has been observed in areas under IWDP. The yield (kg/ha.) of the different crops was also observed to have increased after the implementation of watershed projects. the increase in the yield ranged from about 5% to a high of 32%.

Impact on Employment: A total number of 3.19 million mandays were generated during the period when the projects under IWDP were implemented. The corresponding employment figures in the case of projects under DPAP were 2.49 million. The employment level of females during the implementation of project was observed to be around 33% for the IWDP project and about 41% for DPAP projects.

Impact on Income: The family incomes of beneficiaries registered a higher growth *vis-a-vis* non beneficiaries even in respect of projects in progress. The enhanced family income registered an appreciable growth ranged between 46% (in Dhankanal) and 156% (in Kalahandi) for DPAP and was in the range of 43% in Koraput and 232% in Kalahand.

Overall Impact: From the above, it is clear that the overall impact is positive.

Rajasthan

Conducted by:— M/s. Taylor Nelson Sofres Mode Pvt. Ltd.,
New Delhi.

Sample size and projects assessed:

In all, 462 watershed projects sanctioned from 1991-92 to 1997-98 were covered. The programme-wise details are: — 142 under DPAP, 302 under DDP and 18 projects under IWDP. In all, 25 districts were covered. These are Ajmer, Banswara, Baran, Barmer, Bharatpur, Bhilwara, Bikaner, Churu, Dungarpur, Hanumangarh, Jaisalmer, Jalore, Jaipur, Jhunjhunu, Jodhpur, Jhalawar, Kota, Nagaur, Pali, Rajsamand, Sikar, Sirohi, Sawai Madhopur, Tonk and Udaipur. While there was 100% coverage of IWDP projects, the projects under DPAP and DDP were taken up on a sample of 25% of the projects in the district (with a minimum of 20 projects).

Land Use Pattern:

Average Net Area sown increased by 16.9% under DPAP, 7.4% under DDP and 30.4% under IWDP.

Land under miscellaneous tree crops/groves not included under net area sown increased by 16.2% under DPAP, 9.4% under DDP and 299.6% under IWDP.

Overall average land under current follows, culturable land (but not used), barren and unculturable land and forest decreased during post-project period ranging between 5 percent under forest and 28 percent under cultural land. This decrease was noticed under all programmes except current follows in DPAP where it increased by 11 percent. Average area under nalas, streams, roads, buildings and other non-agriculture use increased marginally in all the programmes during post-project period ranging from less than 1 percent in IWDP to about 5 percent in DPAP.

Changes in Vegetation:

There was an overall increased in average area under trees planted, shrubs and bushes grown and grasses grown, as detailed below:—

Nature of vegetation	% age increase DPAP	% age increase DDP	% age increase DPAP	Total % age increase
Trees planted	122.7	156.7	85.2	140.9
Shrubs & bushes grown	113.0	152.8	68.7	117.6
Grasses grown	117.8	111.3	96.8	111.0

Irrigation:

Water resources status in pre and post project period indicates that the irrigated area increased from 27 to 40 hectares per watershed registering an increase of about 50% in irrigated area during the post-project period. Irrigated areas increased in all programmes, 15% in DPAP, 55.7% in DDP and 66.7% in IWDP in the post-project period.

Changes in Water Table:

Overall, depth of water table of wells decreased from 146 to 138 feet during post-project period. Similarly, level of water table in the villages covered under the Watershed decreased from 134 to 127 feet. But under IWDP there was some marginal increase in these levels. This increase was 2.5 feet in depth of water table to wells and 3.6 feet in case of water table in the villages.

Changes in Cropping Pattern:

Overall average area under dominant crops (except jowar) increased during post-project period ranging from 5 per cent in case of mustard to 73% under pulses. In case of jowar average area decreased by 10%. programme-wise average under bajra and jowar decreased by 20% and 28% in DPAP. In DDP area decreased by 9% and 5% under jowar and mustard respectively and in IWDP average area under jowar decreased by 2%. Area under other dominant crops increased significantly in all the programmes during post-project period.

Changes in Yield:

Overall average yield of all dominant crops increased significantly ranging from 10 percent in case of black gram to 73% under mustard during post project period. Average yield decreased by 1% under rice. In DPAP yield increased significantly under all dominant crops (except rice) ranging by 15% in case of maize to 208% under mustard. In DDP, increase ranged from 10% for black gram to 55% for bajra. Rice yield decreased by 15%. In IWDP yield increased under all dominant crops ranging from 2 percent for wheat to 17 percent for maize. Thus, a positive impact was observed in yield of dominant crops except rice.

Livestock development:

Overall, there had been an increase in the livestock of various categories (except bullocks) per watershed. The increase ranged between

2.2% in case of cows and 63.7% in case of buffaloes. Under IWDP increase was noticed in all the categories of livestock, whereas there was a decrease in the number of livestock during post over pre project period under DPAP, Under DDP decrease was noticed in the case of bullocks.

Employment Generation:

Overall, 2.50 lakh man days of employment were generated under each watershed project on an average. This average was higher for women 1.49 lakh man days than men — 1.01 lakh man days. It was more under IWDP project (4.38 lakh man days) but the employment generation for women was very low (0.8 lakh) compared to men (3.58 lakh). Under a project DDP, it was 3.02 lakh man days while it was 1.16 lakh man days under DPAP project.

Tamil Nadu

Conducted by: Centre for Management Development, Thycaud, Thiruvananthapuram.

District covered: 17 from across the entire State.

Project assessed: Sanctioned from 1.4.1991 to 31.3.1998, under DPAP & IWDP.

Land Use Pattern: Under DPAP, there has been an average of 17.74% in the net area sown across the watershed districts, while gross cropped area has increased by 20.76%. the net area sown has increased in all the districts during the post project period. The highest being 41.33% in Dindigal while the lowest was reported from Namakkal (2.21%). The increase in gross cropped area varied from a high of 43.57% reported from Dindigal to a low of 23.15% reported from Namakkal. There has also been decrease in the current fallows across the watershed districts. Average decreases of 35.22% and 33.71 respectively in the current fallows and unutilized culturable land have been reported. However, no significant change in land use pattern has been reported in the IWDP watershed districts except Erode. The net area sown has increased by 27.61% while the gross cropped area has increased by 29.89%.

Changes in Water Table: The water table has risen in all districts except Namakkal, Sivaganga, Karur and Coimbatore. Even in these four districts, the reason for the water table going down further in the severe failure of monsoons in the last 3-4 years. The improvement in water availability in these areas in further substantiated by the reported increase in irrigated land holding of the beneficiary farmers.

Changes in Livestock & Allied Activities: Watershed projects have been able to create significant impact on the livestock activities in the watershed areas. The population of livestock reared by the beneficiary farmers has increased during the project. Maximum increase was observed in the number of poultry birds, local and improved.

Changes in Cropping Pattern and Yield: The productivity has generally increased for almost all the crops. However, no pattern has been noticed in the change in productivity across the districts. While the productivity of paddy has come down in Tirunelveli, it has registered increases in districts like Ramanathapuram, Sivaganga, etc. The increase is highest for cotton, followed by millets, ground nut, maize and paddy. The availability of fuel and fodder is also noticed to have increase in the watershed area. Increase in fuel has been reported from as high as 99.38% of the watersheds in Ramanathapuram. Similarly, increase in fodder also has been reported from as high as 99.38%.

Impact on Employment: The DPAP watershed projects have generated 5819.73 man days of total average annual employment per project. The maximum employment was generated in Tiruchirapalli (13089 man days), while the minimum was reported from Perambalur (1008 man days). The total average annual employment per project generated by Wasteland Development Projects is much higher at 8859 man days, the maximum employment being generated in Dindigul (16119) and the minimum in Tiruvannamalai (8500).

Impact on Income : The average annual generated as a result of implementation of the watershed projects is around Rs. 2000 per household. The highest average annual income is reported from Coimbatore (Rs. 24348) and the least from Salem (12610).

Overall Impact: The overall performance of the programmes has been good with most of the areas achieving the physical targets. The projects could make significant impact on the ground water recharge in the watershed areas, the land utilization, irrigation facilities, productivity of the land and crops and control of soil and land erosion. The projects have also been successful in generating sustainable employment and helped the beneficiary village community in earning increased income and improving their quality of lives.

Uttar Pradesh

Conducted by: Wizmen Management Consultants, Kanpur

District covered: 28, from across the entire State

Project assessed: Sanctioned from 1991 to 1998, under DPAP & IWDP

The assessment has taken Watershed Schedule Data and Individual Schedule Data both, for impact judgement on each parameter.

Land Use Pattern: (a) Increase in gross cropped area by 20.2% on account of increase in net sown area as well as area sown twice and more. (b) Reduction in culturable land not under use by 48.3%. (c) Area under irrigation in DPAP watershed areas registered an increase by 6.6%. (d) Area under hybrid seeds increased by 265.5%.

Nature of Vegetation: In programme watersheds, the overall vegetation growth increased by 69.2%; the biomass production of shrubs and grasses has been significant in DPAP areas while IWDP areas have shown sizeable improvement in tree plantation done by the Forest Department.

Changes in Water Table: Appreciable improvement registered. Recharging of wells in watershed area and individual farms both, increased by 17% *i.e.* about 5.8 feet. More than 80% of beneficiary population of DPAP area perceives this improvement.

Changes in Livestock & Allied Activities: Increase in Livestock by 24.67% and marked improvement in Fisheries, Poultry and Pig farming due to increased fodder production and water availability and upward contribution in people's earning by these activities.

Changes in Cropping Pattern and Yield: During 5-10 years of time, the area of DPAP watersheds under 10 major crop witnessed considerable increase. The Crop Intensity increased by 4.42% surpassing the State average of 1.49. The production of wheat, Maize and Mustard registered an increase of 67.06%, 41.48% and 47.22% respectively.

Impact on Employment : The No. of man-days per household increased from 392.46 to 463.16 *i.e.* by 18%. The main increase shown in non-agriculture labour, trading agricultural activities.

Impact on Income: Overall annual income per household in the programme areas gone up by 72%, from Rs. 22410 to Rs. 38544. With the average family size of 6.8 in the DPAP area, this increase amounts to from Rs. 3296 to Rs. 5268 per capita income, still quite low from the State average of Rs. 16487.

Overall Impact: Very positive despite some institutional problems and lacunae in implementation. DPAP has increased area under cultivation, irrigation facilities and production of major crops besides bringing up water table, improved employment and increased income opportunities.

APPENDIX-IV

DROUGHT PRONE AREAS PROGRAMME

**STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS SANCTIONED
DURING 1995-96**

State	No. of projects sanctioned	No. of cases where 7 instalments released (100% of cost)	No. of cases where 6 instalments released (90% of cost)	No. of cases where 5 instalments released (80% of cost)	No. of cases where 4 instalments released (65% of cost)	No. of cases where 3 instalments released (45% of cost)	No. of cases where 2 instalments released (25% of cost)
Andhra Pradesh	527	527	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar	101	—	—	—	65	14	22
Chhattisgarh	234	122	—	112	—	—	—
Gujarat	275	275	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh	33	33	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand	263	19	—	16	69	108	51
Karnataka	406	292	93	—	21	—	—
Madhya Pradesh	661	661	—	—	—	—	—
Maharashtra	818	161	187	227	235	—	8
Orissa	192	30	18	—	132	12	—
Rajasthan	182	163	11	8	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu	297	297	—	—	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh	282	282	—	—	—	—	—
Uttaranchal	117	117	—	—	—	—	—
West Bengal	135	—	—	—	127	8	—
Total	4523	2979	309	363	649	142	81

APPENDIX-V

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST SITTING
OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 30 DECEMBER 2003

The Committee sat from 1145 hrs. to 1315 hrs. in Committee Room
'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Shriram Chauhan
4. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullu
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Hassan Khan
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
10. Shri Maheshwar Singh
11. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

Rajya Sabha

12. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
13. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
14. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
15. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah
16. Shri Harish Rawat

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

2. As the chairman was stranded on account of diversion of flight due to inclement weather, the Committee chose Shri Prasanta Chatterjee, M.P., to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. He was in the Chair till 1245 hrs., when the Chairman came and presided over the sitting.

3. The Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda:

- (i) *** *** *** ***
- (ii) Memorandum No. 10 regarding draft action taken report on action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 47th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

4. The Committee, after deliberating on various observations/recommendations made in the aforesaid action taken report as indicated above adopted the same with slight modifications/additions as given in *Annexure*.

5. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the said draft action taken report on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and to present the same to Parliament.

The Committee, then, adjourned.

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

ANNXURE

(See Para 4 of Minutes dated 30.12.2003)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications/Additions
1	2	3	4	5
1.	37	44	—	<p><i>Add at the end:</i></p> <p>In this context, the Committee would like that emphasis should be given on undertaking projects under IWDP for those ecologically fragile areas where preponderance of wastelands hinder developmental activities. The Committee further feel that apart from Government initiative, participation of the community should also be encouraged. They are of the view that involvement of community-based organisations in the planning and implementation of projects would go a long way in making them successful and sustainable.</p>
2.	46	53	2 from below	<p><i>Add after "Planning Commission":</i></p> <p>The Committee also stress that the Government should make all possible efforts to involve beneficiaries and persons from all walks of life in the development of wastelands in the country.</p>

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004) EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 13 JANUARY 2004

The Committee sat from 1515 hours to 1615 hours in Room No. 139, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
6. Shri Shriram Chauhan
7. Shri Jaiprakash
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
11. Shri maheshwar Singh
12. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
13. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
14. Shri ravi Prakash Verma

Rajya Sabha

15. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
16. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
17. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
18. Shri Harish Rawat

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. Chakraborty — Director
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — Under Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the first sitting of the Committee and congratulated them on their nomination to the Committee. The Committee then formally adopted two draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Departments of Drinking Water Supply and Land Resources which were considered and adopted by the previous Committee (2003) at their sitting held on 30 December 2003.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | *** | *** | *** |
| 4. | *** | *** | *** |
| 5. | *** | *** | *** |
| 6. | *** | *** | *** |
| 7. | *** | *** | *** |

The Committee then adjourned.

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

APPENDIX-VII

[Vide para 4 of the introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 47TH REPORT OF THE STNADING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (13TH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total number of recommendations	48
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos.: 2.13, 2.18, 2.36, 2.37, 2.38, 2.43, 2.44, 2.45, 2.48, 2.49, 2.50, 2.57, 2.58, 2.66, 2.83, 2.87, 2.94, 3.20, 3.39, 3.40, 3.41, 3.42, 3.52, 3.61, 3.62, 3.76, 3.77, 3.78, 3.79, 3.100, 3.101 and 3.119	32
	Percentage to total recommendations	(66.67%)
III.	Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies: Para No.: 3.19	1
	Percentage to total recommendation	(2.08%)
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Para Nos.: 2.14, 2.15, 2.21, 2.28, 2.42, 2.82, 3.18, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.95 and 3.128	13
	Percentage to the total recommendations	(27.08%)
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited: Para Nos.: 2.22 and 2.80	2
	Percentage to total recommendations	(4.17%)